

PROCEDURE: A6.0-P6.0

ACADEMIC INTEGRITY

1.0 INTRODUCTION

1.1 Related Policy

Academic Integrity Policy

1.2 Purpose

This procedure outlines the responsibilities and processes required in managing academic integrity and academic misconduct by students. Refer to the Staff Code of Conduct for managing academic misconduct by staff.

1.3 Scope

This procedure applies to all current students enrolled in AIM's nationally recognised Training Products including where a student accesses State funding or traineeships.

This procedure applies to academic and administrative staff in terms of the actions required to demonstrate and promote academic integrity to students, and to manage academic misconduct by students.

1.4 Scope Exceptions

None

2.0 RESPONSIBILITIES

1. Students are responsible for following and complying with this procedure and the Academic Integrity policy.
2. AIM staff are responsible for complying with the requirements of this procedure as it applies.

3.0 PROCEDURE

3.1 Information, Training and Good Practice

1. The Head of Academic Delivery, VET ensures that orientation of new students includes:
 - training on academic integrity, including referencing

- training on what constitutes academic misconduct including plagiarism
 - training on protection of the student's own work when using computers
 - the importance of not sharing log-in details.
2. The Head of Academic Delivery, VET ensures that Trainers and Assessors have the required information/tools to support them in promoting academic integrity and detecting academic misconduct.
 3. Academic Staff must be aware of and refer students to the resources on the AIM learning management system covering information on what constitutes academic misconduct, referencing and plagiarism that can include the following:
 - a. other people's work and/or ideas paraphrased and presented by the student without a reference
 - b. other students' work copied or partly copied and presented as the student's work
 - c. other people's designs, codes or images presented as the student's own work
 - d. phrases and passages used verbatim by the student without quotation marks and/or without a reference to the author or source.
 4. The Head of Product VET will ensure that the design of assessments, both formative and summative, provide a range of assessment types that allow for the authentication of student work and also meet the Rules of Evidence and Principles of Assessment.
 5. The Head of Academic Delivery VET ensures AIM undertakes regular assessment moderation which allows a nominated panel to identify instances of academic misconduct.

3.2 Detection and Authentication

1. Trainers and Assessors, when marking assessments, may detect possible plagiarism which may include:
 - changes in formatting within a paper
 - mixture of quotation marks
 - changes in writing style within a paper
 - a suddenly improved writing style
 - a paper veering away from the topic
 - lack of recent reference sources or unusual references, and common phrases appearing in more than one paper.
2. Trainers and Assessors may employ a range of techniques as part of authenticating student work:
 - a. undertake random sampling of an assessment task to look for strong similarities between students which could indicate collusion.

- b. contact students to ask them further questions about the topic in the assessment that challenge the students to demonstrate competency or knowledge.
- c. review previous assessment to confirm student style and level of knowledge and competency.
- d. search for a key phrase on a search engine to confirm instances of plagiarism.
- e. print out the material from the internet site in case the site is changed or removed, to use as reference in discussions with the student, or as evidence in an investigation.

3.3 Reporting Alleged Academic Misconduct

1. Staff and students reporting alleged academic misconduct by a student(s) must:
 - a. maintain the confidentiality of the student(s) concerned. Talking about the alleged misconduct with anyone other than the Head of Academic Delivery, VET or their Trainer and Assessor or, if requested, other staff involved in the investigation will be viewed as misconduct; and
 - b. make an appointment to discuss the issue with the Head of Academic Delivery, VET, who will investigate the allegation as outlined in clause 3.5 of this Procedure.
2. Allegations of academic misconduct must be based on clear evidence provided to the Head of Academic Delivery, VET. Proven malicious allegations will be viewed as harassment and a breach of the relevant Code of Conduct and will result in consequences.

3.4 Levels of Academic Misconduct

There are several levels of academic misconduct that can impact on students.

Type	Description	Potential Penalties
Minor Unintentional	Careless practice or misinterpretation of academic integrity/misconduct. For example, inadequate or inconsistent referencing, copying one or two sentences verbatim without adequate referencing.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Written student warning • Referral to resources to build knowledge and understanding on academic integrity • Request resubmission of the assessment task
Moderate	Clearly breaches the Student Code of Conduct and is deliberate. For example, copying more than one or two sentences without referencing.	<p>If unintended:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Written student warning • Referral to resources to build knowledge and understanding on academic integrity • Request resubmission of the assessment task <p>If intended:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Written student warning and request resubmission of the assessment task; or

Type	Description	Potential Penalties
		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> a result of not yet competent is recorded for assessment task; or re-commence the full unit, in which case additional fees will apply.
Serious	<p>Substantial breach of the Student Code of Conduct and is deliberate.</p> <p>For example, serious plagiarism, cheating in an examination, having someone else do your assessment in the online classroom, in a video or in person, contract cheating, collusion or providing fraudulent documents.</p>	An Intention to cancel will be sent to the student (See Withdrawal Policy)

3.5 Investigating Alleged Academic Misconduct

1. Staff must in all investigations, communicate to students in writing and the communication and the result of the investigation, recorded on students' files. Students must also be advised of their right to appeal any finding of academic misconduct through the *Complaints and Appeals Policy and Procedure*.
2. Staff will, when investigating alleged academic misconduct, take into account:
 - a. the level of the academic misconduct (see 3.4);
 - b. the experience of the student (for example, the student has just commenced the course)
 - c. whether there have been prior instances of academic misconduct by the student
 - d. the circumstances, such as a medical issue or other significant personal issue that may have impacted on the student, language issues, or cultural background.
3. The Head of Academic Delivery, VET will, on receipt of the allegation of academic misconduct, write to students, within five (5) working days of the allegation being made, and include in the letter:
 - a. the full particulars of the allegation and the possible penalty should the allegation be proven;
 - b. a requirement for the students to reply in writing to the letter within ten (10) business days of receiving it, with a response to the allegation,
 - c. that the investigation will continue irrespective of whether the students responds to the letter, or if they withdraw from the course.
4. The Head of Academic Delivery, VET will consider the factors listed in clause 3.5.2 and the defence provided by the student and make a decision on 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.

Factors that can be taken into consideration when deciding whether the alleged academic misconduct was unintentional, are:

- a. a negligible amount has been plagiarised;
 - b. the student's evident intent; and
 - c. the student has just commenced their course and has not received a prior warning;
 - d. the student is from an educational background where different norms apply for the acknowledgement of sources;
 - e. the student has made an attempt, albeit inadequate, at referencing.
5. Indications that the academic misconduct was intentional include:
- a. the student's evident intent;
 - b. the student was given information on how to acknowledge extracts and quotations was given and knew that the use of material without acknowledgement was unacceptable;
 - c. the student had received a prior warning about academic misconduct or had previously been penalised for academic misconduct.

3.6 Imposing Penalties for Academic Misconduct

1. In all cases, warnings and penalties must be communicated in writing to students within ten (10) working days of the decision and will be recorded on the students' files. Students must also be advised of their right to appeal the finding of academic misconduct through the Complaints and Appeals Policy and Procedure.
2. If the Head of Academic Delivery, VET believes that the student's actions were not academic misconduct, students will be notified in writing and any notes about the alleged incident will be removed from students' files. The person making the report of alleged academic misconduct will also be notified in writing.
3. If the Head of Academic Delivery, VET, believes academic misconduct has occurred, the penalties in 3.4 may be actioned.

3.7 Appeals

1. Students have the right to appeal any decision and penalty made under the Academic Integrity Policy and this procedure.
2. The process for appeals is provided in the *Complaints and Appeals Policy and Procedure*.

3.8 Governance Requirements

1. Proven incidents of academic misconduct, and the resultant disciplinary action are recorded on the Academic Integrity Register by the Head of Academic Delivery, VET who reports this to the VET Governance and Risk Committee.
2. The VET Governance and Risk Committee reports on the risk relating to Academic Integrity to the Corporate Board via the Audit and Risk Committee.

4.0 DEFINITIONS

- **Authentication** - Processes involving a range of IT tools and/or measures to authenticate /confirm that the work submitted is that of the student enrolled.
- **Academic Integrity** - A commitment to the values of honesty, trust, fairness, respect and responsibility in one's studies and related activities.
- **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 negatively impacts the academic integrity of the student or another student and/or their work. Academic misconduct also includes disclosing private details of a client; submitting fraudulent material such as medical certificates, transcripts, parchments or any other required material that is shown to be fraudulent; offering bribes of any sort to gain admission or better grades; and falsifying identity or data.
- **Cheating** - Acting dishonestly or unfairly in order to gain an unfair advantage in an examination or other assessment, for example, using a cheat sheet in an examination, or contracting another person to do an assignment (online, video or written) and the student then submitting it as their own work (Contract Cheating).
- **Collusion** - Collusion is unauthorised collaboration which 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.
- **Contract Cheating**- The practice of engaging a third party to undertake part or all of an assessment tasks or other academic work on behalf of a student.
- **Course** - a program of study that may consist of a nationally recognised qualification, accredited course, skill set or unit of competency.
- **Plagiarism** - Plagiarism means activities where students fail (intentionally or unintentionally) to acknowledge that the ideas of others are being used when writing and presenting their academic work. Plagiarism is a specific and serious form of academic misconduct and includes any of the following, represented as your own work with no attribution to the actual developer of the work: direct copying; close paraphrasing; submitting another student's work as your own; using another person's ideas, work or data; copying computer files, algorithms or code; changing variables in a computer program in order to submit work that has been transformed from another person's work; or in any way appropriating or imitating another's ideas or manner of expressing them, where this is not expressly permitted in the course or unit outline.

5.0 REFERENCES AND ASSOCIATED INFORMATION

- Academic Integrity Policy
- Assessment Policy and Procedure
- Complaints and Appeals Policy and Procedure
- Privacy of Information and Records Policy and Procedure
- Staff Code of Conduct
- [Standards for Registered Training Organisations \(RTOs\) 2015](#)
- Student Code of Conduct

6.0 POLICY/PROCEDURE OWNERSHIP

Policy Owner	Head of Academic Delivery, VET
Status	Reviewed on July 2022
Approval Authority	Chief Executive Officer
Date of Approval	13 September 2022
Effective Date	26 September 2022
Implementation Owner	Head of Academic Delivery, VET
Maintenance Owner	VET Compliance and Operations Manager
Review Due	11 August 2025
Content Enquiries	Head of Academic Delivery VET- Sandy Jagdev Email: sandy.jagdev@aim.com.au

7.0 AMENDMENTS

Version	Amendment Approval (Date)	Amendment Made By (Position)	Amendment Details
A6.0-P6.0		VET Compliance and Operations Manager	New Policy and Procedure