

Academic Integrity Policy

Purpose	This policy addresses AITC’s approach to academic integrity.
Location	The policy is maintained on owncloud
Responsible executive	Academic Dean
Responsible office	Academic Dean’s Office
Contact officer	TBA
Effective date	29 June 2020
Review date	TBA
Modification history	Version 1.0
Related documents	AITC Student Feedback Policy AITC Student Feedback Procedure AITC Monitoring Review and Improvement Procedure AITC Examinations Policy and Procedure AITC Student Progression, Exclusion and Graduation Policy AITC Education Plan AITC Student Code of Conduct Policy AITC Staff Code of Conduct Policy
Authority	Approved by the Academic Board

1. Purpose

AITC Academic integrity principles include, honesty, and a respect for knowledge, truth and ethical practices. These principles are at the core of all academic endeavour in teaching, learning and research. Dishonest practices contravene academic values, compromise and devalue the quality of learning and the credibility of the award. This policy is intended to reinforce the importance of integrity and honesty in the Australian Institute of Technology and Commerce (AITC) academic environment.

2. Scope

This policy applies to all students and staff of the AITC.

3. Definitions

3.1. Academic integrity is defined as: ‘a commitment, even in the face of adversity, to six fundamental values: honesty, trust, fairness, respect, responsibility, and courage. From these values flow principles of behaviour that enable academic communities to translate ideals to action’ (International Centre for Academic Integrity, 2014).

3.2. For the purposes of the Higher Education Standards Framework (Threshold Standards) 2015 (HES Framework), academic integrity is: ‘the moral code of academia. It involves using, generating and communicating information in an ethical, honest and responsible manner’ (Monash University, 2013). The term ‘ethical scholarship’ has a similar meaning. These definitions apply to the behaviour of teachers, researchers, students or others who are

engaged in any form of scholarly activity.

- 3.3. Research integrity can also be defined in terms of the credibility of its findings as ‘the trustworthiness of research due to the soundness of its methods and the honesty and accuracy of its presentation’ (Singapore Statement on Research Integrity, 2010).
- 3.4. Academic plagiarism is a form of academic misconduct that involves making a false representation to gain an unjust advantage. It can include:
- a) Falsification of data.
 - b) Using a substitute person to undertake, in full or part, an examination or other assessment.
 - c) Reusing one’s own work, or part thereof, that has been submitted previously and counted towards another course without permission from the relevant course coordinator.
 - d) Making contact or colluding with another person, contrary to instructions, during an examination or other assessment item.
 - e) Bringing material or device(s) into an examination or other assessment item other than such as may be specified for that assessment item.
 - f) Making use of computer software or other material and device(s) during an examination or other assessment item other than such as may be specified for that assessment item.
 - g) Contract cheating or having another writer compete for tender to produce an essay or assignment and then submitting the work as one’s own.
- 3.5. Plagiarism is the presentation of the thoughts or works of another as one’s own. Without limiting the generality of this definition, it may include:
- a) Copying or paraphrasing material from any source without due acknowledgment.
 - b) Using another person’s ideas without due acknowledgment.
 - c) Collusion or working with others without permission and presenting the resulting work as though it.
 - d) was completed independently.
- 3.6. Academic misconduct includes but is not limited to conduct that involves plagiarism and any other dishonest conduct by a student to gain academic or general advantage; or conduct that otherwise contravenes the provisions of AITC’s academic rules, policies, procedures and/or guidelines. Dishonesty in the preparation or presentation of any assessable work is regarded as student academic misconduct. Academic misconduct includes, but is not limited to:
- a) Cheating: behaving deceitfully or dishonestly in examinations, in the preparation of assessable items and during in-class tests.
 - b) Fabrication: intentional and unauthorised falsification or invention of any information or citation in an academic exercise.
 - c) Intentionally or recklessly facilitating academic dishonesty by other students.
 - d) Providing an assessment item, or providing access to an assessment item to others, either directly or indirectly, in circumstances where it is reasonably foreseeable that it will be used dishonestly.
 - e) Deceitful behaviour by which it is sought to gain some unfair or dishonest advantage either for yourself or for another person.
 - f) Misleading ascription of authorship (including claiming authorship of parts of a group

- assignment prepared by other students).
- g) Misrepresentation: misrepresenting data or information incorrectly, improperly or falsely; (h). Behaving in any way that limits the academic opportunities of other students by improperly.
 - h) impeding their work or their access to educational resources.
 - i) Re-using one's own work without appropriate acknowledgement.
 - j) Using unauthorised equipment or material in an assessment item.
 - k) Using another person to undertake an examination or assessment item in your name.

4. Principles

4.1 Roles & Responsibilities

- 4.1.1 All staff and students must ensure that they understand and comply with legal restrictions and obligations (e.g. copyright) relating to Academic Integrity.
- 4.1.2 AITC has a responsibility to:
 - a) Promote the values of Academic Integrity; and
 - b) Provide students and staff with resources to ensure that students are supported to develop the skills required to uphold the values of Academic Integrity in all academic endeavours.
- 4.1.3 The academic management team has a responsibility to provide staff with, knowledge, skills and resources that will assist them in supporting academic integrity through teaching and research, and in supporting students to acquire and demonstrate the values of academic integrity.
- 4.1.4 Unit Coordinators have a responsibility to design assessment tasks and study load in such a way that supports academic integrity and minimises opportunities for plagiarism and other forms of academic misconduct.
- 4.1.5 In accordance with the Staff Code of Conduct, Academic staff have a responsibility to:
 - a) Be familiar with Academic Integrity requirements at AITC and continuously contribute to upholding a culture of Academic Integrity (this includes but is not limited to the appropriate conduct of lectures, tutorials and revision classes);
 - b) Ensure that confidential materials and information, such as examination questions and assessment marking guides, are handled with the upmost care and confidentiality at all times;
 - c) Inform all students of acknowledgement practices that are appropriate for their fields of study and provide clear examples of what is acceptable;
 - d) Clearly explain academic expectations and what constitutes plagiarism or other forms of academic misconduct to students;
 - e) Provide clear instructions in plain English and avoid using wording or terms that may be misunderstood by students with a non-English speaking background;
 - f) Follow the assessment design requirements as outlined in the relevant policies to promote Academic Integrity;
 - g) Set appropriate conditions for group work and make clear the distinction between group work and individual work;
 - h) Cultivate in students a climate of respect for authorship and for acknowledging the source of ideas;
 - i) Actively seek to detect plagiarism and identify and act whenever plagiarism or other forms of academic misconduct is suspected;

- j) Be aware of indicators that may assist in the identification of breaches of Academic Integrity; and
- k) Carry out or request investigations of student academic misconduct in accordance with this policy.

4.1.6 Students have a responsibility to:

- a) Submit only work which properly acknowledges the ideas, designs, words or works of others in what is otherwise their own original work.
- b) Avoid lending or otherwise providing original work to others for any reason other than where work is provided to another student in the course of collaboration in connection with group work assessment, and subject to any requirements imposed on students in connection with such collaboration.
- c) Have a clear understanding of the conditions of assessment, including assessment task requirements, appropriate source acknowledgement practices, and marking criteria.
- d) Provide, when requested (and where the item of work has been prepared using electronic means), an electronic copy of any work to academic staff involved in marking the work.
- e) Be clear about the acknowledgement practices that are appropriate for their field of study.
- f) Be aware of the collective responsibility of proper source acknowledgement within group assignments and be able to support their claims of authorship in a group assignment.
- g) Encourage other students to uphold the values of academic integrity and discourage other students from plagiarising or carrying out other forms of academic misconduct.

4.1.7 The Course Coordinator has a responsibility to carry out investigations of student academic misconduct in accordance with the Policy and report to the Academic Board through the Academic Dean.

4.2 Prevention and Detection of Plagiarism and Other Forms of Academic Misconduct

AITC will take steps to detect plagiarism and other forms of academic misconduct. These may include manual searches of resources, as well as the use of electronic text matching software (e.g. Turnitin) to compare work submitted for assessment against electronic text on the publicly accessible internet, in published works, on commercial databases, and in student previously submitted assignments.

4.3 Actions and Penalties

4.3.1 If an allegation of student academic misconduct is made, the Course Coordinator will investigate the matter by:

- a) Advising the student in writing of the referral.
- b) Issuing the student with a notice to show cause in relation to the allegation with advice that failure to respond within 10 days may result in confirmation of the allegation and imposition of a penalty.
- c) Examining the material with reference to the academic integrity policy.
- d) Using any electronic text-matching software (i.e., Turnitin) or other methods of detecting dishonesty made available by AITC.

- e) Considering any evidence or representations deemed necessary to undertake an assessment of the matter.

4.3.2 If any form of student academic misconduct is found to have occurred, a range of actions may be taken, or penalties imposed.

- a) Remedial action such as counselling or training on proper academic conventions and techniques and/or allowing the student to re-attempt the assessment item without loss of marks.
- b) Allowing the student to re-attempt the assessment item with a capped mark.
- c) Allowing the student to complete a new piece of work with a capped mark.
- d) Excluding any parts resulting from dishonest practices and referring the assessment item for remarking appropriate to the work completed.
- e) Awarding no marks for the assessment item.
- f) Awarding a fail grade in a course or courses.
- g) Imposing a suspension, with or without conditions, for a specified period.
- h) Imposing an exclusion, with or without conditions, for a specified period, after which the student will be required to apply for re-admission to AITC.
- i) Expelling the student from AITC.

Students under investigation for student academic misconduct will not be eligible to graduate until the matter is resolved.

4.3.3 An alleged breach of this policy conducted by AITC staff may amount to a breach of the Staff Code of Conduct and will be dealt with accordingly.

4.3.4 Education Integrity Decision-making and Penalties.

Following a framework developed by the University of Sydney:

	No impropriety	Further Development	Plagiarism	Academic Dishonesty	Potential Misconduct
Plagiarism – arising from failure to understand referencing requirements	<p>Plagiarised material is minimal and limited to a very small number of instances.</p> <p>Genuine attempt to acknowledge sources, possibly with imprecision in use of referencing conventions.</p> <p>Any stage of candidature.</p> <p>No prior findings or formal development requirements on record.</p>	<p>Plagiarised material is of low to moderate volume.</p> <p>Genuine attempt to acknowledge sources, possibly with imprecision in use of referencing conventions.</p> <p>Early- to mid-stage of candidature.</p> <p>No prior findings or formal development requirements on record.</p>	<p>Plagiarised material is of low to moderate volume.</p> <p>Genuine attempt to acknowledge sources, possibly with imprecision in use of referencing conventions.</p> <p>Mid- to late-stage of candidature.</p> <p>No prior findings on record, although may have formal development requirements on record.</p>		

	Corrective feedback sufficient.				
<i>Indicative outcome</i>	No penalty	Further development activity Submission of corrected work Specified maximum mark of 64%	Further development activity Submission of corrected work Specified maximum mark of 50% or 64%		
Plagiarism – arising from negligence	Plagiarised material is minimal and limited to a small number of instances. Genuine attempt to acknowledge sources, possibly with imprecision in use of referencing conventions. Any stage of candidature. No prior findings and/or formal development requirements on record. Corrective feedback sufficient.	Plagiarised material is of low volume. Genuine attempt to acknowledge sources, possibly with imprecision in use of referencing conventions. Early- to mid-stage of candidature. Prior formal development requirements on record.	Plagiarised material is of low to moderate volume. Genuine attempt to acknowledge sources, possibly with imprecision in use of referencing conventions. Mid- to late-stage of candidature. Prior findings and/or formal development requirements	Plagiarised material is of moderate to high volume. Limited attempt to paraphrase or acknowledge source material appropriately, demonstrating reckless disregard for academic standards. Mid- to late-stage of candidature. Prior findings and/or formal development requirements on record.	
<i>Indicative outcome</i>	No penalty	Further development activity Submission of corrected work Specified maximum mark of 50% or 64%	Further development activity Submission of corrected or alternative work Specified maximum mark of 50%	Further development activity (can incl. Academic Honesty Education Module) Submission of alternative work Specified maximum mark of 50%	
Plagiarism – arising from dishonesty			Low volume of plagiarised material, with insufficient attempt to paraphrase and/or	Moderate to high volume of plagiarised material. No attempt to acknowledge source material	Multiple findings of academic dishonesty on record

			<p>acknowledge all sources.</p> <p>Early- to mid-stage of candidature</p> <p>May or may not have formal development requirements on record.</p>	<p>appropriately or accurately, demonstrating willful disregard for academic standards.</p> <p>Any stage of candidature.</p> <p>May or may not have prior findings and/or formal development requirements on record</p>	
Indicative outcome			<p>Further development activity (can incl. Academic Honesty Education Module)</p> <p>Submission of alternative work</p> <p>Specified maximum mark of 50%</p>	<p>No prior finding of plagiarism or academic dishonesty: Fail item of assessment (0% - 49%)</p> <p>Prior finding: Fail unit of study (0% - 49%)</p> <p>Further development activity (can incl. Academic Honesty Education Module)</p>	Refer to Registrar
Recycling	<p>Recycled material is relevant to task, minimal and limited to a small number of instances.</p> <p>Genuine, but insufficient attempt to paraphrase from, or no acknowledgement of, the previously submitted work.</p> <p>Any stage of candidature.</p> <p>No prior findings and/or requirements on record.</p> <p>Cautionary feedback sufficient</p>	<p>Recycled material is relevant and of low or moderate volume without acknowledgement of prior use.</p> <p>Any stage of candidature.</p> <p>No prior findings on record.</p>		<p>Recycled material is unacknowledged and of sufficiently high volume to demonstrate limited or no engagement with disciplinary content and/or learning outcomes specific to the unit of study.</p> <p>Any stage of candidature.</p> <p>May or may not have prior findings on record.</p>	Multiple findings of academic dishonesty on record.

Australian Institute of Technology & Commerce Pty Ltd

ABN 47 634 668 214 CRICOS Code: TBA

Head Office: Level 6, 8 Quay Street, Haymarket NSW 2000

Website: www.aitc.nsw.edu.au Email: info@aitc.nsw.edu.au

Phone: 02 9211 4958



<p>Indicative outcome</p>	<p>No penalty</p>	<p>Further development activity (can incl. Academic Honest Education Module)</p> <p>Submission of corrected or alternative work</p> <p>Specified maximum mark of 50%</p>		<p>No prior finding of academic dishonesty: Fail item of assessment (0% - 49%) or submission of corrected or alternative work for specified maximum mark of 50%</p> <p>Prior finding: Fail unit of study (0% - 49%)</p> <p>Further development activity (can incl. Academic Honesty Education Module)</p>	<p>Refer to Registrar</p>
<p>Fabricating data and/or sources</p>		<p>Submitted work is relevant, contains no plagiarised content, and includes only single instance of inaccurate attribution to an unverifiable or non-existent source.</p> <p>Any stage of candidature.</p> <p>No prior findings on record</p>		<p>Evidence of systematic or deliberate attempt to mislead the examiner, either by concealing:</p> <p>the extent and/or quality of the empirical or scholarly research or (b) the actual sources of paraphrased or plagiarised material.</p> <p>Any stage of candidature.</p> <p>May or may not have prior findings on record.</p>	<p>Multiple findings of academic dishonesty on record.</p>
<p>Indicative outcome</p>		<p>Specified mark penalty of 5% or 10%</p> <p>Further development activity (can incl. Academic Honesty Education Module)</p>		<p>No prior finding of academic dishonesty:</p> <p>Fail item of assessment (0% - 49%)</p> <p>Prior finding: Fail unit of study (0% - 49%)</p> <p>Further development activity (can incl. Academic Honesty Education Module)</p>	<p>Refer to Registrar</p>

<p>Providing (or attempt to provide) assessment answers to another student</p>	<p>The task is a formative task or of low weighting relative to the overall assessment.</p> <p>Provision of work was inappropriate but done in good faith.</p> <p>Recipient and donor students possibly known to one another, with the donor student potentially under duress.</p> <p>Early stage of candidature</p>			<p>The task is a summative task and of moderate or greater weighting relative to the overall assessment.</p> <p>Recipient and donor students possibly known to one another, with the donor student potentially under duress.</p> <p>Any stage of candidature.</p> <p>May or may not have prior findings on record.</p>	<p>Prior (equivalent) finding or multiple findings of academic dishonesty.</p> <p>There is evidence of systematic or calculated provision of assignment answers, including via online platforms (e.g., social media or sharing websites), regardless of whether the donor student knows the recipient/s or not.</p>
<p>Indicative outcome</p>	<p>No penalty</p>			<p>No prior finding of academic dishonesty: no penalty and warning.</p> <p>Further development activity (can incl. Academic Honesty Education Module)</p>	<p>Refer to Registrar</p>
<p>Illegitimate cooperation (i.e., collusion) with another student or group of students in completing assessment task (incl. examination)</p>				<p>Evidence of illegitimate cooperation is obvious.</p> <p>Any stage of candidature.</p> <p>May or may not have prior findings and/or formal development requirements on record</p>	<p>Systematic and/or sophisticated attempt to conceal extent of cooperation, which may span multiple units of study.</p> <p>Multiple findings of academic dishonesty on record.</p>
<p>Indicative outcome</p>				<p>No prior finding of academic dishonesty:</p> <p>Fail item of low weighted assessment (0%)</p> <p>Submit alternative work for moderate to</p>	<p>Refer to Registrar</p>

Australian Institute of Technology & Commerce Pty Ltd

ABN 47 634 668 214 CRICOS Code: TBA

Head Office: Level 6, 8 Quay Street, Haymarket NSW 2000

Website: www.aitc.nsw.edu.au Email: info@aitc.nsw.edu.au

Phone: 02 9211 4958



				highly weighted assessment with specified maximum mark of 50%	
				Prior finding: Fail unit of study (0% - 49%)	
				Further development activity (can incl. Academic Honesty Education Module)	

4.4 Recording Outcomes

- 4.4.1 Once a determination has been made on a misconduct matter, the Course Coordinator will document the decision and relevant conditions of an imposed penalty.
- 4.4.2 The student will be informed in writing of the decision.
- 4.4.3 The student administration and enrolment staff will be informed of this for the purposes of appropriately recording the misconduct on the student's academic record and/or amending the student's enrolment.

4.5 Appeal Process

- 4.5.1 An appeal against a determination in a student misconduct matter can be lodged by the student if there is:
 - a) Evidence of a breach of this policy or general principles of procedural fairness; and/or
 - b) The suggestion that the decision was affected by a conflict of interest or personal bias; and/or
 - c) New information that could not reasonably have been provided prior to the hearing and it is probable that this information would have affected the decision.
- 4.5.2 An appeal on the grounds of penalty alone will not be considered.
- 4.5.3 An appeal against a determination made by the Course Coordinator may be made in writing to the Academic Dean within 20 days of Notice of the Decision and the grounds for appeal must be clearly set out.
- 4.5.4 Upon receipt of the Appeal, the Academic Dean (AD) shall undertake a preliminary review to determine the validity of the appeal. Once determined, and within 10 days of receiving the Appeal, the AD may:
 - a) Dismiss the Appeal if not valid.
 - b) Decide in relation to the Appeal.
 - c) Refer the Appeal to the Academic Board for determination.
- 4.5.5 The Appeal Decision (made by the AD or the Academic Board) is final and there is no further avenue of appeal within AITC. However, the student has the right to further appeal outside AITC (please see the Student Grievance Mediation Policy for information on external mediators).
- 4.5.6 In making a decision in relation to the Appeal, the original decision may be confirmed, varied or set aside.
- 4.5.7 The student will be informed in writing of the Appeal's Decision outlining reasons for the decision.
- 4.5.8 Relevant staff within AITC will be informed of the Appeal's Decision and appropriate records will be made.