

Resilience and Integrity (RISE) Project Scenario Development Competition 2026

Scenario Design Description and Rationale

The example is meant to demonstrate the requirements and expectations for submissions. Direct copy-and-paste and adaptation of the written input should be avoided, considering the Competition's requirement regarding originality.

Q1. Which of the six core competency/competencies from the “Resilience and Integrity Framework” relate to your scenario designed for this competition? (You may choose up to 4 most relevant competencies)

- ☒ Ethical Judgement (C1)
- ☒ Interpersonal Skills (C2)
- ☒ Self-Awareness (C3)
- ☐ Self-Care (C4)
- ☒ Self-Determination (C5)
- ☐ Self-Regulation (C6)

Q2. Which of the five domain(s) from the “Resilience and Integrity Framework” relate to your scenario designed for this competition? (You may choose up to 2 most relevant domains)

- ☒ Academic / Professional (D1)
- ☐ Civic / Political (D2)
- ☐ Environmental (D3)
- ☐ Personal (D4)
- ☒ Relational / Social (D5)

Q3. Is your scenario focused on a specific discipline?

- ☐ Yes
- ☒ No

If yes, please select the most relevant specific discipline below.

- ☐ Arts & Humanities
- ☐ Business
- ☐ Education
- ☐ Engineering
- ☐ Healthcare & Medical
- ☐ Law & Legal
- ☐ Media & Communications
- ☐ Science & Technology
- ☐ Social Sciences
- ☐ Other (please specify): _____

Q4. Please input your scenario script in the box below.

Notes:

- Please design a two-level scenario, with 3-4 choices for each question in the scenario.
- Please align your script with the RISE framework by inserting the relevant Competence codes in brackets—e.g., (C1, C2)—directly after the corresponding evidence or actions in your scenario.
- If an action or line demonstrates a lacking, missed, or inappropriate use of a competence, add a minus sign before the relevant code—e.g., (-C1, C2) or (-C1, -C2)."
- Throughout your script, please indicate clearly where each video clip should be played by referencing its exact file name in brackets—for example: [Play: Video_Filename.mp4].

Topic: Group Assignment Dilemma

Characters:

Alex: The student facing the dilemma (main character).

Ben: The group member who uses GenAI extensively.

Chole: Another group member, focused on the deadline.

Narrator: Voiceover for questions and explanations.

Add clear reference
to the video clip

(Scene 1: The Dilemma) – Video [Seedance 2_5 - Scene1.mp4]

Visual: Three students, Alex, Ben, and Chole are in group assignment Zoom meeting. They look stressed. A mostly empty shared document is visible on screen.

Chole: “The deadline is Friday. We’re way behind. I’m really worried we won’t get this done.”

Ben: “Don’t worry. I used an AI writing assistant to draft our analysis section. Check it out.”

Visual: Ben shares his screen and with a huge, perfectly written block of text pasted into the document. Alex and Chloe look stunned.

Alex: “Wow, Ben... that’s... not really our work. It feels like cheating.”

Ben: “It’s just being efficient. We only need to add a conclusion.”

Narrator: “Alex is facing a common dilemma in the age of AI. What should Alex do?”

Level 1: What is Alex’s immediate action?

Option 1: Go along with it, acknowledging the use of GenAI tool

Alex agrees to use the AI-generated text to maintain harmony with teammates and meet the deadline, while knowing that direct adoption of AI-generated content is wrong. He suggests declaring that a GenAI tool is used. [-C1, C2]

Add relevant Competence codes

Option 2: Challenge it directly

Alex immediately voices his strong objection, stating that using AI in this way is academic misconduct. [C1, -C2, C5]

Option 3: Ask for a pause to think about the suggestion

Alex suggests the group take some time to consider the situation and make a decision the next day. [C2, C3, C5]

Level 2: Further choices and the consequences

Path from Level 1, Option 1: You choose “Go along with it, acknowledging the use of GenAI tool”

(Scene 2) – Video [Seedance 2_5 - Scene2.mp4]

Visual: The three students submit the group assignment on time and feel relieved at first. However, two weeks later, the instructor investigates and discovers that the entire analysis section was written by AI. The group is suspected of committing plagiarism, even though they declared the use of GenAI tool. The group is requested to meet with the instructor to explain the situation.

Narrator: “The three students are scared to meet the instructor. What should they do at the meeting?”

Option 1.1: Deny everything

They explain that they misunderstood the university policy and guidelines regarding the appropriate use of the GenAI tools. They insist that they declared the use of GenAI tool to generate ideas in completing the assignment, and do not admit to directly copying and pasting the AI-generated text into the assignment.

Outcome: While knowing that what they did was academic misconduct, the group, lacking self-determination, denies responsibility for their actions. They do not admit their mistake and fail to understand the seriousness of committing plagiarism (directly copying and pasting the AI-generated text into the assignment).

[C1, -C5]

Option 1.2: Blame Ben

Alex and Chloe blame Ben, insisting that he pushed for the use of the AI writing assistant for the analysis section.

Outcome: This destroys the team’s trust and relationships. Although the inappropriate use of GenAI was suggested by Ben, Alex and Chole are still responsible for submitting work they knew was not their own, as the assignment was a group effort. This demonstrates a lack of ethical judgement, poor interpersonal skills, and a failure to accept collective responsibility. [C1, -C2]

Option 1.3: Take collective responsibility *(Ideal answer)*

The group admits that they did not use GenAI appropriately. They seek help from instructor and commit to learning how to use it ethically and responsibility in the future.

Outcome: While the group will still face consequences (failing the assignment), their honesty and willingness to learn are viewed positively by the instructor. This act of integrity and self-awareness transforms a failure into a valuable learning experience. [C1, C3]

Path from Level 1, Option 2: You choose “Challenge it directly”.

(Scene 3) – Video [Seedance 2_5 - Scene3.mp4]

Visual: Alex immediately confronts Ben.

Alex: “This is cheating! We can’t use it like this.”

Chole: “But the deadline is really close. What should we do?”

Ben: “Cheating? It’s just being efficient! If you won’t use it, I will submit it myself.”

Narrator: “The group is now at a stand-off, and the conflict has escalated. How does Alex move forward?”

Option 2.1: Report Ben to the instructor

Alex is very angry and reports the case to the instructor.

Outcome: The instructor requested a meeting with the whole group. The instructor would likely intervene. This dissolved the group and destroyed their relationship. However, Alex’s actions demonstrated self-determination and avoided academic misconduct. [-C2, C5]

Option 2.2: Fracture the group

Alex stands his ground, and the group decides to submit the assignment separately.

Outcome: The separate submissions would be incomplete or of poor quality. This action destroyed their relationship. However, Alex’s actions demonstrated self-determination and avoided academic misconduct. [-C2, C5]

Option 2.3: Negotiate a compromise (Ideal answer)

Alex suggests checking the university’s guidelines and course policy on the appropriate use of GenAI tools for assignments. Given the tight timeline, the group divides the work among themselves and uses GenAI output for their brainstorming. They complete their writing independently before using AI for grammar checking and critically verify the sources.

Outcome: This addresses the integrity issue while fostering good relationships and collaboration within the group. This act of negotiation demonstrates strong interpersonal skills, as it validates Ben’s desire for efficiency while steering the group towards an ethical solution. [C1, C2, C5]

Path from Level 1, Option 3: You choose to “Ask for a pause to think about the suggestion”.

(Scene 4) – Video [Seedance 2_5 - Scene4.mp4]

Visual: The three students spend some time to think about how to proceed. Chole is very nervous about the deadline. Then, Alex calls a short Zoom meeting to discuss what they should do.

Alex: “Ben, I appreciate the effort, but I’m not quite sure about the guidelines for using GenAI in completing assignment tasks. Can we talk about this for 15 minutes?”

Ben: “Fine. But we’re still on a tight deadline.”

Chole: “Yeah, that’s a good idea. I’m confused too.”

Narrator: “How will they proceed and what decision will they make?”

Option 3.1: “Modify the AI-generated text”

The team rely on AI detector indicator to measure the originality of their work. They decide to paraphrase the AI generated text to avoid detection.

Outcome: They do not use GenAI ethically and responsibly, prioritising avoidance of detection over academic integrity. This approach is a form of plagiarism and shows a failure of ethical judgement. [C1]

Option 3.2: “Check how to use GenAI tools” *(Ideal answer)*

Alex checks the university’s guidelines and course policy regarding the use of GenAI tool in assignments. He suggests using the GenAI tool ethically and responsibly, for example, for brainstorming ideas, clarifying concepts, or generating feedback on their own work. Then they write the content in their own words and verify the sources critically. When submitting the assignment, they declare how and why GenAI tools are used.

Outcome: By consulting university’s guidelines and course policy and transparently declaring their use of GenAI tools, the group demonstrates integrity and responsibility. Ben’s contribution is respected, and the group leverages GenAI tools ethically, not as a substitute for original work. [C1, C2, C5]

Option 3.3: “Avoid using AI and request an extension of deadline”

They decide not to use AI at all and instead request an extension for the assignment deadline from their instructor, explaining their concerns about ethical use of GenAI tool and the need for more time.

Outcome: Although the group acts with integrity, they show a lack of self-determination in tackling the challenge. The group misses an opportunity to develop valuable digital skills and experience with emerging technologies in today’s digital world. [C1, -C5]

Q5. Briefly describe how your designed scenario illustrates the selected competence(s) and domain(s). (Word limit: 100)

This scenario operates within the **Academic/Professional (D1)** domain of a group assignment, while the core conflict unfolds in the **Relational/Social (D5)** domain. It prompts **Ethical Judgement (C1)** by forcing a choice between academic integrity and an easy solution. **Interpersonal Skills (C2)** are crucial for navigating the conflict with teammates. **Self-Awareness (C3)** is demonstrated when Alex recognises his own ethical discomfort and when the group later admits their mistake. Finally, **Self-Determination (C5)** is key as Alex must proactively seek information and guide the group towards a responsible and ethical decision.

Q6. What specific skills / knowledge does your designed scenario aim to convey to the audience?
(Word limit: 100)

This scenario aims to teach students how to navigate the ethical complexities of using Generative AI in academic work. It conveys the importance of understanding university policy and guidelines regarding the appropriate and ethical use of GenAI tools. Key skills include:

- Communicating ethical concerns constructively within a group.
- Negotiating compromises that uphold both integrity and collaboration.
- Taking collective responsibility for group actions.
- Knowing how to use AI tools as ethical aids for brainstorming and feedback, rather than as a substitute for original thought and work.

Q7. What real-world challenges, experiences, or issues inspired you to create this scenario? (Word limit: 100)

This scenario was inspired by the rapid emergence of powerful Generative AI tools and the resulting confusion and ethical dilemmas faced by students. In the real world, students are under pressure to perform well and meet tight deadlines. The temptation to use AI as a shortcut is immense. This scenario reflects the common group-work tension between students who prioritise efficiency at all costs and those concerned with academic integrity, creating a highly relevant and realistic challenge that many students now face.

Q8. How do the storytelling elements in your scenario, such as characters, plot, and narrative structure, work together to engage the audience and promote awareness of resilience and integrity? (Word limit: 100)

The scenario uses relatable characters: Alex (the conscientious student), Ben (the pragmatist), and Chloe (the worrier), creating a realistic group dynamic. The plot presents a high-stakes dilemma—plagiarism vs. potential failure—that immediately engages the audience. The branching narrative structure (two-level choices) makes the experience interactive, forcing the user to personally weigh the consequences of their decisions. This active participation promotes a deeper understanding of how exercising integrity and resilience (negotiating conflict, taking responsibility) leads to better long-term outcomes than taking unethical shortcuts.

Q9. Please acknowledge the use of GenAI tools by declaration (if any).

Declaration

I *did / ~~I did not~~ use GenAI tools in assisting the scenario creation.

**Please delete where appropriate.*

Acknowledgement

If you did use any GenAI tools, please complete the following acknowledgement:

- I acknowledge the use of (ChatGPT & SeeDance 2.5 @Runway) to (brainstorm ideas for designing the scenario & generate shot respectively) for why they were used, e.g.(to stimulate thinking about dilemmas involving AI and academic integrity & for project reference respectively).