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Dashboards – AIOS, LECTRURER ,STUDENT

REGISTRATION : ( Role based , admin will verify wheather its lecturer or aios )

LOGIN-

LECTURES DASHBOARD –

1.list of all students under particular course not module, after clicking on one student name / number it shows all the details of modules which student enrolled.

2. Search bar for searching with student number not with name.

STUDENT DASHBOARD

In Student dashboard , we need details of particular student like :

Name, id, course, module

Integrity score – after analaysing by this software

Activity timeline

Observations

Awarness

ALL evidances

Learning Analytics

Note : All these are calculated based on different rules which will mention below

|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **Fact**  **source** | **Fact**  **Category** | **Fact**  **subcategory** | **Question to collect fact** | **Fact**  **Id** | **Possible**  **values** | **Fact**  **weightage** | **Evidence**  **weightage** |
|  |  |  | Did the student attend a |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  | seminar, session, or  training organised by the | AS1 | YES  NO | LOW | NA |
|  |  |  | university to educate them  about contract cheating? |  | NA |  |  |
|  |  |  | Was the student |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  | successful in passing an  online or offline test on | AS2 | YES  NO | LOW | NA |
|  |  | Awareness scores (AS) | contract cheating  awareness? |  | NA |  |  |
| Did the student participate in an academic integrity activity campaign or other similar events offered by the higher education  institution? | AS3 | YES NO NA | LOW | NA |
| NILE  platform to |  |  | Has the student signed a  self-declaration confirming |  | YES |  |  |
| rate these  values |  |  | that the student is  committed to maintain | AS4 | NO  NA | LOW | NA |
|  | Student's  academic |  | academic integrity ? |  |  |  |  |
|  | What is the student's level |  |  |  |  |
|  | behaviour | Learning | of engagement in the virtual learning environment in terms of the overall interaction expected from the  student? | LA1 | HIGH MEDIUM LOW  NA | MEDIUM | LOW |
|  |  | analytics  (LA) | Is there any suspicious  activity reported in the |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  | student's device interaction log, such as concurrent logins from multiple  locations, logins from a | LA2 | YES NO NA | HIGH | HIGH |
|  |  |  | different geographical  area, etc? |  |  |  |  |
| Lecturer |  | Academic engagement (AG) | What is the level of engagement of the student in the module/course as evidenced by their participation in class  discussions, in-class | AG1 | HIGH MEDIUM LOW  NA | MEDIUM | LOW |
|  |  |  | assignments, email |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |

|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
|  |  |  | correspondence, and other activities? |  |  |  |  |
|  | | | | | | | |
|  |  |  | Has the lecturer |  |  |  |  |
|  |  | Lecturer's awareness score(LAS) | participated in any training/learning sessions on contract cheating  hosted by the higher | AD1 | YES NO NA | LOW | NA |
|  |  |  | education institute? |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  | Does the assessment |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  | design ensure relatively higher possibility of detecting contract cheating?  (Eg: practical tasks,  reflections etc. are easier | AD2 | YES NO NA | MEDIUM | NA |
|  |  |  | to be detected ) |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  | Is a face-to-face or |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  | recorded presentation  required for the | AD3 | YES  NO | MEDIUM | NA |
|  |  |  | assessment? |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  | Does the assessment |  |  |  |  |
| Lecturer | Assessment design risk | Assessment design type (ADT) | artefact type fit into the assessment category when there is a similarity of less than 5% and can be taken as an indication of  contract cheating? | AD4 | YES NO NA | Not applicable | NA |
|  |  |  | Does the assessment  artefact type fit into the |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  | assessment category when there is a similarity of greater than 30% and can  be taken as an indication | AD5 | YES NO | Not applicable | NA |
|  |  |  | of contract cheating? |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  | Is there a mechanism in |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  | place as part of the assessment design to track the changes made to  the student-submitted files | AD6 | YES NO NA | MEDIUM | NA |
|  |  |  | since they were created? |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  | What is the assessment's |  | HIGH |  |  |
|  |  | Assessment | weightage in terms of the  overall grade awarded for | AD7 | MEDIUM  LOW | HIGH | NA |
|  |  | weightage (AW) | the module? |  | NA |  |  |
| What is the module's weightage in terms of the | AD8 | HIGH MEDIUM | HIGH | NA |

|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
|  |  |  | overall grade awarded for the course? |  | LOW NA |  |  |
|  | | | | | | | |
|  |  |  | Is there any information |  |  |  |  |
|  |  | Online Search (OS) | about the assessment available online on any websites that could indicate the likelihood of  outsourcing? | OS1 | YES NO | HIGH | HIGH |
| Is there any traceable |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  | metadata accessible on the contents of the website which can be associated  with the student? | OS2 | YES NO | HIGH | HIGH |
|  |  |  | What is the similarity score reported on TurnitIn (or similar softwares)  excluding references? | DS1 | HIGH MEDIUM LOW  NA | HIGH | MEDIUM |
|  |  | Document  similarity | Is the work submitted by  the student very similar to | DS2 | YES  NO | HIGH | HIGH |
|  |  | (DS) | that of another student? |  | NA |  |  |
| Lecturer | Assessment artefact analysis |  | Is there a similarity reported on a block of references in the  bibliography? | DS3 | YES NO NA | HIGH | MEDIUM |
|  | Are there any references mentioned in the documents that have been  submitted by the student? | DR1 | YES NO NA | MEDIUM | LOW |
|  |  | Document references (DR) | Has the student used sources that are specific to the assessment topic rather than generic or outdated ones in the  references? | DR2 | YES NO NA | MEDIUM | LOW |
| Do the citations from the  references appear in the | DR3 | YES  NO | MEDIUM | LOW |
|  |  |  | text as well? |  | NA |  |  |
|  |  |  | Is there a reasonable |  | YES |  |  |
|  |  |  | range of reference access  dates in bibliography? | DR4 | NO  NA | MEDIUM | LOW |
|  |  |  | Has the student used the correct referencing style as mentioned in the  assessment brief? | DR5 | YES NO NA | MEDIUM | LOW |
|  |  | Document content (DC) | Do you think that the quality of the student assessment submissions  is reasonable considering | DC1 | YES NO NA | HIGH | MEDIUM |

|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
|  |  |  | the student's participation and module's level? |  |  |  |  |
| Is the writing style used in |  |  |  |  |
| the supplied documents overly sophisticated, with minimal evidence of the  depth of the study | DC2 | YES NO NA | MEDIUM | MEDIUM |
| undertaken? |  |  |  |  |
| Is the level of the English |  |  |  |  |
| writing in the submitted documents significantly better than the quality of the English used by the student in emails, in-class  discussions, and other | DC3 | YES NO NA | MEDIUM | MEDIUM |
| forms of communication? |  |  |  |  |
| Is the student's submission generic in nature, failing to address the assignment's  key focus points? | DC4 | YES NO NA | HIGH | MEDIUM |
| Are there inappropriate |  |  |  |  |
| replacements of  vocabulary in the work that | DC5 | YES  NO | MEDIUM | MEDIUM |
| suggests an attempt to  make it plagiarism free? |  | NA |  |  |
| Are there any indications  on the student's |  |  |  |  |
| documents that show the  involvement of a third |  | YES |  |  |
| party, such as directions to  insert the name/contents in | DC6 | NO  NA | HIGH | HIGH |
| the document, contract  number, billing number, |  |  |  |  |
| etc.? |  |  |  |  |
|  | Is the student's name listed as an author on the assessment submission  document's metadata? | MD1 | YES NO NA | MEDIUM | MEDIUM |
|  | Does the “Last saved by” |  | YES |  |  |
| Meta data (MD) | value on the metadata  show student's name? | MD2 | NO  NA | MEDIUM | MEDIUM |
| Does the document's metadata indicate that the total modification time was  minimal? | MD3 | YES NO NA | MEDIUM | MEDIUM |
|  | Is there a realistic change trail reported in the mechanism in place to  track changes made to | MD4 | YES NO NA | HIGH | HIGH |

|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
|  |  |  | student-submitted files since they were created? |  |  |  |  |
| Assessment Presentation | In the live/recorded presentation, does the student appear to be  comfortable and confident? | AP1 | YES NO | HIGH | HIGH |
| Viva | Is a viva needed? (This is a system generated value based on some facts  specified above) | V | YES NO | NA | NA |
| Was the student's  performance in the viva satisfactory? | V1 | YES NO | HIGH | HIGH |
|  | | | | | | | |
| Academic Integrity Officer | Initial investigation | Investigation factors | Any whistleblowing reported in the name of the  student? | IF1 | YES NO | HIGH | HIGH |
| Authorship analysis score displayed on software like Turnitin indicates possibility of contract  cheating? | IF2 | YES  NO NA | MEDIUM | MEDIUM |
| Is there any information about the student on social media platforms or on the internet that raises a  warning flag? | IF3 | YES NO | MEDIUM | MEDIUM |
| Student records department | Student Records from VLE | Academic history (AH) | What is extend of difference between the student's current grade of the assessment and the average of student's  grades so far? | AH1 | HIGH MEDIUM LOW  NA | MEDIUM | MEDIUM |
| Is there a history of academic misconduct suspicions or proceedings filed in the name of the  student? | AH2 | YES NO  NA | HIGH | HIGH |

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **Threshold configuration parameter name** | **Value** |
| AWARENESS\_SCORE\_THRESHOLD | 0 |
| ASSESSMENT\_DESIGN\_RISK\_THRESHOLD | GOOD |
| DOCUMENT\_SIMILARITY\_SCORE\_THRESHOLD | 1 |
| DOCUMENT\_REFERENCE\_SCORE\_THRESHOLD | 1 |
| HIGH\_PRIORITY\_DOC\_CONTENT\_CUE\_WEIGHTAGE | 2 |
| MEDIUM\_PRIORITY\_DOC\_CONTENT\_CUE\_WEIGHTAGE | 1 |
| DOCUMENT\_CONTENT\_SCORE\_THRESHOLD | 2 |
| HIGH\_PRIORITY\_META\_DATA\_CUE\_WEIGHTAGE | 2 |
| MEDIUM\_PRIORITY\_DOC\_CONTENT\_CUE\_WEIGHTAGE | 1 |
| META\_DATA\_SCORE\_THRESHOLD | 1 |
| LOW\_PRIORITY\_EVIDENCE\_WEIGHTAGE | 1 |
| MEDIUM\_PRIORITY\_EVIDENCE\_WEIGHTAGE | 2 |
| HIGH\_PRIORITY\_EVIDENCE\_WEIGHTAGE | 3 |
| EVIDENCE\_SCORE\_THRESHOLD | 3 |

Extra : if one student is referred to academic misconduct,in that particular students dashboard include case id and status of case

AIOS DASHBOARD :

In AIOS Dashboard, need to list all the details of suspicious students list like their ID, name, couse & module

Along with this, need to add an option to download the report submitted by lecturer about their findings and evidence to refer each student to misconduct

AIOS have the right to modify evidence form.

Other option need to add is search with case id , aios have the option to view / update case details / status ( like pending, in progress ..)

RULES FOR GENERATION FINAL RESULT OF STUDENT BY SYSTEM

All these rules are calculated based on the details entered on each students dashboard