

ACADEMIC INTEGRITY PROCEDURES

Approving authority	Executive Management Team
Purpose	These procedures outline the processes to be followed in preventing, detecting and resolving cases of violation of the academic integrity and honesty.
Responsible Officer	Academic Dean
Next scheduled review	July 2023
Document Location	http://www.oxford.edu.au/higher-education/policies-and-procedures/
Associated documents	Academic Integrity Policy Academic Appeals Policy and Procedure Academic Staff Professional Development Policy and Procedure Professional Staff Professional Development Policy and Procedure

1. PRINCIPLES

- 1.1 Maintaining academic honesty and integrity is of highest importance to the principle of genuine pursuit of knowledge at the Institute
- 1.2 The sets of procedures as outlined details the sequence and actions that should take place to prevent, detect and resolve any incident of violation of academic integrity.

2. SCOPE

These procedures apply to all cases of violation of academic integrity and honest by students and staff at the Institute.

3. DEFINITIONS

3.1 *Assessment*

An *assessment* is a consideration of someone or something and a judgment about them. In education, the term *assessment* refers to the wide variety of methods or tools that educators use to evaluate, measure, and document the academic readiness, learning progress, skill acquisition, or educational needs of students.

3.2 *Procedure*

Procedure is a fixed, step-by-step sequence of activities or course of action (with definite start and end points) that must be followed in the same order to correctly perform a task.

3.3 *Refer to the Policy document for definitions of various forms of academic misconduct.*

4. PROCEDURES

4.1 Promotion of academic integrity by:

The Institute will promote academic Integrity by:

- maintaining online resources that provides access to relevant resources on Academic Integrity for prospective and current students and staff;
- providing resources and support to staff to assist them in providing guidance and feedback to students to develop their knowledge and skills related to academic integrity; as well as responding to allegations of academic misconduct;
- monitoring, reviewing and reporting on strategies to promote academic integrity and minimise academic misconduct across the Institute.
- each course offered by the Institute must integrate academic integrity instruction.
- assessments must be designed to minimise the potential for academic misconduct by students.
- the Institute requires all academic staff to participate in professional development training on academic integrity and academic misconduct management.
- students must complete a declaration in hard copy or online when submitting assignments.
- in the event academic misconduct is confirmed, a student or staff member will be required to attend an academic integrity workshop.

Set out below are procedures which will be followed where the types of academic misconduct or plagiarism covered by this policy are suspected or alleged.

4.2 Plagiarism

Prevention/Detection

The Institute has text matching software that is used to deter and detect plagiarism. All submitted assignments, projects and other assessments are checked by staff members, the students have access to such software via Moodle.

Management of detected plagiarism

Level of Plagiarism	Procedure and Penalties
<p>Level 1: Poor scholarship or inexperience rather than culpable plagiarism. Level 1 offences are dealt with by the lecturer/tutor and unit convenor (if the unit convenor is a different person).</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The lecturer/tutor or unit convenor will provide the student with advice on avoiding plagiarism. • The mark for the work should reflect the academic quality of the work taking any poor practice in referencing, etc. into account. For example: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ Reduced marks may be allocated for inadequate citation of material (e.g. material copied from online sources without acknowledgment); ○ Reduced marks for an element of submitted work may be allocated for joint work which is submitted without acknowledgement of co-contribution or for submitted work which has clearly been jointly prepared where this this is not authorised.
<p>Level 2: Minor cases, where the suspected plagiarism is a first offence, may include:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> a) over-reliance on sources without sufficient evidence of the student's own work; b) an element in a piece of work which makes a small contribution to the mark for the course; c) more significant cases where there are mitigating special circumstances; d) moderate significant cases at an early stage of an undergraduate student's career. <p>Level 2 offences are managed by the lecturer /tutor and the unit convenor in consultation with the Academic Dean.</p>	<p>Level 2 plagiarism will be reported by the lecturer/tutor and the unit convenor to the Academic Dean. The Academic Dean will:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • send the student a written warning including advice on avoiding plagiarism <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ➤ provide a copy of the written warning to the responsible Institute officer for inclusion in the student's file. ➤ ensure that relevant details of the incident have been recorded by the responsible Institute officer in the Institute's academic misconduct/plagiarism database, which is maintained and updated for the purpose of detection of multiple offences. <p>As with Level 1 above, the mark for the work should reflect the academic quality of the work, recognising, for example, that the referencing may be poor, or that not all the work is the student's own.</p>

Level 3: More **significant cases**, including cases of extensive or concurrent plagiarism by the student or for a repeat offence.

Examples:

- a) work where large sections have been copied from online sources without acknowledgment;
- b) cases where plagiarism has been detected in more than one piece of work submitted by a student;
- c) work where the plagiarised element would contribute significantly to the mark for the course.

Significance

Significance must be judged by the Academic Dean on a combination of the following factors:

- a) Level and stage in the academic career.
- b) Advice given to students on the course about avoiding plagiarism.
- c) The marking conventions of the discipline.
- d) The opportunities for re-submission.
- e) The impact of failure in that assessment.
- f) The extent of the plagiarism.

Level 3 offences are escalated to the Academic Dean who will determine the significance of the offence and apply an appropriate penalty. The more serious cases or repeat will be referred to the Student Discipline and Appeals Committee at the discretion of the Academic Dean.

Level 3 plagiarism is reported to and managed by the Academic Dean who will decide on the appropriate **reduction of the student's mark(s)** by an amount to reflect her/his assessment of the extent of the seriousness of the matter.

The Institute's database recording cases of plagiarism/academic misconduct will be updated accordingly.

A written account setting out details of the incident and the action taken will be prepared by the Academic Dean and will be added to the student's file.

Penalties (listed from minimum to maximum)

Below are penalties which may be applied with the approval and oversight of the Academic Dean:

- **Re-marking** of the original work with the plagiarised section removed. Marks allocated as a reflection of the academic quality of the remaining work. [Care should be taken in applying this penalty. The 'volume' of plagiarised work should not be used as the sole indicator of the significance of the case. Consideration should also be given to the validity of the remaining work and the ability for it to be marked in an edited form when plagiarised sections have been removed]. Any additional attempts or re-submissions of the work, where this is normal practice for the discipline, should be restricted to a **pass mark**.
- **A written warning.**
- **Reduction of face value mark** in bands of 10%, to reflect the significance of the plagiarism e.g. a mark of 57% might be reduced to 47% where the assessment item has been plagiarised by 30% or less.
- **A mark of zero for that assessment** where the assessment item has been plagiarised by 50% or more.
- **A mark of zero for that unit** where the assessment item has been plagiarised by more than 80%.
- Serious cases or repeat offences may be referred to the Student Discipline and Appeals Committee and at the discretion of the Committee students may be required to show cause why they should not be excluded.

4.3 Cheating in Examinations

Cheating in examinations is another form of academic misconduct and undermines academic integrity. Students' attempts to circumvent assessment requirements by seeking to obtain an unfair advantage in examinations will be taken seriously. In supervising examinations invigilators and/or other persons in authority will:

- 4.3.1 Refer suspected instances of cheating in examinations to the Academic Dean and these reports will be referred to the Student Discipline and Appeals Committee.
- 4.3.2 Take action where candidates have unauthorised materials in their possession.

4.4 Penalties for cheating in examinations

- 4.4.1 Where there is clear evidence a student is using unauthorised material in the examination venue the Academic Dean has the right to remove the student from the venue.
- 4.4.2 Cheating in any form during an examination will normally result in a failing grade being recorded for the unit in question and at the discretion of the Academic Dean they may be required to show cause why they should not be excluded.
- 4.4.3 Further instances of cheating in examinations will result in a fail grade for the unit and the student shall be asked to show cause why they should not be excluded from their course of study for a period of 2 years. Any student excluded from one course of study will not be permitted to transfer any internal advanced standing to another course of study.

4.5 Other academic misconduct

Other forms of academic misconduct as outlined in this policy are taken very seriously and will be dealt with according to the nature of the misconduct at the discretion of the Academic Dean with serious and repeat cases being reported to and dealt with by the Student Discipline and Appeals Committee.

- 4.5.1 Suspected instances of other forms of academic misconduct will be referred to the Academic Dean in the first instance.
- 4.5.2 The Academic Dean may seek the advice of the Vice President on whether the alleged academic misconduct constitutes a breach of policy.
- 4.5.3 The Academic Dean at their discretion may impose a penalty or in serious or repeat cases may refer suspected instances of other academic misconduct to the Student Discipline and Appeals Committee.

4.6 Penalties for other academic misconduct for students

- 4.6.1 Award a mark of zero if the misconduct relates to a specific assessment task.
- 4.6.2 Award of fail in a unit related to the misconduct.
- 4.6.3 A student may be asked to show cause why they should not be excluded from their course of study for a period of 2 years. Any student excluded from one course of study will not be permitted to transfer any internal advanced standing to another course of study.

5 EXCLUSION

Any student who under the procedures above (4.2 to 4.6) is required to show cause why he/she should not be excluded from the course, will be required to do so in writing within a 10 working days from the date of the letter of notification to them. The Student Discipline and Appeals Committee will consider the case and normally the student will be required to present their case in person before the Committee.

6 APPEALS

- 6.1 Students may appeal the decision of the Academic Dean or Student Discipline and Appeals Committee regarding the findings of misconduct or plagiarism or the penalty imposed.
- 6.2 Appeals arising from decisions made by the Academic Dean or by the Student Disciplines and Appeals Committee should be made to the Academic Appeals Committee. The Academic Appeals Committee will consider all relevant documentary evidence and may also take verbal evidence from the teaching staff and student. The Academic Appeals Committee may also seek advice from any other party considered relevant to the case.

6.3 Students may seek assistance from an external authority if they are not satisfied with the decision reached at the Academic Appeals Committee. (Refer to the Academic Appeals Policy).

6.3 The ultimate external authority for appeals is the Commonwealth Ombudsman. It can investigate complaints about problems that any intending, current and former student have with private schools, colleges, universities and other education providers in Australia. The Overseas Students Ombudsman is a specialist section of the Commonwealth Ombudsman. The contact details of the Commonwealth Ombudsman are as follows:

Office location:
Level 6, 34 Queen Street
Melbourne Victoria 3000
Phone: 1300 362 072

URL: <http://www.ombudsman.gov.au/making-a-complaint/overseas-students>

7. QUALITY ASSURANCE

To ensure that this procedure is fit for purpose and meet the requirements of the HES Threshold Standards the procedure will be:

- 7.1 internally approved by the Executive Management Team on development or review
- 7.2 externally reviewed as part of any independent review of the HES Threshold Standards approved by the Governing Board;
- 7.3 internally reviewed by the Responsible Officer every three years from the date of approval (if not earlier).
- 7.4 referenced to the applicable HES threshold Standard and/or other legislation/regulation.

8. FEEDBACK

Feedback or comments on this policy is welcomed by the listed Responsible Officers of the Institute.

9. VERSION CONTROL

Version	Date approved	Description	Approved by
2.0	18 June 2018	Reflecting the requirements of the HESF standards and changes in academic leadership structure	EMT
3.0	13 July 2020	Internal Review	EMT
Related legislation/ regulation/standard	HES Threshold Standards (2015) 5.2 (Academic and Research Integrity)		