

Student Academic Integrity and Academic Misconduct Procedure

Purpose

1. The purpose of this Procedure is to outline operational steps for the Student Academic Integrity and Academic Misconduct Policy, including the categories applied to instances of academic misconduct at Global Higher Education (GHE) and a framework for identifying and addressing instances.

Scope

2. This Procedure applies to:
 - a) all GHE students;
 - b) staff in their role as guardians of academic integrity and in managing instances of academic misconduct;
 - c) all academic activity engaged in by students at GHE, including in off-campus activities such as work-integrated learning.

Definitions

3. Definitions for key terms are presented in the Glossary of Terms which may be accessed on the GHE website at <https://www.globalhe.edu.au/policy>

Suite documents

4. This Procedure is linked to the Student Academic Integrity and Academic Misconduct Policy.

Procedure

Promoting academic integrity and preventing academic misconduct

5. GHE supports students to develop the skills of academic integrity and provides training and advice on avoiding academic misconduct throughout the student journey. A written guide on academic integrity is provided through orientation programs and is also available as a standard requirement within the Learning Management System (LMS). The principles and practices of good scholarship are reinforced through dedicated training in the first teaching period of each course and refreshed in each unit of study. Emerging forms of academic misconduct are clearly explained to all students as they are identified.
6. GHE ensures that its academic staff are equipped to support academic integrity through the following measures:
 - a) the requirement for staff to participate in staff induction at the commencement of their employment to understand GHE's expectations in relation to staff behaviours and student conduct and to undergo training in the use and interpretation of tools and practices to detect academic misconduct;
 - b) the provision of appropriate tools to assist staff to promote academic integrity in their own practice and to prevent and detect student academic misconduct;

- c) the requirement for staff to undertake professional development/refresher training annually as approved by GHE in relation to academic integrity and misconduct.
7. Academic staff and staff who interact with students within the teaching and learning environment are also expected to contribute to the prevention of student academic misconduct by:
- a) emphasising expectations for academic integrity and conveying to students and staff the importance and implications of this Policy and Procedure;
 - b) providing clear information in advance of students commencing assessment tasks to minimise the risk of academic misconduct;
 - c) eliminating or reducing the opportunity for academic misconduct through careful design of assessment including the deployment of early, formative and original assessment;
 - d) using electronic submission of assignments in association with electronic text matching detection systems unless specific dispensation is granted by the Academic Director;
 - e) requiring students to sign statements that their assignment task is their own and is original with no part having been submitted previously, when lodging any work submitted for assessment.

Academic Integrity Officers

8. GHE will appoint one or more Academic Integrity Officers (AIO). An AIO is a senior academic staff member, with specialist training in academic integrity matters, who must be independent of the student against whom an allegation has been made. AIOs are responsible for investigating and determining consequences for lower level instances of academic misconduct and for referring more serious instances to appropriate bodies, as outlined below.

Student Academic Misconduct Register

9. GHE recognises that the recording of all potential and actual breaches of academic misconduct is critical to the monitoring of overall patterns of academic misconduct and the detection of repeat behaviours. For this reason, all relevant instances are recorded on a central Student Academic Misconduct Register (SAMR).
10. The Register will include summary records of all allegations, investigations and findings and the associated educational responses and/or penalties. Findings of poor academic practice (see below) will be maintained in a separate section of the Register.
11. The Manager, Quality and Compliance is responsible for maintaining the SAMR. The Course Coordinator may request information from the Manager, Quality and Compliance to determine if a student under investigation for a suspected case of academic misconduct has a previous record.
12. Access to the Register otherwise will be determined by the Academic Director.

Confidentiality

13. All information associated with reports, investigations and outcomes associated with individual allegations of academic misconduct must be treated as confidential and not released to any third party or external agency unless required by law, or the person has expressly consented to its release in writing.

Poor academic practice

14. GHE recognises that a distinction needs to be made between practices which may demonstrate poor academic study and writing skills due to students' inexperience, and instances which may involve intentional misconduct and misrepresentation. The former instances, particularly when they occur early in a student's enrolment, are designated 'poor academic practice'.

15. At the same time, it is important that, should any future instances of potential academic misconduct occur, any previous cautions or counselling events have been recorded to inform judgements in those cases.
16. Where a staff member determines that evidence of poor academic practice is simply due to a student's inexperience, and there is no prior record of poor practice or misconduct, the staff member will provide feedback and academic counselling to the student. A report of the finding and action is submitted to the Manager, Quality and Compliance for recording as a counselling event in the SAMR.

Categories of academic misconduct

17. Any breach by a student of the principles of academic integrity, other than that designated 'poor academic practice' as outlined above, constitutes academic misconduct as outlined in the **Student Academic Integrity and Academic Misconduct Policy**.
18. The level of an allegation of academic misconduct will determine the processes for its investigation. The level of a confirmed finding of academic misconduct will determine the possible consequences and/or penalties that may be applied.
19. GHE classifies academic misconduct as either a Category One or Category Two instance according to a number of factors:
 - a) the type of misconduct;
 - b) the extent of the misconduct;
 - c) the experience of the person;
 - d) the intent of the misconduct;
 - e) the impact of the misconduct.
20. Category One instances are confined to:
 - a) students who have had the opportunity to be trained in the conventions of academic writing and scholarship and/or may have already had a counselling event recorded in the SAMR;
 - b) low-level instances of misconduct such as plagiarism that appear to be a consequence of a person's lack of skill in the conventions of academic writing or arising from carelessness;
 - c) instances of collusion, or attempted collusion that appear to be other than a planned and deliberate act of deception.
21. Category Two instances are deemed to be offences where the intention to engage in misconduct appears to be conscious, pre-meditated and intended to deceive.
22. The matrix at Appendix 1 provides a guide to assess whether academic misconduct is either a Category One or a Category Two instance.

Detecting and reporting of allegations of academic misconduct

23. All assessment material submitted for grading will be subjected to checking for evidence of any form of academic misconduct using a range of methods including, but not limited to:
 - a) plagiarism detection software;
 - b) internet search engines and key word/phrase searches;
 - c) content matching and authenticity software;
 - d) comparison of assessments to previously submitted work and checking for consistency in use of language and grammar.
24. To aid in the detection and management of contract cheating academic staff will also monitor known sites and the advertising of services that provide pre-prepared assessments.

25. Where student academic misconduct is suspected, it must be reported immediately to the relevant Course Coordinator. The report must be accompanied by relevant evidence, e.g. direct or documentary evidence such as student work, text matching reports, or witness statements.

Assessment of allegations of academic misconduct

26. The Course Coordinator is required to make a preliminary assessment within 10 working days of receipt of an allegation of student academic misconduct.
27. If the Course Coordinator determines that there is a *prima facie* case of academic misconduct, they will refer the matter to an appropriate AIO for investigation or further referral.
28. If the Course Coordinator determines that academic misconduct has not occurred the relevant staff member will be advised, where relevant, to provide counselling to the student and a report will be submitted to the Manager, Quality and Compliance for recording as a counselling event on the SAMR.
29. Where a matter has been referred to an AIO they will determine, based on the information and evidence provided with the report, whether there is sufficient evidence that the matter should be investigated as a Category One or Two instance.
30. The purpose of the investigation in all cases is to make an independent evidence-based determination of whether:
 - a) it has been established on the balance of probabilities that the misconduct did occur;
 - b) there were any associated extenuating circumstances.
31. Where there is sufficient evidence of misconduct the AIO will make an assessment as to the likely severity of the case, based on the Academic Misconduct Matrix at Appendix One. The reasons for the allegation are to be documented by the AIO.
32. Where the allegation is deemed a potential Category One instance, the AIO will assume responsibility for the investigation. Where the allegation is deemed a potential Category Two instance the matter will be referred to the Academic Director.

Category One instance

33. Within five working days of the determination that further inquiry is warranted, the AIO will:
 - a) notify the student (the Respondent) that an allegation has been made, and provide them with copies of the available evidence;
 - b) inform the student of the general substance of the allegation and the range of possible consequences if the investigation results in the allegation being substantiated);
 - c) notify the Course Coordinator and the Manager, Quality and Compliance.
34. The AIO commences an investigation and must reach a determination, including imposing an appropriate penalty, within 20 working days of the initial determination.
35. The method of investigation will be determined by the AIO based on the circumstances of the allegation but may include interviews with the student and relevant staff.
36. Where the finding is:
 - a) in favour of the Respondent the matter will be deemed closed, the Academic Director, Course Coordinator and Manager, Quality and Compliance will be advised, and all records stored with reference to the SAMR and **Records and Data Management Policy**;
 - b) of a confirmed Category One instance the Respondent will be notified in writing by the AIO and has the right of reply, in writing, to the AIO within 10 working days of receipt of the findings.

37. Where the Respondent:
- a) does not invoke the right of reply the AIO will advise the Course Coordinator to ensure that required action is initiated;
 - b) seeks a review of the decision, the AIO will refer the matter to the Academic Director who will review all records pertaining to the allegation and provide a review report within 20 working days of receipt of the initial reply from the Respondent.
38. Where the review report:
- a) is in favour of the Respondent the matter will be deemed closed, the student, AIO, Manager, Quality, Compliance and Governance, and Course Coordinator will be advised, and all records stored with reference to the SAMR and the **Records and Data Management Policy**;
 - b) upholds the original decision the Respondent is advised of the outcome and their right of appeal under the **Student Complaints, Grievances and Appeals Policy**, and appropriate notifications and records are made as above.

Category Two instance

39. The Academic Director is responsible for investigation of all Category Two instances of alleged student misconduct. Within 20 working days of the referral of the matter from the AIO the Academic Director will:
- a) convene a Student Academic Misconduct Committee (SAMC);
 - b) notify the student that an allegation has been made and provide them with copies of the available evidence;
 - c) inform the student/s concerned of the general substance of the allegation and the range of possible consequences if the investigation results in the allegation being substantiated;
 - d) advise the student that they may make a submission to the SAMC by:
 - i. submitting an explanation in writing or any other evidence in response to the allegation, and/or
 - ii. appearing in person before the SAMC.
 - e) provide an opportunity for the student/s concerned to make a case concerning why a particular consequence should not follow in the event that the allegation is substantiated.
40. The SAMC will consist of:
- i. the Academic Director;
 - ii. the Course Coordinator;
 - iii. the Chair of Academic Board;
 - iv. one other academic staff independent of the case.
41. A student has 10 days to respond to the allegation from the date of the notification. If the student does not respond to the notice within the designated period or attend the scheduled meeting, the SAMC will proceed to deal with the allegation on the basis of the available evidence.
42. The student may, no later than 24 hours before the hearing is to take place, notify the Academic Director that he or she wishes to have a specified person present at the hearing (the 'support person'). The support person may not be:
- a) a person who was involved in, associated with, or alleged to have been involved in or associated with the misconduct alleged in the allegation notice, or
 - b) a qualified legal practitioner for the purposes of legal representation.

43. The support person accompanying the student during a hearing has no right to be heard, except with the permission of Academic Director, and may be excluded from the hearing if they disrupt or unreasonably impair the conduct of the hearing.
44. The SAMC must:
 - a) act fairly without bias, and without preconceived notions of culpability;
 - b) make inquiries and take actions to determine the facts of the matter based on sound reasoning and relevant evidence;
 - c) commence and complete the investigation without undue delay;
 - d) reach a majority decision on the allegation and prepare a findings report.
45. Where the finding is:
 - a) in favour of the Respondent the matter will be deemed closed, the AIO, Manager, Quality and Compliance, and Course Coordinator will be advised, and all records stored with reference to the SAMR and **Records and Data Management Policy**;
 - b) of a Category Two offence the Respondent will be advised of the outcome and the penalty that will be applied and appropriate notifications and records are made as above.
46. Where a SAMC makes a positive finding of a Category Two case of academic misconduct a Respondent may only seek a review under this Procedure where they believe that due process has not been followed. In such instances the Respondent must outline the reasons for this belief in writing to the Chief Executive Officer (CEO) within 10 days of the receipt of the findings.
47. The CEO will:
 - a) review all records pertaining to the allegation;
 - b) provide a review report within 20 working days of receipt of the application for review from the Respondent.
48. Where the review report:
 - a) is in favour of the Respondent the matter will be deemed closed, the Respondent, AIO, Manager, Quality, Compliance and Governance, and Course Coordinator will be advised, and all records stored with reference to the SAMR and the **Records and Data Management Policy**;
 - b) upholds the original decision the Respondent is advised of the outcome and their right of appeal under the **Student Complaints, Grievances and Appeals Policy** and appropriate notifications and records are made as above.

Penalties for substantiated cases of academic misconduct

49. In determining the penalty for proven academic misconduct, the following circumstances are required to be taken into consideration:
 - a) whether the student is relatively new and inexperienced in terms of the conventions of scholarship;
 - b) whether the student has a history of academic misconduct;
 - c) any admissions by the student in relation to the misconduct;
 - d) the nature and extent of the misconduct relative to assessment weighting;
 - e) whether the misconduct was a deliberate act of deception or cheating;
 - f) the extent to which the misconduct approximates an offence in the wider community that under law might lead to legal proceedings, e.g. theft, fraud, false representation;
 - g) the extent to which the misconduct, if undetected, would have resulted in an unfair advantage for the student;
 - h) the extent to which the misconduct, if undetected, would have had potential to inflate

- another student's assessment grade or otherwise result in another student gaining an unfair advantage;
- i) the extent to which the misconduct, if undetected, would have had potential to compromise the integrity of GHE's assessment processes.
50. Responses and penalties will be applied as outlined in Appendix Two.
51. If the penalty of exclusion from GHE is imposed on a student, the following conditions apply following the completion of all appeal mechanisms:
- a) the student's enrolment will be terminated;
 - b) the student will be recorded as excluded from GHE for the specified period of exclusion;
 - c) the student will not be entitled to any benefits, advantages or privileges of GHE during the specified period of exclusion;
 - d) the student will not be permitted to enrol at GHE whether for award or otherwise during the period of exclusion;
 - e) the student may re-apply for readmission at GHE at the end of the period of exclusion. Readmission is not automatic, and conditions may be applied relating to the student's future conduct at GHE.
52. If the penalty of expulsion is imposed on a student, the following conditions apply following the completion of all appeal mechanisms:
- a) the student's enrolment will be terminated;
 - b) the student will be recorded as excluded from the campus;
 - c) the student will not be entitled to any benefits, advantages or privileges of the institution;
 - d) the student will not be permitted to enrol in any unit whether for award or otherwise at GHE.

Governance reporting and monitoring

53. The Academic Board is responsible for the overall monitoring of academic integrity and misconduct and proposing corrective action to manage or minimise risk in this area.
54. The Manager, Quality and Compliance will ensure that reports on academic integrity and academic misconduct are provided to Academic Board (and, through the Minutes, to the Board of Directors) as follows:
- a) reports of specific instances of academic misconduct will be submitted to the next available meeting of Academic Board drawing on summary records from the SAMR;
 - b) a summary annual academic integrity report will be submitted to the last scheduled meeting of Academic Board each year and will contain:
 - i. a summary of all academic integrity measures and programs undertaken during the year;
 - ii. summary data of all instances of academic misconduct and their outcomes;
 - iii. an analysis of any trends detected in the data and recommendations for actions proposed to address these.
55. Academic Board will include data on academic misconduct in its annual academic risk report to the Audit and Risk Committee.
56. The Academic Board and/or Board of Directors will make recommendations for implementation by appropriate staff arising from their consideration of such annual reports.

Roles and responsibilities

57. Academic Integrity Officers are responsible for:
- receiving reports of allegations of student academic misconduct;
 - assessing and investigating allegations of Category One misconduct as appropriate;
 - notifying all relevant parties of outcomes of Category One allegations;
 - referring instances of potential Category Two allegations to the Academic Director.
58. The Academic Director is responsible for:
- review of Category One findings where requested;
 - investigation of Category Two allegations and convening a Student Academic Misconduct Committee.
59. Course Coordinators are responsible for:
- receiving reports of allegations of academic misconduct and determining if a prima facie case exists;
 - notifying the AIO of suspected instances of student academic misconduct;
 - receiving reports of the outcomes of investigations and implementing any required actions.
60. The Manager, Quality and Compliance is responsible for:
- maintaining all records associated with the SAMR and PAPR;
 - the provision of regular and annual reports on student academic misconduct cases and findings of poor academic performance to Academic Board;
 - providing appropriate staff with access to the SAMR;
 - all records management arising from this Policy and Procedure.
61. All staff and students are responsible for becoming familiar and complying with this Procedure.

Associated information

Related Internal Documents	Student Academic Integrity and Academic Misconduct Policy Student Academic Misconduct Register Assessment Policy Course Design Policy Records and Data Management Policy Student Complaints, Grievances and Appeals Policy Student Non-Academic Conduct and Misconduct Policy Work-Integrated Learning Placement Policy Glossary of Terms
Related Legislation, Standards and Codes	<i>Tertiary Education Quality and Standards Agency Act 2011</i> <i>Higher Education Standards Framework (Threshold Standards) 2021</i> TEQSA Good Practice Note: <i>Addressing contract cheating to safeguard academic integrity</i> , Oct 2017 TEQSA Guidance Note: <i>Academic Integrity</i> , Version 1.2
Date Approved	27 April 2020
Date Endorsed	5 June 2020
Date of Effect	5 June 2020
Date of Review	June 2026
Approval Authority	Academic Board
Policy Custodian	Academic Director
PinPoint DocID	2525

Change history

Version Control		Version 1.5
Change Summary	12-Dec-19	V1.0 Draft for consideration by Academic Board (AB) 20 Dec-19
	7-Feb-20	V1.1 Revised draft approved by AB 7 Feb-20 and recommended to the Board of Directors (BoD) for endorsement with minor amendments
	11-May-20	V1.2 revised version not endorsed by BoD 21-Feb-20 with requested amendments approved by AB 27-Apr-20 and recommended to the BoD and endorsed 5-Jun-20 with administrative updates
	27-Jul-20	V1.3 administrative updates
	18-Nov-22	V1.4 minor amendments (cl5) re AI tools and administrative updates endorsed by Chair AB and AD 18-Nov-22 BoD meeting
	5-Oct-23	V1.5 administrative updates following TEQSA registration

Warning - Document uncontrolled when printed! The current version of this document is maintained on the GHE website at <https://www.globalhe.edu.au/policy>

Appendix 1: Academic Misconduct Matrix¹

CRITERIA	An overall judgement as to whether a case is Category 1 or Category 2 is made on the basis of an overall qualitative assessment based on the criteria set out in this matrix. Where the offence straddles Category 1 and Category 2 the person should in general, for a first offence, be treated as a Category 1 case unless the intent and impact is such to warrant a full investigation. Second or subsequent offences in the middle range will generally be investigated as Category 2 cases.		
	CATEGORY 1 CASE	<<<<<<<<< >>>>>>>>>	CATEGORY 2 CASE
History of Misconduct	No prior positive findings, but has received appropriate training and may have received prior academic counselling	Previous Category 1 offence	Previous Category 1 Offence(s) or Category 2 offence(s)
Type of Misconduct Nature of the breach	Examples: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Referencing or attribution of work is not clear or adequate or has numerous errors. • Inappropriate paraphrasing. • Possession of unauthorised examination materials in the exam venue 	Examples: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Failure to reference and/or cite adequately. • Copying segments of other students' assignment work. • False indication of contribution to group work. • Copying fragments of material from websites, book or other publications. • Recycling parts of previous assignments. • Resubmitting parts of previous assignments without permission. • Completing individual assessment tasks with peers. 	Examples: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Fabricated references or citations. • Significant amount of work copied (from students or other sources). • Contract cheating, purchased assignments, selling, procuring or hawking examination materials and assessment items. • Stealing others' work. • Cheating in an examination. • Offering or accepting bribes for academic or career gain.
Extent of Misconduct Amount or proportion of assessment item or work that is not the person's own. Extent to which the process is compromised.	Examples: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • A few paragraphs, or graphics, or a few elements of computer source code. • Selling, procuring or hawking a single exam question with a model answer or a portion of an assignment. 	Example: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • A proportion or segment of the work. Multiple segments of computer source code. • Selling, procuring or hawking a single exam paper, exam script or assignment. 	Example: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Comprises minimal original work. Significant appropriation of ideas or artistic work. • Multiple pages or sections of text or graphics copied. • Selling, procuring or hawking a number of exam papers, exam scripts or assignments.

¹ Based on matrix developed by Griffith University

CRITERIA	An overall judgement as to whether a case is Category 1 or Category 2 is made on the basis of an overall qualitative assessment based on the criteria set out in this matrix. Where the offence straddles Category 1 and Category 2 the person should in general, for a first offence, be treated as a Category 1 case unless the intent and impact is such to warrant a full investigation. Second or subsequent offences in the middle range will generally be investigated as Category 2 cases.		
	CATEGORY 1 CASE	<<<<<<<<< >>>>>>>>>	CATEGORY 2 CASE
Experience of the Person Expectation that the person should be aware of the seriousness of their actions	Example: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • First year student who has not previously attempted this type of assessment. 	Example: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Students after first semester of course but before final year. After completion of known instruction in avoiding plagiarism. 	Example: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Final year, experienced student. Where student is expected to fully understand and exhibit academic integrity.
Intent of Person Intentionality of the act	Examples: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Plagiarism appears accidental, unintentional or due to lack of knowledge. • Solicitation occurs through cultural considerations or by accident. • Cultural considerations/mitigating circumstances e.g. no prior instruction or unclear instructions given intent to cheat is unlikely or doubtful. 	Examples: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Plagiarism appears intentional but without malicious intent. • Intent to cheat is probable. • Two or more students involved. • Solicitation occurs among a group of students. 	Examples: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Plagiarism appears deliberate and planned. • Actions contravene clear instructions Intent to cheat is evident. • Solicitation is addressed broadly to students in a range of course/s with/ without commercial conditions and terms.
Impact of the Misconduct Impact of the act on others	Example: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The academic achievement of other students completing the assessment task, and/or the academic achievement of other students enrolled in the course are impacted. 	Example: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The academic achievement of other students enrolled in the course and the reputation of the degree are impacted. 	Example: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The reputation of GHE is impacted.

Appendix 2: Responses and penalties for academic misconduct

Category	Responses and penalties
Category 1	Educational/Remedial activities and one or more of the following penalties will be applied: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The student is given a formal written warning or reprimand including advice of the possible consequences of any further student academic misconduct AND/OR • The student is required to undertake and submit work in place of any work that was associated with the misconduct and is advised that where the work is an assessment item, any mark or rating awarded for the work may not exceed a score of 50% of the worth of the assessment item
Category 2 (Generic)	Educational/Remedial activities and the student is given a formal written warning or reprimand, including advice of the possible consequences of any further student academic misconduct PLUS:
Category 2 (First instance)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The student is required to undertake and submit work in place of any work that was associated with the misconduct and is advised that where the work is an assessment item, any mark or rating awarded for the work may not exceed a score of 50% of the worth of the assessment item OR • The student is advised in writing that specified work associated with the misconduct will not be counted towards meeting the assessment requirements for completion of a specified unit/course.
Category 2 (Subsequent instance)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The student is awarded a fail grade for the unit in which the misconduct occurred OR • The student is immediately excluded from enrolment at GHE for one semester OR • The student is permanently expelled.