

ACADEMIC INTEGRITY PROCEDURE

Section 1 - Purpose and Scope

(1) The purpose of this Procedure is to give effect to the Academic Integrity Policy.

Scope

(2) This Procedure sets out how allegations of academic misconduct by students are managed and addressed.

Section 2 - Definitions

(3) In addition to the definitions set out in the Academic Integrity Policy:

Assessor (includes markers) are members of academic staff associated with a unit of study and responsible for grading students' assessments. Assessors have a specific responsibility for detecting possible cases of academic misconduct.

Similarity Reports can be used to check work for authenticity. When you run a report through a specific text-matching software, it compares a student's file against sources on the internet and papers submitted to Turnitin.

Heads of Department (HoD) are members of academic staff who have been assigned overall responsibility for the leadership of a specified department. This includes keeping academic staff informed about the available materials and College processes related to academic integrity and misconduct.

Section 3 - Procedures

College responsibilities

- (4) The College will:
- provide adequate training and support for students to learn about academic integrity and correct academic practice (including referencing) from the earliest stage of their study (orientation) and thereafter during their studies;
 - make policies, procedures and resources available to staff and students, informing them of their rights and responsibilities to uphold, and the possible penalties for breaching academic integrity;
 - limit opportunities for academic dishonesty including implementing appropriate security practices for submitting and returning assessments;

- d. provide adequate training and support for academic staff to be appropriately trained in academic integrity, the relevant College policies and the support services available to students to learn about academic integrity;
- e. regularly report to Academic Board about breaches and other issues arising in relation to academic integrity in the College; and
- f. use the data about breaches in academic integrity to improve practices in teaching and learning.

Student responsibilities

(5) Students are expected to:

- a. act with honesty, trust, fairness, respect, and responsibility in learning and research;
- b. make use of the resources provided by the College to educate themselves about academic integrity;
- c. complete the mandatory online Academic Integrity Module and any other mandatory requirements;
- d. seek assistance from appropriate sources when they need more support to develop their academic integrity skills;
- e. learn about the College's expectations for:
 - I. academic writing;
 - II. submitting their own work and ensuring that the ideas, words or works of other are acknowledged through the appropriate conventions of referencing; and
 - III. abiding by the ACPE Style and Referencing Guidelines;
- f. undertake and complete assessment work independently, unless collaboration/group work is specified in the assessment criteria;
- g. retain a copy of all assignments submitted; and
- h. avoid placing themselves in situations that could be construed as academic misconduct.

Staff responsibilities

(6) Academic staff are expected to:

- a. demonstrate their ongoing commitment to academic integrity across their teaching practice and assessment responsibilities including designing assessments that encourage academic integrity;
- b. develop students' knowledge and skills by guidance and feedback about appropriate academic practice (including referencing) during the assessment process;
- c. adhere, with consistency and fairness, to the College's policies and procedures when responding to potential instances of academic dishonesty; and
- d. direct students to the relevant practices and policies, including the Student Code of Conduct as required.

- (7) Academic Integrity Officers are responsible for:
- keeping relevant staff informed about the available resources to foster strong academic integrity practice among staff and students; and
 - managing cases of potential breaches of academic integrity.
- (8) Further to subclause 7(b), the Academic Integrity Officer's (or their delegate's) responsibilities include:
- formally liaising with the student about the allegations;
 - recording the relevant details, the supporting evidence and any outcomes/penalties lodged on the Academic Integrity Register and on the Student Paradigm Notes;
 - determining the appropriate outcome or penalty in response to an allegation, referring the allegation to, or seeking advice from, the Academic Integrity Committee convened by the Academic Integrity Officer. The Academic Integrity Officer can convene an Academic Integrity Committee when it is deemed necessary. The Academic Integrity Committee will be composed of the following members: Dean, Academic Integrity Officer, a Head of Department and a staff member from a different department to the course the student(s) is enrolled in;
 - reporting outcomes to the student, Head of Department or other staff member who originally referred the allegation.

Use of Text Matching Software

- (9) The College uses text matching software to support staff in detecting possible instances of plagiarism but this is not the sole tool used nor the sole determinant of plagiarism.
- (10) Assessors are responsible for explaining to students the use of text matching software to assist in the detection of plagiarism and how it may be used as a formative tool.
- (11) Students:
- are encouraged to submit their draft assignments as a learning tool, and to seek guidance from Student Learning Services or the Assessor, when necessary, before the final submission of the assignment;
 - are not subject to potential academic misconduct allegations for draft assignments. However, failure by the Assessor to detect potential academic misconduct in a draft assignment does not relieve the student from responsibility for academic misconduct in the final assignment.

Assessment Misconduct

Step 1: Detecting breaches

- (12) Assessors have responsibility for:

- a. detecting possible breaches of academic integrity in assessments; and
- b. reporting to their Unit Coordinator (or HoD where the Assessor is also the Unit Coordinator) any concerns:
 - i. as indicated by the similarity report; or
 - ii. by other means (such as comparisons with other students' work, the student's previous work and with published or non-published work not identified by text matching software)

this can be at any time in the marking process even if marks have been returned to students.

- (13) In considering whether there has been a possible breach of academic integrity, and before referring possible incidents of academic misconduct to the relevant Unit Coordinator or HOD for initial review. Assessors:
- a. must refer to the requirements that are set out in the Unit Assessment Guide;
 - b. are required to review all similarity reports; and
 - c. are required to seek the opinion of another academic member of staff to corroborate the breach.

- (14) Any staff member who becomes aware of a potential incident of academic dishonesty at any time must report the matter to the respective Unit Coordinator or HoD to be managed in accordance with the steps below.

Step 2: Referral to the Academic Integrity Officer

- (15) Where the Unit Coordinator (or HoD) agrees that there is a possible breach of academic integrity, they will forward to the Academic Integrity Officer the relevant supporting material which may include:
- a. the similarity report with highlighted passages of text; and
 - b. explanations for any details deemed relevant such as:
 - i. notes as to suspected academic misconduct in the assessment, including poor referencing;
 - ii. notes as to other suspected sources of plagiarised content; and/or
 - iii. copies of multiple student assessments in cases where collusion or peer plagiarism is suspected.

- (16) Assessors should endeavour to refer incidents of academic misconduct identified through the text-matching software to the Academic Integrity Officer within 5 working days of the assessment submission date.

- (17) Assessors will defer marking or providing the student, who is the subject of the referral, with feedback on the assessment until a decision has been made by the Academic Integrity Officer or the Academic Integrity Committee.

Step 3: Investigating allegations of academic misconduct

- (18) Within three working days of receipt of the referral (clause 15), the Academic Integrity Officer will aim to:
- review the materials provided to assess whether there is any evidence of plagiarism or other forms of academic dishonesty in relation to the assessment item;
 - confirm whether the student has a record of any past incidences of plagiarism or academic dishonesty in the Academic Misconduct Register; and
 - seek input from relevant academic or other staff members as required.
- (19) The Academic Integrity Officer will consider each case on its merits, guided by the following circumstances:
- the levels of similarity and highlighted text identified in the similarity report;
 - the relevant supporting materials; and/or
 - different writing style from the student's regular work; and/or
 - extent of the breach and the student's history of prior breaches, if any.
- (20) Where the Academic Integrity Officer finds there is no academic misconduct:
- the matter is dismissed and not recorded;
 - the Academic Integrity Officer notifies the referring academic staff of the decision; and
 - the Assessor will resume marking the assessment.
- (21) Where the Academic Integrity Officer finds there is a case for formally investigating a possible case of academic misconduct, the Academic Integrity Officer will:
- notify the student via their ACPE email of the allegations including the possible penalties that can be applied;
 - include in the notification an extracted copy or link to the College's relevant policies (Academic Integrity Policy and Procedure, and the Student Code of Conduct);
 - instruct the student to:
 - acknowledge receipt of the email notification with 5 working days of delivery of the email notification;
 - organise an appointment with the Academic Integrity Officer within 10 working days of delivery of the email notification; and
 - inform the student that they are responsible for providing satisfactory evidence / explanation that they did not commit the alleged misconduct.
- (22) Where a student fails to acknowledge receipt of the email notification or attend the meeting, the following penalties may apply:
- mark of zero for the assessment;
 - fail the unit; and/or

- c. referral to the Academic Integrity Committee. Penalties can include, but not be limited to, a zero grade for the task, a zero grade for the unit, suspension, or permanent exclusion.

(23) At the meeting with the student, the Academic Integrity Officer will:

- a. review the case to assist the student to understand the nature of the allegations;
- b. provide the student with access to the relevant evidence such as the similarity report;
- c. provide the student with an opportunity to provide evidence or explanation regarding the academic misconduct allegation; and
- d. review the conventions of academic integrity that are relevant to the particular allegation under investigation.

(24) The student may bring a support person to the meeting but that person may not speak on their behalf. The support person will be communicated of their role prior to the meeting.

(25) The Academic Integrity Officer may:

- a. ask another staff member to attend the meeting; and
- b. treat multiple assessments as a single incident for the purpose of the academic misconduct process (particularly for first year students).

Step 4: Outcomes and penalties

(26) Following the investigation and further consideration of the available evidence (including that provided by the student) the Academic Integrity Officer may:

- a. dismiss the case (no finding of academic misconduct);
- b. defer making a decision until further information is provided; or
- c. make a finding that academic misconduct has occurred and apply a penalty in line with Schedule A.

(27) Other penalties that may be imposed include exclusion from representing the College for a period of time (for example, the University National Championships, internships, or removal from the Student Representative Council).

(28) The Academic Integrity Officer may:

- a. exercise discretion in the penalty that might be imposed
- b. impose one or more penalties; and
- c. refer a matter to the Academic Integrity Committee at any time.

(29) The Academic Integrity Officer will notify the student in writing as to the outcome of the investigation, and the penalty, if any, that will be imposed.

(30) The Academic Integrity Officer is responsible for:

- a. notifying relevant staff members about the outcomes of all investigations; and

- b. recording information on the College's record management system where breaches have been found.

Examination Misconduct

- (31) All allegations about misconduct in examinations will be referred to the Academic Integrity Officer in the first instance.
- (32) The Academic Integrity Officer:
 - a. may, as they see fit, inform themselves about the allegations; and
 - b. will prepare a report of the allegations for review and determination by the Academic Integrity Committee.
- (33) The Academic Integrity Committee may seek further information from any staff member or student before making its determination.
- (34) The penalties where examination misconduct has been found to have occurred would normally align with the penalties for Major plagiarism/Academic dishonesty in Schedule A.

Unsatisfactory work

- (35) Where a student has been tasked with resubmitting an assessment but has failed to do so to the Academic integrity Officer's specifications, the Academic integrity Officer may request further revisions by the student before the assessment is able to be graded.
- (36) If these further revisions are not undertaken within five working days of the Academic Integrity Officer's request, they will assign the penalty outlined in Schedule A for failure to complete the task.

Student appeals

- (37) Students may seek to appeal a decision in accordance with the Grievances, Complaints and Appeals Policy. For the purposes of that Policy:
 - a. a request to review the decision of the Academic Integrity Officer will be considered a "Stage 2 – Formal Resolution Process" matter; and
 - b. a request to review the decision of the Academic Integrity Committee will be considered a "Stage 3 – Appealing the Original Decision – Internal Appeal" matter.

To appeal an Academic Integrity decision, students are required to provide satisfactory evidence. Appeals are required to be submitted within 5 working days of the Academic Integrity Officer awarding the penalty.

Section 4 – Schedule A

Schedule A sets out the penalties that apply for breaches of academic integrity.

The following penalties or combination of penalties may be imposed for minor, moderate and major breaches dependent on the evidence available to make the assessment.

Category & Definition	Possible Penalty
<p>Minor Breaches in this category refer to a student who is in their first year of study or is a first breach in subsequent years:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> a) unintentionally or carelessly presents another person's work b) due to inadequate or incorrect paraphrasing and/or referencing practices c) a misunderstanding or unfamiliarity of policies and procedures and d) the unattributed content is not substantial in the context of the task 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> a. A formal warning is recorded on the Academic Integrity Register and on Student Paradigm notes b. further Academic Integrity education modules be undertaken c. a resubmission of the task without penalty d. a reduction in marks for any part or parts of an assessment; or e. a requirement that the student amend and re-submit the same assessment task, with a possible reduction in marks of up to 26% of the maximum possible mark f. a requirement that the student undertake another alternative assessment task, with a possible reduction in marks of up to 26% of the maximum possible mark
<p>Moderate Moderate breaches are cases of inappropriate academic practice where the breach involves:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> a) A subsequent Academic Integrity breach b) Involves a substantial volume of unattributed content in a submitted task c) Making a limited or no attempt to appropriately attribute content to the source material d) Significant paraphrasing issues e) Citing references that have not been directly read or acknowledging the secondary resource f) White text g) Collusion 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> a. a zero-mark result for any part or parts of an assessment. b. a requirement that the student amend and re-submit the same assessment task, with a possible reduction in marks of up to 36% of the maximum possible mark c. a requirement that the student undertake another alternative assessment task, with a possible reduction in marks of up to 36% of the maximum possible mark d. a zero mark for the task e. a zero mark and 'Fail' result for the unit.

<p>Major Major breaches are cases where the breach is determined to be intentional or deliberately negligent including but not limited to:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> a) a previous moderate breach b) contract cheating including the use of unsanctioned artificial intelligence c) recycling d) exam cheating e) fabricating citations (could be downgraded at the discretion of the Academic Integrity Officer) f) falsification of data (could be downgraded at the discretion of the Academic Integrity Officer) g) breaches deemed by the Academic Integrity Officer to warrant a penalty exceeding those specified in the moderate breaches. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> a) a zero mark for the task b) a zero mark and 'Fail' result for the unit, c) suspension from the College for up to 12 months or d) exclusion from the College
--	---

Document Administration

Procedure Name	Academic Integrity Procedure
Procedure Owner	Dean
Approval Authority	Academic Board
Approval Date	29 June 2023
Effective Date	As at Approval Date
Next Review #	Three years from the Approval Date
Amendment history	
Version 1:	Original Procedure document revised for new template. Other substantive changes include: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Scaling set of breaches that occur in the first semester of a degree - Scaling set of breaches that occur in the second semester of a degree - Introduction of an online Academic Integrity module for students and staff Approved on 24 June 2021.
Version 2:	Changes to terminology: changes from <i>unintentional</i> and <i>intentional/dishonest</i> to <i>minor</i> and <i>major plagiarism</i> . Changes to penalty structure, as a result of the changes in terminologies.

Unless otherwise indicated, this Procedure will apply beyond the Review date