

Taikura – Quality Management System

A4-P8 Academic Integrity Procedures

1. Introduction

1.1 These procedures:

- a) Give effect to *T2-R2 Commitment to Learning*, *A1-R1 Academic Statute* (section 4), *A4 Learning and Teaching Policy*, *A4-P4 Assessment Procedures*, *A5-R1 Student Rights and Responsibilities* and *A7 Research Policy*
- b) Outline the commitment to academic integrity expected of staff and students
- c) Are made available to students when they start their programme of study
- d) Are applied in the management of allegations of academic misconduct by students

2. Commitment to Academic Integrity

2.1 Academic staff:

- a) Consistently model honesty in academic practice
- b) Promote and inform students of the requirements and expectations for academic integrity in assessments and research
- c) Inform students of text-matching software as a learning tool
- d) Minimise potential for academic misconduct through assessment design and practice

2.2 Students:

- a) Engage proactively with learning about, and showing commitment to, academic integrity
- b) Submit their own work
- c) Protect their work from copying
- d) Acknowledge contributions from all sources using the latest edition of APA referencing (as required)

3. Academic Misconduct

3.1 Academic misconduct includes any form of dishonest academic practice that intentionally or unintentionally undermines academic integrity and may result in unearned academic benefit.

3.2 Plagiarism is using someone else's work without proper acknowledgement (citation), including:

- a) Copying directly from any source
- b) Summarising another's work
- c) Using research data obtained by another

3.3 Plagiarism also includes:

- a) Copying the work of another student
- b) Re-use of previously submitted work
- c) Submitting an assessment written by someone else
- d) Submitting the work of a group when individual work is required
- e) Intentionally or knowingly helping or attempting to help another student engage in some form of academic misconduct

These are likely to be deemed cases of serious academic misconduct.

3.4 Academic misconduct in a supervised assessment, includes:

- a) Secretly bringing in unauthorised material
- b) Copying answers from another student
- c) Giving answers to another student
- d) Making additions to work outside time allowed

These are likely to be deemed cases of serious academic misconduct.

3.5 Other forms of academic misconduct include misrepresentation of identity or circumstances, data falsification and breach of ethics.

4. Procedural Fairness

4.1 The institutions deal with allegations of academic misconduct in a fair, consistent and transparent manner.

4.2 A first instance of academic misconduct may be regarded as unintentional through a lack of understanding of academic integrity.

4.3 When an allegation is being investigated the student:

- a) Is informed in writing of the allegation
- b) May continue with their studies and submit assessments unless the Head of School deems this inappropriate due to the serious nature of the allegation

4.4 The student is given at least five (5) working days' notice in writing of any meeting they are requested to attend to discuss the allegation. The student may use this time to prepare a response and arrange for one or more support people to attend the meeting. The notification:

- a) States the date, location, the intent of the meeting and people who will be present at the meeting
- b) Includes *A4-P8 Academic Integrity Procedures* and any other relevant Academic section of Taikura policy documents
- c) Advises entitlement to representation, advice, advocacy and support at all stages
- d) Advises that students under 16 years of age must have a parent or caregiver or other appropriate support person present

4.5 Personal information related to the allegation is confidential and is disclosed only to those involved on a "need to know" basis.

4.6 The student has the right to see their student record on request.

4.7 If the person making the allegation is a student they may request that their name is kept confidential.

5. Allegation of Academic Misconduct

5.1 An allegation of academic misconduct can be made by a student, tutor, assessor, examiner or other member of staff, against one student or a group of students.

5.2 The allegation, with evidence, is reported to the Programme Manager or Head of School.

5.3 Where an allegation of academic misconduct is made, the Programme Manager, in consultation with the Head of School, determines one of the following:

- a) There is insufficient evidence to investigate.
- b) There is sufficient evidence to investigate (refer to section 6).
- c) The alleged misconduct is of a serious nature (refer to section 7).

5.4 In a first instance of academic misconduct where it is regarded as a lack of understanding by the student, the tutor:

- a) Ensures the student has access to targeted skills development
- b) May reduce the grade for the original assessment
- c) May require, and allow, the student to correct the plagiarised sections and submit the assessment to be marked as a first attempt
- d) Records the instance and action taken in the student's file

6. Academic Misconduct Investigation

- 6.1 The Programme Manager confirms with the Head of School that there is sufficient evidence to proceed with an investigation.
- 6.2 The Head of School may delegate the investigation to a suitable staff member independent of the allegation.
- 6.3 The Programme Manager notifies the student in writing of the allegation. If relevant the student is informed that their assessment result and/or course grade under investigation are being withheld or withdrawn until the allegation is resolved.
- 6.4 The Head of School or delegated staff member:
 - a) Checks for compliance with regulations set by any relevant external body
 - b) Collects further evidence as required
 - c) Arranges to meet with the student (refer to section 4.4)

Academic Misconduct Sanctions

- 6.5 If academic misconduct is admitted or established the Head of School considers the following factors to determine the appropriate sanction:
 - a) The extent of the misconduct
 - b) The student's intention
 - c) The level of programme
 - d) Any previous record of academic misconduct
 - e) Adequacy of information and support around academic integrity provided within the course
 - f) The impact, if undetected, the academic misconduct may have had on the student, other students and the academic integrity of the institution
- 6.6 The student receives no more than the minimum pass grade for the assessment.
- 6.7 The Head of School may:
 - a) Require the student to undergo targeted academic skills development
 - b) Cancel the result of the assessment and allow the student a further assessment attempt (refer *A1-R1 Academic Statute - Further Assessment Attempts*)
 - c) Uphold the minimum pass or fail grade given for that assessment with no opportunity for further assessment attempt

7. Serious Academic Misconduct

- 7.1 Serious academic misconduct may include cases identified in 3.3, 3.4 and 3.5 and where academic misconduct has previously been admitted or established.
- 7.2 Allegations of academic misconduct that are of a serious nature may warrant an academic misconduct hearing.
- 7.3 The hearing panel is the Head of School and two senior academic staff who are independent of the allegation.
- 7.4 The student may elect to respond in writing or appear in person and may bring a support person.

- 7.5 The panel:
- a) Hears and considers the evidence of the student and those making the allegation
 - b) Makes a decision

Serious Academic Misconduct Sanctions

- 7.6 After a hearing, the Head of School may impose any of the sanctions in 6.7 and/or require the student to repeat the course.
- 7.7 The Head of School may recommend to their Director that the student's enrolment in the programme is cancelled.
- 7.8 The Head of School may be required to inform the appropriate professional body.
- 7.9 Registration bodies may decline to register students who have been found guilty of academic misconduct.

8. Notification of Decision

- 8.1 The Head of School notifies the student in writing of the decision resulting from the investigation or hearing, within five (5) working days of the decision, informing them of the:
- a) Explanation for the decision and sanction
 - b) Sanctions that may apply if further academic misconduct is established
 - c) Student's right to appeal
- 8.2 The Programme Manager writes a brief report on the allegation of academic misconduct and decisions and outcomes, including unsubstantiated, and
- a) Lodges it in the student file
 - b) Reports to the Board of Studies
- 8.3 If appropriate, the person who made the allegation is informed.
- 8.4 StudyLink are informed of the decision to cancel the student's enrolment, after the period for Appeals has lapsed.

9. Appeal

- 9.1 A student may appeal a decision on one of the following grounds:
- a) Additional information has become available since the decision was made by the relevant body
 - b) There is evidence of procedural irregularities in the process followed.
- 9.2 The student applies in writing to the Director Academic, within five (5) working days of notification of the decision, stating the decision the student is appealing and ground/s of the appeal. The student states the outcome they are seeking.
- 9.3 The appeals process is documented in *A1-P9 Appeals Procedures*.

10. Related Documents

T2-R1 Commitment to Learning
A1-R1 Academic Statute
A1-P9 Appeals Procedures
A4 Learning and Teaching Policy
A4-P4 Assessment Procedures
A5-R5 Student Rights and Responsibilities
A7 Research Policy

11. Appendix 1: Application of Turnitin

- 11.1 Programmes primarily use Turnitin to empower students to take responsibility for the content of their academic writing.
- 11.2 Turnitin can also be used to:
 - a) Assess and provide feedback on student work in a secure online environment
 - b) Check that student submitted material has not been plagiarised

Turnitin for Improving Student Academic Writing

- 11.3 Tutors introduce students to Turnitin early in the programme, with training provided on how to submit written assessments.
- 11.4 Tutors encourage students to upload and self-assess the level of originality of their work. Some Schools or programmes may require students to formally submit written assessments electronically through Turnitin.
- 11.5 Turnitin may be used at Levels 1-4 for educative/training purposes. The relevant Centre of Learning Board of Studies approves the number of submissions.
- 11.6 Turnitin may be used at Levels 5 and above for submission of a summative assessment. Turnitin can be used only once, or as approved by the respective Board of Studies – the course tutor manages this provision.
- 11.7 Students receive a report detailing where Turnitin has detected the same content elsewhere, and whether referencing has been done correctly.
- 11.8 Tutors may assess student self-assessment as part of summative assessment.

Grademark for Marking and Feedback

- 11.9 Tutors may use any combination of in-text feedback, audio feedback, marking guides and other functions of Grademark to provide feedback.
- 11.10 Tutors ensure feedback provided via Grademark aligns with the marking guide and the learning outcomes.
- 11.11 Where a grade method for an assessment differs from the Programme grade method, the tutor turns off the automatic grading system so that the mark awarded by the marking guide entered into Turnitin, does not confuse students.
- 11.12 It is recommended that tutors download and save a copy of the assessment material and marked assessments to be used for moderation. Tutors can retrieve assessments and Turnitin results for moderation from the online learning system with assistance from the Flexible Learning Unit.
- 11.13 While programmes may determine an upper level for the percentage of originality it is not an absolute figure; it is an indicator of academic integrity. Tutors critically evaluate the similarities in instances where it exceeds the parameter set.
- 11.14 Tutors using Grademark maintain the *A4-P4 Assessment Procedures*.

Sharing Student Work

- 11.15 Turnitin keeps a digitalised copy of the text of student work once submitted but it is not published or re-distributed. If a match is identified with work from another institution, the date of submission is shared or confirmed but not the identity of the writer or content of their work