

PROCEDURE DOCUMENT

ACADEMIC INTEGRITY PROCEDURE

1 Purpose and Scope

This procedure sets out the processes to be followed to handle incidents of academic dishonesty or plagiarism, hereafter termed academic misconduct, at the Australian College of Physical Education (ACPE). ACPE will exercise diligence in dealing with all cases of academic misconduct.

Scope:

- All students (including domestic and international)
- All academic staff
- Student Learning Services staff
- Student Services staff
- Library Staff

2 Procedure

2.1 Training of Staff and Students

The Academic Integrity Policy defines academic misconduct as “academic fraud, cheating, plagiarism, collusion and any other dishonest conduct by a student to gain academic or general advantage” For definitions of these key terms and others pertaining to academic misconduct, see the *Academic Integrity Policy*.

All staff and students need to be aware of the various policies, procedures, guides and training materials available to them in relation to academic misconduct, including the use of Turnitin as a formative tool. The College expects that academics design assessments that encourage academic integrity and that students and staff understand and adhere to the *Academic Integrity Policy*.

2.1.1 Staff

Academic Integrity Officers (AIO) are members of staff whose duties include the handling of academic misconduct cases. At the College, AIOs are located with Student Learning Services (SLS). Any third or subsequent cases of academic misconduct will be handled by an Academic Integrity Committee comprising an AIO as well as a Head of Department and assessor from a different department to the student.

Heads of Department (HOD) are members of academic staff who have been assigned overall responsibility for the leadership of a specified Department.

It is the responsibility of the AIO to ensure HODs are kept up-to-date with any changes or additions to materials and processes related to academic integrity and misconduct, while HODs are responsible for ensuring that academic staff under their purview -specifically assessors (any staff member tasked with grading assessments) and Subject Coordinators- are likewise up-to-date. Ultimately, all academic staff at the College should:

- Know where to locate relevant policies, procedures, guidelines and training materials relevant to academic integrity and misconduct; and
 - Be able to locate and explain the content of relevant materials to students, including:
 - Academic Integrity Procedure
 - Academic Integrity Policy
 - Student Misconduct (Non-Academic) Policy
 - APA Referencing Guidelines
 - Turnitin Software
 - Student Learning Services (SLS) training materials on academic integrity and referencing
 - Definitions of terms such as plagiarism and academic dishonesty
- These materials may be located via the College's website, the Student Learning Services link on the Learning Management System (LMS), or via other centralised repositories used by the College.
- Know the process for handling academic misconduct cases outlined in this document. This will be facilitated by various means, including but not limited to:
 - Dissemination of information electronically
 - Departmental meetings
 - Training workshops/meetings

2.1.2 Students

When a student enrolls at ACPE, they are required to complete an Academic Integrity module/activities as part of their Orientation (i.e. during orientation week or in the first few weeks of semester). This will orient students to Academic Integrity and introduce them to key resources and materials as listed above.

In addition, as part of their compulsory Foundation subjects -either Understanding Health (GHS1301) or Administration for the Sport and Recreation Industry (SPB1301) - students will learn more about:

- Plagiarism and its consequences
- Guidelines on assessment submission
- Referencing academic sources in the APA Style

Students also have access to a range of training materials via the LMS, SLS and Library websites, as well as a special SLS tab on each of their subject's homepages. It is expected that, particularly in the first semester of study, academic staff will remind students prior to assessment about referencing, plagiarism and academic dishonesty issues and direct them to relevant materials for further information.

2.2 Detecting Academic Misconduct

- An assessment refers to any evaluation of a student's performance by written/oral examination, assignments, presentation, performance, thesis, or practical. The assessor is a member of academic staff associated with the subject of study and responsible for assessing students' assessments. It is the responsibility of all assessors to detect potential cases of academic misconduct and refer those cases for processing under this Procedure (see procedure outlined below). Assessors may become aware of potential misconduct either via the Turnitin software or other means, including comparisons with other students' work.
- High Turnitin similarity scores (e.g. 20% or higher) may be used as an indicator that investigation is warranted, but assessors are encouraged to be conscientious and review all Turnitin reports prior to forwarding potential cases. Alternative similarity score limits may be set by Subject Coordinators depending on the nature of the assessment: see subject materials for specific requirements.
- All assessments suspected of misconduct must first be vetted by another member of staff before progressing to the AIO, in order to secure a second opinion and minimise excessive workload for the AIO. If the assessor suspects a student's assessment of

academic misconduct, they should refer the case to the relevant Subject Coordinator. In instances where the assessor also serves as Subject Coordinator, they should refer the case to their HOD. In cases where the Subject Coordinator/HOD agrees with the suspicion of misconduct, they should in turn refer the case directly to the AIO along with relevant supporting materials, which may include:

- the Turnitin report containing the student's similarity score and highlighted passages of text; and
- explanations for any details deemed relevant to the case, for example:
 - notes from the assessor regarding where they have found or suspect illegitimate practice in the assessment;
 - notes regarding where they believe legitimate practices such as referencing, quotation, and paraphrasing have been ignored;
 - suspected (if unidentified by Turnitin) sources for plagiarised content; and/or
 - copies of multiple student assessments in cases where collusion or peer plagiarism are suspected.
- Assessors are encouraged to email the AIO regarding academic misconduct discovered through Turnitin **within 5 working days of the assessment submission date**. In addition, assessors should not mark or provide students with feedback on assessments in potential breach of academic misconduct until a decision has been made by the AIO. However, as not all instances of academic misconduct are immediately identifiable through Turnitin, assessors can raise and refer suspected cases of academic misconduct at any point in the marking process or retrospectively. NB. – Any draft submissions that report a high Turnitin match should be managed by academics. Where possible, students should be counselled appropriately and encouraged to use the Student Learning Services. Assessments do not become 'Academic Misconduct' until the final submission.

2.3 Addressing Allegations of Academic Misconduct

- Within **2 working days** of receipt of the referral from the Subject Coordinator/HOD, the AIO will review the materials provided, access the student's record to identify any previous incidences of academic misconduct, and will discuss the case with the Subject Coordinator/HOD and assessor where applicable. Assessments under investigation for potential academic misconduct should not be marked or provided with feedback until a decision has been made by the AIO, except in cases where misconduct is identified retrospectively.

- Each case should be treated on its own merits, and criteria used to examine breaches of academic integrity can include:
 - levels of similarity and highlighted text identified in the Turnitin report;
 - relevant supporting materials provided by the Subject Coordinator/HOD and assessor; and/or
 - extent of the breach and the student's history of prior breaches.

2.4 No Academic Misconduct

In instances where no misconduct case is found warranted, the AIO will notify the Subject Coordinator/HOD (whoever referred them the case) within 2 working days of receipt of referral, and the case will be dismissed or, if needed, discussed further. The Subject Coordinator/HOD will in turn inform the assessor/Subject Coordinator (whoever referred them the case) who will resume marking the assessment.

2.5 Academic Misconduct Deemed

The AIO will determine that an allegation of academic misconduct should be pursued where the assessment exhibits evidence of the following:

- Unintentional plagiarism: where a student has not been thorough in exercising legitimate practices such as referencing, quotation, and paraphrasing, whether through lack of training, inexperience, inattentiveness to detail, or extenuating circumstances.
- Dishonest plagiarism: where a student has intentionally committed plagiarism by copying the work of others, whether published or unpublished work
- Academic dishonesty: where a student has engaged in one of these other dishonest practices: recruiting a contract author, participating in collusion, cheating or colluding in an assessment or examination, recycling prior work, or fabricating information or sources.

For further description of these forms of academic misconduct, see the Definitions section of this document and the *Academic Integrity Policy*, all breaches of academic integrity -whether they are deemed unintentional or dishonest plagiarism or academic dishonesty- are subject to the same processes and scaffolding of consequences.

NB: With the exception of cases where misconduct is identified retrospectively, under no circumstances should assessments under investigation of academic misconduct be marked or students provided with feedback, until the assessor/Subject Coordinator/HOD is notified of the decision by the AIO.

2.6 Pursuing Allegations of Academic Misconduct

Within 1 working day of electing to pursue the allegation of academic misconduct, the AIO will contact the student via email. This email will:

- notify the student of the charge of academic misconduct;
- instruct the student to respond acknowledging receipt of email **within 5 working days of delivery of this email**;
- instruct the student to organise an appointment with the AIO **within 10 working days of delivery of this email** (face-to-face for on-campus students; via telephone for online students); and
- inform the student that, should they disagree with the charge of academic misconduct, the burden of proof is upon them to provide satisfactory evidence they did not commit unintentional or dishonest plagiarism or academic dishonesty.

If a student fails to acknowledge the meeting request within 5 working days and/or fails to attend their scheduled meeting within 10 working days without satisfactory explanation, the student will:

- receive zero for this assessment (first offence of degree);
- fail the subject (second offence of degree); or
- be referred to the Academic Integrity Committee who, based on the severity of the misconduct and/or history of cases, can choose to exclude the student from study for a period of time or permanently (all third or subsequent offences).

At the meeting with the student, the AIO will:

- review the case with the student to ensure they understand the nature of the misconduct; provide and refer the student to relevant evidence, including:
 - copies of the Turnitin report;
 - copies of the Academic Integrity Policy, Student Misconduct Policy, or specific excerpted sections of these policies; and/or
 - copies of further evidence provided at the AIO's discretion;
- review any evidence against the misconduct charge provided by the student at the meeting;
- based on discussion with the student, determine the type of academic misconduct that has been committed (and, consequently, determine the punishment from two possible options if *second or subsequent year: first offence*); and
- review with the student the conventions of academic integrity relevant and pertaining to the charge of misconduct, whether unintentional or dishonest plagiarism or academic dishonesty.

Another staff member may be asked to attend the meeting if deemed relevant and at the AIO's discretion. Students are also permitted to bring along a support person (i.e. a friend or family member) to their meeting.

If the student provides compelling and satisfying evidence they did not commit misconduct, the case will be dismissed or, if needed, discussed further. If the student fails to provide satisfying evidence, the AIO will:

- refer first-time offenders to ACPE's Academic Integrity Module, which must be completed within **5 working days** of the appointment;
- refer the student to further consultation with an Academic Skills Advisor (SLS Office) if they require further instruction in referencing, paraphrasing, quotation or summarising;
- inform the student of the penalties for their academic misconduct (as outlined in Outcomes & Penalties below); and
- complete the *Breach of Academic Integrity Form* (on-campus students only). The form should be:
 - signed and dated by both the student and the AIO; and
 - filed in the student's record on the student record management system Paradigm.

2.7 Outcomes and Penalties

Outcomes and penalties have been designed to be educative for first offences and for students in their first year of undergraduate study (defined here as their first eight subjects of study). It is expected that after the successful completion of first year or after a first offence, students have had opportunity to learn and practice referencing and paraphrasing and now understand academic integrity.

Whilst allowing some concession for first offences committed in the second or subsequent year of study that are deemed unintentional plagiarism, penalties assigned to cases of academic misconduct will escalate in accordance with the student's progression through their degree and history of prior offences.

The table below shows the scaffolding of penalties based upon the student's status at the time of the offence. Note: in instances where students are in their first year and multiple assessments across multiple subjects are submitted to the AIO simultaneously, these will be grouped together as a single offence.

If a student fails to acknowledge the meeting request within 5 working days of initial email and/or fails to attend their scheduled meeting within 10 working days of initial email without satisfactory explanation, the student will:

Receive a zero grade for the assessment (first offence)	Fail the subject (second offence)	Be referred to the Academic Integrity Committee for potential exclusion from study (third or subsequent offences)
---	-----------------------------------	---

<u>Offence number</u>	<u>Penalty/requirement</u>
-----------------------	----------------------------

First year (during first eight subjects of study)

<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • First offence of their degree 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Resubmission of task within 5 working days for maximum mark of 64% of the assigned grade for the assessment. (NOTE: If offence occurs in SPB1301/GHS1301 a maximum of 74% of assigned grade applies) • Completion of Academic Integrity Module within 5 working days • Failure to complete either requirement will result in zero grade for the assessment
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Second offence of their degree 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Resubmission of task within 5 working days for maximum mark of 49% of the assigned grade for the assessment • Failure to complete this requirement will result in zero grade for the assessment
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Third or subsequent offences 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Zero grade for the assessment • Referral to the Academic Integrity Committee who, based on the severity of the misconduct and/or history of cases, can choose to exclude the student from study for a period of time or permanently.

Second or subsequent years (following successful completion of first eight subjects of study, i.e. subject 9 onwards)

<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • First offence of their degree 	<p><i>Unintentional plagiarism</i></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Resubmission of task within 5 working days for maximum mark of 64% of the assigned grade for the assessment • Completion of Academic Integrity Module within 5 working days • Failure to complete either task will result in zero grade for the assessment 	<p><i>Dishonest plagiarism/academic dishonesty</i></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Resubmission of task within 5 working days for maximum mark of 49% of the assigned grade for the assessment • Completion of Academic Integrity Module within 5 working days • Failure to complete either task will result in zero grade for the subject as a whole
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Second offence of their degree 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Zero grade for the assessment 	
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Third or subsequent offences 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Zero grade for the subject as a whole • Referral to the Academic Integrity Committee who, based on the severity of the misconduct and/or history of cases, can choose to exclude the student from study for a period of time or permanently. 	

2.8 Examination Misconduct

Where a student is guilty of committing misconduct in an exam, whether through use of cheat notes, collusion or communication with other students, or other means, these cases of academic dishonesty will be reviewed by the Academic Integrity Committee. Penalties will align with those set for written assessments in the table above and escalate over the course of a degree and the number of offences committed.

2.9 Recording of Academic Misconduct

Outcomes and penalties will be recorded by the AIO on Paradigm on the student's record and on the AIO's records; a follow-up letter will be sent to students formally announcing the AIO's decision. In addition, the AIO will notify other relevant parties (the Assessor/Subject Coordinator and HOD) of the outcome, as it pertains to their subject.

In instances where other students are implicated in academic misconduct through an investigation (e.g. for giving their assessment to another student) those students will also be called to meet with the AIO. If deemed guilty not of committing academic misconduct in their own work, but rather of contributing to another student's misconduct, these will be regarded as unique offences and students will be required to complete the Academic Integrity Module. Failure to attend a meeting with the AIO and/or complete the module may impede the student's academic progress.

NB. The AIO will keep detailed records of all investigations, whether deemed misconduct or not; however, draft submissions with high Turnitin matches or other breaches, as well as investigated potential breaches that were not deemed misconduct, will not be recorded on the student's file. Subject Coordinators and HODs can record these cases within their departments as they see fit.

2.10 Unsatisfactory work

If a student is tasked with revising and resubmitting their assessment and does this, but does not do so to the AIO's specifications, the AIO may request further revisions by the student before closing the case and allowing the paper to be graded. If these further revisions are not undertaken within 5 working days of the AIO's request, the AIO will assign the penalty outlined above for failure to complete a task, i.e. zero grade for the task for *first year: first offence/second offence* and *second year: first offence (unintentional plagiarism)*; failure of the subject for *second year: first offence (dishonest plagiarism/academic dishonesty)*.

In addition, in cases where new forms of misconduct are introduced by the student and/or identified by the assessor/AIO in the resubmitted assessment, a new academic misconduct case will be initiated.

2.11 Student Appeals

If the student is not satisfied with the outcome determined by the AIO/Academic Integrity Committee, they have the opportunity to appeal the decision through the CEO and Dean. Information on accessing and completing appeals documentation and timelines for appealing will be included in the student's letter of notification and can be also found in the *Grievances, Complaints and Appeals Policy and Procedure*.

3 Definitions

- **Academic Dishonesty** means seeking to obtain or obtaining academic advantage by dishonest or unfair means or knowingly assisting another student to do so. Academic dishonesty includes, but is not restricted to:
 - The act of **plagiarism** as further defined below
 - The act of collusion, which includes
 - a. assisting another student to commit plagiarism or other academic dishonesty by allowing one's work to be copied, utilised as a resource/guide or appropriated in some other form, and/or
 - b. collaborating to create alternate versions of the same assessment
 - Taking unauthorised information, materials or aids into an examination, irrespective of whether the unauthorised objects relate directly to the examination content (refer to Exam Administration Guidelines)
 - Using unauthorised information, material or aids in an examination
 - Submitting, as a new work, an assessment piece that has been previously submitted and assessed for another subject or award, or for the same subject previously failed, without appropriate acknowledgment and/or prior permission of lecturer
 - Using experimental results or data obtained or gathered by another person without appropriate acknowledgement of the other person's contribution
 - Fabricating or falsifying information, reference or data
 - Failing to give accurate acknowledgement to other collaborators' contributions to an assessment piece

- Tampering or attempting to tamper with assessment items, grades or class records
 - Falsifying or fabricating clinical, practical or laboratory reports
 - Falsifying word count through the inclusion of white/invisible text
 - Acquiring, attempting to acquire, possessing or distributing examination or assessment materials without the approval of the College.
- **Academic Integrity** means to act in a way that maintains integrity of all academic work and is not academically dishonest in any way.
 - **Copyright** is the exclusive legal right to make copies, license, and otherwise use literary, musical or artistic work whether printed, audio, video etc. Works granted such rights after 1977 are protected for the lifetime of the originator and for a period of 70 years after his or her death. Approval must be sought and granted to use copyright material in any student work.
 - **Plagiarism** is presenting another person's ideas, findings or work as one's own, either intentionally or unintentionally, and without acknowledgement of the original source. It is a subset of academic dishonesty and a form of academic misconduct.
 - **Unintentional Plagiarism** means innocently or carelessly presenting another person's work as one's own without appropriate acknowledgement of the source. It may be due to failure to follow appropriate referencing practices and is often a result of a student's fear/misunderstanding of paraphrasing or ignorance of policies and procedures.
 - **Dishonest Plagiarism** means knowingly presenting another person's work as one's own work without appropriate acknowledgement of the source. It may include instances where substantial portions of work have been copied from the work of another or from other sources including the internet and in a manner that cannot be explained as unintentional plagiarism (this includes if the student already has an instance of unintentional plagiarism on their record). It may also include instances where a student has engaged another person to produce the work and has claimed it as their own.

Possible forms of Plagiarism include:

- **Collusion** occurs when students use other students' work without adequately crediting the authors. It means submitting the work of someone else and calling it one's own, with full knowledge and consent of the other person who has supplied the work, in order to give a false representation of one's effort or performance on the assessment item. (The person supplying the work can also be deemed to have participated in collusion/ academic dishonesty, as

defined above.) Unintentional collusion can arise from study groups and from group-based assessments where students are unsure about the boundary between what the lecturer considers acceptable group work and collusion. In such a case, students should consult the Subject Coordinator for advice.

- **Collaboration** is the legitimate joint work by two or more students in the completion of a project, such as an assignment. In certain circumstances, lecturers may permit collaboration on all or part of an assessment piece for the purpose of facilitating peer learning and inquiry. Subjects that require group work expect legitimate collaborative learning to take place. Any specific collaborative arrangements will be specified in the assessment information available for the subject. Unless collaboration/group work is specified in the assessment criteria, students are expected to undertake and complete assessment work independently.
- All parties involved in the work (the student submitting the work and all other consenting participants supplying the work) are considered participants in the act of collusion.
- **Contract cheating** occurs when an assignment is purposely written by another person and represented by the student as her or his own work.
- **Incorrect referencing** occurs when material is copied word for word and presented as paraphrased but should have been in quotation marks, or material is paraphrased but without appropriate acknowledgement of its source.
- **Infringing copyright.**
- **Purloining** occurs when material is copied from another student's assignment or work without that person's knowledge. It also refers to the use by staff of another's work without that person's permission.
- **Self-plagiarism/recycling** includes resubmission of material which has been previously submitted (either in another subject or the same subject) and where the assessor has not been informed that the student has previously submitted the material nor approved the resubmission.
- **Student/Learner** is an individual person who is formally enrolled to study at the College. The individual person is that who appears on the College's documents such as enrolment, admission and payment documents, and who is assigned an individual student ID.

4 Related Documents

- Academic Integrity Policy
- Student Misconduct (Non-Academic) Policy
- Student Code of Conduct
- Assessment Policy and Procedure
- Grievances, Complaints and Appeals Policy and Procedure
- Breach of Academic Integrity Form
- Contract Cheating

Legislation:

- Higher Education Standards Framework 2015
- Tertiary Education Quality and Standards Agency Act 2011
- National Code of Practice for Registration Authorities and Providers of Education and Training to Overseas Students 2018

5 Policy Administration

Policy Name & Code:			Academic Integrity Procedure (PRO – 01)
Policy Owner:			Director of Student Services and Campus Wellbeing
Approval Authority:			Academic Board (ACPE)
Next Review:			September 2023
Approval Date	Effective Date	Version	Summary of changes
27 Oct 16	28 Oct 16	1	Full harmonisation – to incorporate all HE institutions. Approved by Academic Board on 27 October 2016.
26 Jun 18	27 Jun 18	2	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Revision includes rebranding to apply to only ACPE, from former SGA harmonised Academic Integrity and Student Misconduct Procedure - UG Policy of 2016. • Content revised to reflect current practices. • Document Owner changed from Dean and Operations Director to Student Services and Learning Support Manager. • Document format changed in line with the new document template for ACPE policies, procedures and ToRs. • Original document content revised to reflect current ACPE practices. • References to other SGA colleges have been removed. • References to Director of Education have been replaced with Dean & Operations Director.

Printed versions of this document are not controlled. Please refer to the ACPE website for the latest version.

			<ul style="list-style-type: none"> References to Executive Director replaced with Dean and Operations Director. References to Associate Dean (Programs and Quality) have been replaced with Dean & Operations Director. Changes made to document format include: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Old logo with references to Study Group removed. Document code, version and dates moved to 'Policy Administration' section. Paragraphs numbered. Previous 'Further Information Section' with references to related policies moved to new 'Related Documents' section. This section includes a list of related policies, procedures, and other documents. 'Policy Administration' table reformatted. Numbering system updated. Footer updated to include document title, document code, and document version only. The Responsibilities section has been updated to include references to Academic Integrity Officer (AIO).
04 Oct 18	05 Oct 18	3	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Complete de-harmonisation from other SGA brands. Procedure content revised to reflect current practices and to ensure compliance with the HES (5.2). Procedure retitled (<i>Academic Integrity and Student Misconduct Procedure</i> to <i>Academic Integrity Procedure</i>), for consistency. <i>Section 2.10 Unsatisfactory Work</i> added to reflect current activities. References to <i>negligent plagiarism</i> changed to <i>unintentional plagiarism</i>. <i>Section 2.7 Outcomes and Penalties</i> updated and references to "instructional" have been replaced with "educative" Appeals section updated to include references to <i>Grievances, Complaints and Appeals Policy</i>. Definition of Collaboration added. <i>Ghost Writing</i> changed to <i>Contract cheating</i>.
14 Mar 19	14 Mar 19	3.1	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> References to Dean and Operations Director replaced with CEO and Dean. References to Student Services and Learning Support Manager replaced with Director of Student Services and Campus Wellbeing.

* Unless otherwise indicated, this policy will still apply beyond the review date.