



## STUDENT ACADEMIC INTEGRITY AND HONESTY POLICY AND PROCEDURE

### 1. Overview

Students of CIHE will conduct themselves in their academic studies honestly and ethically and are expected to carefully acknowledge the work of others in all their academic activities.

This policy describes academic misconduct to students and outlines CIHE'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 words, an idea or concept without acknowledging the source of the information.

Academic misconduct includes any form of activity that negates the academic integrity of the student or another student and/or their work.

*Plagiarism* 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, and/or
- images, information or data from the internet are reproduced without acknowledgement.

*Cheating* occurs when a student seeks to obtain an unfair advantage in an examination or in other written or practical work is required to be submitted or completed for assessment. *Cheating* also involves engaging someone else to produce or contribute to the production of an assessment, for example, by using a contract cheating site.

*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

Unit Learning Guides will explain the meaning of academic misconduct and will give students clear instructions as to whether they are permitted to work on an assignment jointly and provide clear guidelines relating to all aspects of group work. The CIHE Student Assessment Policy stipulates the use of systems to monitor and evaluate the contribution of individual students to group work.

Unit Learning Guides will also provide adequate information to students about referencing requirements and academic conventions for the use of others' work including advice on how to avoid plagiarism. Unit Learning Guides will refer students to this policy.

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

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

The Unit Learning Guide will provide 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, the use of evidence in assignments and strategies for effective summarising and paraphrasing will be offered regularly by CIHE's Language and Learning Advisor in collaboration with the Library Services Officer.

CIHE uses Turnitin as a system of assessment submission in order to assess student work for originality.

In addition, marking papers, teaching staff 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 a member of teaching staff 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 will be required to submit all papers in electronic format so that they can be subject to electronic scanning to detect plagiarism.

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

When academic misconduct is suspected by teaching staff, the Course Coordinator (if not the same person as the unit lecturer) 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.

To achieve this, the student(s) should be called to a meeting where they are given particulars of the suspected academic misconduct and given a chance to defend the allegation. At the meeting, the student(s) should be informed of the penalties that may be applied if the allegation of academic misconduct is upheld. Communication with the student, meetings and decisions should be recorded using the electronic student Notification and Processing of Academic Misconduct forms available through the staff page on the CIHE website.

The process for student academic misconduct is as follows and must be followed and recorded:

1. Academic staff member suspects academic misconduct.
2. Course Coordinator informed in writing of suspected academic misconduct using the Notification and Processing of Academic Misconduct form on the CIHE website.

- i. Even if the Course Coordinator is the lecturer making the notification, the form must be initiated and kept up to date throughout the process.
  - ii. The form requires that evidence be attached and an explanation included.
  - iii. The Dean must be notified of the allegation and kept informed throughout the process.
3. Course Coordinator organises a meeting with the student.
  - i. Student notified via email and sent any evidence and the explanation of the allegation and a copy of the CIHE policy (this policy).
  - ii. Students must respond to the email within 10 Days.
  - iii. Student may bring a support person to meeting who cannot address the meeting directly.
  - iv. The Course Coordinator must ensure that the Dean or their nominee is present at the meeting.
4. At the meeting,
  - i. the allegation is explained to the student(s) and
  - ii. they are given an opportunity to respond.
  - iii. records must be kept, and
  - iv. when the meeting is complete, the student and all others present must sign the form indicating that it accurately records the content of the meeting.
  - v. no determination is to be made at the meeting.
5. A determination is made following the meeting using the guidelines in this policy.
  - i. If the allegation is upheld (intentional misconduct), a penalty must be determined and recorded. A note will be placed on the students record in RTO manager.
  - ii. If the allegation is not upheld, no penalty will be applied.

In both instances (8 or 9), the student will be required to attend the next scheduled academic integrity workshop. This requirement and its completion will be recorded in the student's file in RTO manager (the SMS system).

6. The student will be notified of the outcome of the misconduct meeting via email and of any penalty within 10 working days.
  - i. They must also be alerted to the policy and procedure for appeal.
  - ii. The letter will also contain an explanation of the integrity workshop requirement.
7. Once the student has attended the workshop, a further note will be made on their file and in the records of the case of academic misconduct.

### **5.1 Determination**

There are several 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 student records 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, require attendance at an appropriate workshop and mark the assessment item without penalty (deduction of marks),
- warn the student, require attendance at an appropriate workshop and mark the assessment item with penalty, or
- warn the student, request resubmission after attendance at an appropriate workshop, 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 will be advised of their right to appeal the finding of academic misconduct and the penalty. The student will be required to attend the next scheduled academic integrity workshop.

### 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 unit,
- 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 CIHE.

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 via email to the student within 10 working days and a copy kept on the student's file. The student will be advised of their right to appeal the finding of academic misconduct and the penalty. The student will be required to attend the next scheduled academic integrity workshop.

| Degrees of misconduct               | Degree of Section   |
|-------------------------------------|---|
| Category one – unintentional breach | Counselling by Lecturer; record of breach in the intervention log by the course coordinator |

|  |   |
|--|---|
| Category two intentional but minor (e.g. less than 10% plagiarism or breach of examination discipline not occasioning advantage)                                 | 10%-mark penalty; record of breach in the intervention log by the course coordinator; no opportunity for resubmission.        |
| Category three – intermediate breach (e.g. 10-25% plagiarism)  | Zero for the assignment; record of breach in the intervention log by the course coordinator; no opportunity for resubmission. |
| Category four – major (greater than 50% plagiarism; repeated breach of any kind; a breach that constitutes malicious harm to another student or the institution) | Failure in the unit and referral to the Dean, who will consider whether the breach warrants termination (exceptional cases)   |

### 6.3 Recording incidences of academic misconduct

All proven cases of academic misconduct are entered onto student records as a hidden entry to allow for verification of repeated infringements.

### 7. Appeals

A student may appeal against a decision made under this policy. The grounds for appeal are that the decision is inconsistent with this policy. Appeals must be made in writing and lodged with the Dean within ten working days of the student receiving email notification of the decision. The Dean will respond in writing to the appeal within twenty working days and may confirm or vary the decision. All decisions of the Dean in regard to appeals under this policy will be reviewed by the Teaching and Learning Committee. If a student remains dissatisfied with the outcome of their appeal, they may utilise CIHE's grievance handling procedures.

### 8. Version history

| Version | Approved by    | Approval Date | Details  |
|---------|----------------|---------------|--|
| 1.0     | Academic Board | 27.1.2017     | Document creation  |
| 1.1     | Academic Board | 21.4.2017     | Copy edit and inclusion of the use of Turnitin for originality checking.                                   |
| 2.0     | Academic Board | 15.9.2017     | Redeveloped to determine the formal academic misconduct process, its electronic format and record keeping. |
| 2.1     | Academic Board | 13.12.2019    | Added s schedule of categories of misconduct and programmed responses                                      |

Document owner: Dean