

## STUDENT ACADEMIC INTEGRITY POLICY AND PROCEDURE

### 1. Overview

Higher Education Leadership Institute (“the Institute”) upholds the principle that academic integrity relies on the application of honesty in all scholarly endeavour. Students of the Institute are expected to conduct themselves in their academic studies honestly and ethically and to carefully acknowledge the work of others in all their academic activities.

This policy describes academic misconduct to students<sup>1</sup> and outlines the Institute’s response to instances of academic misconduct that are detected.

### 2. Types of academic misconduct

Academic misconduct involves cheating, collusion, plagiarism or any other conduct that deliberately or inadvertently claims ownership of an idea or concept without acknowledging the source of the information. This includes any form of activity that negates the academic integrity of the student or another student and/or their work.

Plagiarism occurs when students fail to acknowledge that the ideas of others are being used. Specifically, it occurs when:

- other people’s work and/or ideas are paraphrased and presented without a reference;
- other students’ work is copied or partly copied;
- other people’s designs, codes or images are presented as the student’s own work;
- phrases and passages are used verbatim without quotation marks and/or without a reference to the author or source;
- lecture notes are reproduced without due acknowledgement.

Cheating occurs when a student seeks to obtain an unfair advantage in an examination or in other written or practical work required to be submitted or completed for assessment.

Collusion (unauthorised collaboration) involves working with others without permission to produce work which is then presented as work completed independently by the student. Collusion is a form of plagiarism. Students should not knowingly allow their work to be copied.

### 3. Notification to students

Students are notified about academic integrity through the *Student Orientation and Study Support Guide*, available to all enrolled students in the Canvas LMS. This Canvas program explains the meaning of academic misconduct and provides students with clear instructions about assessment preparation and submission standards and expectations and refers students to this policy and the *Student Assessment Policy and Procedure (QAF075)*.

The *Student Orientation and Study Support Guide* and HELI Digital Library also provides information to students about referencing requirements and academic conventions for the use of others’ work including advice on how to avoid plagiarism.

---

<sup>1</sup> The expectation of academic integrity in relation to the Institute’s staff is contained in the *Academic Freedom, Integrity and Free Intellectual Enquiry Policy (QAF005)*

#### **4. Prevention and detection of plagiarism**

In order to assist in the prevention of plagiarism educators have a responsibility to explain to students both good scholarly practice and the concept of plagiarism.

The *Student Orientation and Study Support Guide* provides advice to students about referencing requirements and academic conventions for the use of others' work as well as advice on how to avoid plagiarism. Also, specialised tutorials on referencing techniques are available through the HELI Digital Library.

When marking papers educators may detect possible plagiarism by observing changes in formatting within a paper, including a mixture of quotation marks; changes in writing style within a paper; suddenly improved writing style; a paper veering away from the topic; lack of recent reference sources or unusual or anachronistic references; and common phrases appearing in more than one paper.

If an educator believes that plagiarism has occurred they can search for a key phrase on a search engine (preferably enclosed in quotation marks).

If it is suspected that plagiarism of an internet site has occurred it would be advisable to print out the material in case the site is changed or removed.

Students are required to submit all papers through Turnitin so that they can be subject to electronic scanning to detect plagiarism.

#### **5. Allegation of academic misconduct**

When academic misconduct is suspected by an educator, the Course Coordinator should be notified. Allegations of academic misconduct must be based on firm evidence.

The Course Coordinator will put the matter to the student(s) and give them an opportunity to respond to the allegation of academic misconduct. The student(s) should be called to a meeting where they are given details of the suspected academic misconduct and given a chance to defend the allegation. The student(s) should be informed of the penalties that may be applied if the allegation of academic misconduct is upheld. In cases where it is impracticable for a student to attend such a meeting, particulars of the alleged academic misconduct should be put to the student in writing, and the student should be asked to respond within ten working days from receipt of the written communication.

The Course Coordinator is required to decide whether the allegation of academic misconduct is upheld or rejected and, if upheld, whether the academic misconduct was likely to have been intentional or unintentional.

There are a number of factors that might be taken into consideration when deciding whether the alleged academic misconduct was unintentional, such as:

- the student is in the first year of the course and has not received a prior warning;
- the student is from an educational background where different norms apply for the acknowledgement of sources;
- a negligible amount has been plagiarised;
- the student has made an inadequate attempt at referencing.

An indication that alleged academic misconduct was intentional may be:

- that the students in the cohort were given information on how to acknowledge extracts and quotations and the student was present and received written information and knew that the use of material without acknowledgement was unacceptable;
- that the student had received a prior warning about academic misconduct.

## **6. Penalties**

Once an allegation of academic misconduct has been investigated and found to be upheld a determination will be made within ten working days of the appropriate penalty. Each finding of academic misconduct will be treated on its merits. To detect repeated infringements of academic misconduct reference to the central *Register of Findings of Academic Misconduct* will be made before the penalty is determined (refer section 6.3).

### **6.1 Unintentional academic misconduct**

Where the Course Coordinator determines that academic misconduct was not intentional they may take one of the following possible actions:

- warn the student and mark the assessment item without penalty (deduction of marks); or
- warn the student and mark the assessment item with penalty; or
- warn the student, request resubmission, and mark the assessment item with or without penalty.

Warnings and penalties must be communicated in writing to the student and will be kept on the student's file. The student shall also be advised of their right to appeal the finding of academic misconduct and the penalty imposed.

### **6.2 Intentional academic misconduct**

Before the Course Coordinator determines that the finding of academic misconduct was intentional they must consider the student's response (if any) to the allegation. If the student fails to respond to an allegation of intentional academic misconduct or cannot convince the Course Coordinator that the academic misconduct was unintentional, the Course Coordinator will determine the appropriate penalty for the finding of intentional academic misconduct, which may be one or more of the following:

- the student may be required to undertake additional or alternative assessment (the maximum mark possible being a Pass grade);
- a grade of Fail may be recorded for the assessment item;
- a grade of Fail may be recorded for the subject;
- the student may be withdrawn from the course for a period of specified time;
- the student may be excluded from the course and expelled from the Institute.

The most serious penalties may be considered in the case of repeated academic misconduct.

The basis on which the academic misconduct has been determined to be intentional and the penalty that has been determined must be communicated in writing to the student and a copy kept on the student's file. The student shall also be advised of their right to appeal the finding of academic misconduct and the penalty imposed.

### 6.3 Recording incidences of academic misconduct

All proven cases of academic misconduct are entered onto a central *Register of Findings of Academic Misconduct* to allow for verification of repeated infringements. This register is maintained by the Registrar.

### 6.4 Further education

In the case that a finding of academic misconduct has been determined, and the student is not expelled from the Institute, the student will be required to receive professional development on referencing techniques.

## 7. Review of decision

A student may request a review of a decision made under this policy. The grounds for a request are that the decision is inconsistent with this policy. Requests must be made in writing and lodged with the Dean within ten working days of the student receiving written notification of the decision. The Dean will respond in writing to the request within twenty working days and may confirm or vary the decision. All decisions of the Dean in regard to requests for the review of a decision made under this policy will be reviewed by the Academic Quality Committee.

If a student remains dissatisfied with the outcome of their request for a review they may utilise the Institute's grievance handling procedures: *QAF090 Student Grievance Handling Policy and Procedure*.

## 8. Related documents

- Student Orientation and Study Support Guide
- FRM080 Register of Findings of Academic Misconduct
- QAF075 Student Assessment Policy and Procedure
- QAF090 Student Grievance Handling Policy and Procedure

## 9. Version history

Version	Approved by	Approval Date	Details
1.0	Academic Board	20 February 2016	Document creation and initial approval
1.1	Dean	3 November 2016	Change to nomenclature regarding appeals Change to role titles
1.2	Academic Board	5 December 2018	Scheduled review

Document owner: Dean