

Health Education and Training Institute Higher Education Student Academic Misconduct Policy and Procedure

Document Reference Number	HEP18/24[v2]
Superseded Version	HEP18/24[v1]
NSWIOP Document Number	IOP15/3732[v2]
TRIM Document Classification	Governance
Framework Part	Part 4 – Course Impact (Encompassing Academic Learning Standards)
Approval date	
Publication date	
Summary	This policy defines academic misconduct by students and details the process for dealing with allegations. In particular it covers plagiarism, cheating, collusion, and other forms of academic misconduct.
Keywords	Academic misconduct, academic counselling, plagiarism, collusion, minor misconduct, substantial misconduct ethical scholarship, procedural irregularities, investigation, allegation, appeal hearings
Authoring Portfolio	Mental Health
Contact	Director
Consultation	as per Document History
Distribution	Higher Education
Applies to	Higher Education
Related documents	Health Education and Training Institute Higher Education Admissions Policy Health Education and Training Institute Higher Education Advanced Standing Policy Health Education and Training Institute Higher Education Enrolment Policy NSW Health Policy Directive Managing Misconduct PD2014_042
Review date	
Risk Assessment	As per Attachment 1 to this document.

Issued under the authority of the Health Education and Training Institute Higher Education Governing Council

Please note printed copies of this document are uncontrolled, to ensure you are viewing the latest version of this document, please refer to our website <http://www.heti.edu.au/policies-and-procedures>

Student Academic Misconduct Policy and Procedure

Policy Statement

Health Education and Training Institute (HETI) Higher Education is committed to academic integrity, honesty and the promotion of ethical scholarship. It expects students to respect these values and to learn and observe the accepted academic referencing and other academic requirements of their field/s of study.

Aims and Objectives

1. This Policy defines the actions that constitute academic misconduct by students and describes HETI Higher Education's processes for investigating and hearing allegations of academic misconduct. It also describes the penalties that will apply, where allegations are proven.
2. This Policy applies to all HETI Higher Education students who are enrolled in coursework units of HETI Higher Education.

Overview

3. This Policy is a key component of the HETI Higher Education's approach to Ethical Scholarship, which is student focussed and aims to integrate all areas of the student experience that impinge on ethical scholarship. They include the educational aspects of studying ethically, learning the ethical requirements of the professions, as well as understanding the policies that govern ethical behaviour.
4. There is an important distinction to be understood between student academic misconduct and other forms of misconduct which are not of an academic nature. This policy concerns alleged and established academic misconduct only. All other forms of alleged or established misconduct on the part of a student will be managed in accordance with NSW Health Policy Directive Managing Misconduct PD2014_042 (or other relevant NSW Health policy directives).
5. Actions by students such as plagiarism and collusion (see Definitions) are not permitted. These actions will be treated by HETI Higher Education as academic misconduct and will be penalised.

6. Information will be made available about proper referencing and other academic requirements available to students, including clear instructions about the nature and extent of collaboration that is permissible in group work (see Assessment Policy) <http://www.heti.edu.au/policies-and-procedures>.

Definitions

7. Academic integrity is the moral code of academia. It involves using, generating and communicating information in an ethical, honest and responsible manner¹. The term 'ethical scholarship' has a similar meaning.
8. Student academic misconduct refers to breach of academic integrity and may involve one or more of the following: Plagiarism; Collusion; and any other academic misconduct as described below.

Types of Academic Misconduct

9. Plagiarism: occurs in a student's work when the student submits work in which ideas, words or other work are taken from a source, for example, a website or computer program, another student's essay or presentation, a book or journal article, a lecture, and presented as if they are the student's own, without appropriate acknowledgement of the original author. In this definition of plagiarism, it is the act of presenting material as one's own without appropriate acknowledgement that constitutes plagiarism, not the intention of the student when doing so. Plagiarism includes a student re-purposing their own written material, from a previous assessment, for example, without providing proper attribution by citing the original content. 'Appropriate acknowledgement' is defined as the conventions of citation recognised as acceptable to HETI Higher Education.
10. Collusion: is when two or more students, or a student and any other person(s), act together to plagiarise or engage in academic misconduct, or incite others to do so.
11. Other academic misconduct includes, but is not limited to:
 - a. tampering, or attempting to tamper, with class work, grades or class records
 - b. failing to abide by directions of a member of academic staff regarding individual responsibility for the submission of assessable work, including that for any group work submitted

¹ Monash University (2013) in Teqsa (2017) Guidance Note: Academic Integrity accessed on 21st Sep 2018 <https://www.teqsa.gov.au/latest-news/publications/guidance-note-academic-integrity>

- c. impersonating another student, or arranging for anyone to impersonate a student, in an assessment task
- d. contract cheating which occurs when students outsource their assessments to a third party, whether that is a commercial provider, current or former student, family member or acquaintance. It includes the unauthorised use of file-sharing sites, as well as organising another person to take an examination²
- e. falsifying or fabricating reports
- f. altering group assessment work that has been agreed as final by all participating students prior to submission without the collaborating students' consent
- g. use of taped, recorded or videotaped lectures, tutorials or other classes in a way that infringes another person's privacy or intellectual property rights - for example, by publishing or distributing a recording without permission from the teacher of the unit

Levels of Academic Misconduct

12. Minor and Major Misconduct: The terms 'minor misconduct' and 'major misconduct' in this Policy indicate HETI Higher Education's view of the gravity of the impact of the alleged breach of the Policy, according to the following definitions:
 - a. Minor misconduct: breaches of academic integrity that are judged by HETI Higher Education to be unintentional due to the student's lack of understanding of appropriate referencing or other academic conventions required for the course, or to be a minimal threat to the integrity of assessment processes in the unit of study, or both.
 - b. Major misconduct: breaches of academic integrity that are judged by HETI Higher Education to be intentional in order to gain an unfair advantage or to be a significant threat to the integrity of HETI Higher Education's assessment procedures, or both.

13. The following instances of misconduct will always be treated as major:
 - a. any subsequent misconduct after a student has been found to have committed minor or major misconduct
 - b. collusion, provided students have been given clear instructions about the nature and extent of collaboration that is permissible in group work
 - c. tampering

² TEQSA (2017) Good Practice Note: Addressing contract cheating to safeguard academic integrity accessed on 21st September 2018 <https://www.teqsa.gov.au/sites/g/files/net2046/f/good-practice-note-addressing-contract-cheating.pdf?v=1507082628>

- d. impersonating
- e. contract cheating

Procedures

Principles for Cases of Academic Misconduct

14. In the first instance, cases of potential academic misconduct by students must be thoroughly investigated by the Unit Coordinator.
15. All investigations of academic misconduct by students are to be conducted with close regard for procedural fairness. The processes prescribed in this Policy provide students with opportunities to respond to breaches of academic integrity and, on specified grounds, to appeal disciplinary decisions.
16. All meetings to discuss academic misconduct will be conducted with the principal object of impartially and fairly investigating the facts surrounding the breach of academic integrity. Proceedings will be formal, but will not be adversarial. A student invited to attend such meetings may be assisted by a fellow enrolled student, or a member of HETI Higher Education's staff, such as one of their teachers or a personal friend or acquaintance. The support person may provide the student with advice, but may not act as an advocate, nor make direct comment in the meeting, unless given permission to do so by the convenor of the meeting.

Procedures for Cases of Academic Misconduct

17. Investigations of cases of academic misconduct by students, or of appeals by students, will be conducted in accordance with the following summary of procedures and in as non-adversarial a manner as possible.

Minor Academic Misconduct

18. Where the unit coordinator has reason to believe that a student has engaged in minor academic misconduct, they must notify the student in writing and arrange a meeting in accordance with Principle 16. At this meeting, the Unit Coordinator will:
 - a. outline the nature of the breach of academic integrity
 - b. provide evidence relating to the breach of academic integrity
 - c. seek a response or explanation from the student

19. As a result of the meeting, the Unit Coordinator will determine an appropriate course of action from the following options:
 - a. accepts the students explanations and take no further action
 - b. accepts the students explanations and require the students to undertake appropriate academic counselling
 - c. require the student to re-submit an item of work in which misconduct has been detected, after the student has edited or totally re-written it, as appropriate, so that it meets the required academic referencing and other conventions and standards. The unit coordinator may specify a maximum mark or grade that can be awarded for this re-submitted work
 - d. require the student to submit a replacement for any relevant assessment task, with a requirement that the student must satisfactorily achieve the outcomes for the assessment task. The unit coordinator may specify a maximum mark or grade that can be awarded for this re-submitted work
 - e. downgrade the mark for a relevant assessment task
20. Except where the Unit Coordinator has accepted the student's explanation and has decided to take no further action, the Unit Coordinator will complete an Academic Misconduct Report form outlining the nature of the breach and the course of action applied. The report will be send to the student and Education Support Officer who will record the breach and report in the student management system.
21. Students may appeal the Unit Coordinator's decision in accordance with the Student Grievance Procedure <http://www.heti.edu.au/policies-and-procedures>.

Major Academic Misconduct

22. Where the unit coordinator has reason to believe that a student has engaged in major academic misconduct, they must confer with the Framework Coordinator to confirm that the breach is major.
23. If the Framework Coordinator does not agree that the misconduct is major, but rather that it is minor, the procedures for Minor Academic Misconduct will be followed.
24. If the Framework Coordinator agrees that the Academic Misconduct is major, the Framework Coordinator will convene a panel and invite the student to the meeting in accordance with Principle 16. The panel should consist of:

- a. Director, Education and Training or nominee
 - b. Student and a student's support person, if requested
 - c. Framework Coordinator
 - d. Unit Coordinator
25. At this meeting, the panel will:
- a. outline the nature of the breach of academic integrity
 - b. provide evidence relating to the breach of academic integrity
 - c. seek a response or explanation from the student
26. If the student does not respond to the meeting invitation within five working days of the date the invitation was despatched, the panel will convene and make a determination in the student's absence. Following the meeting, Clause 27 will apply.
27. As a result of the meeting, the panel will determine an appropriate sanction from the following options:
- a. downgrade the mark
 - b. award a nil mark
 - c. fail the unit
 - d. recommends suspension to the Executive Director of HETI Higher Education
28. Subsequent to the meeting, the Framework Coordinator will complete an Academic Misconduct Report form outlining the nature of the breach and the sanction applied. The report will be sent to the student and Education Support Officer who will record the breach and report in the student management system.
29. Students may appeal the panel's decision in accordance with the Student Grievance Procedure <http://www.heti.edu.au/policies-and-procedures>.
30. For cases of repeated major academic misconduct, the panel may recommend to the Executive Director that the student be suspended or excluded.

Related Documents

- HETI Higher Education Admissions Policy
- HETI Higher Education Advanced Standing Policy
- HETI Higher Education Enrolment Policy
- NSW Health Policy Directive Managing Misconduct PD2014_042

DOCUMENT HISTORY

Version	Issued	Status	Author	Reason for Change
v1.0	24 February 2016	Final	Mark Wilbourn	As approved by HETI Higher Education Governing Council
v1.1	16 May 2017	Draft	Valerie Rhodes	Policy name amended to Student Academic Misconduct Policy with the introduction of the Academic Staff Misconduct Policy
v2.0	29 June 2017	Final	Mark Wilbourn	Approved as a minor wording change in policy by Chair T&L Committee
v1.0	22 August 2018	Final	Valerie Rhodes	Updated logos, template and new TRIM Reference
v1.1	June 2018	Draft	David Baxter	Policy review
v1.1	6 September 2018	Draft	Silke O'Callaghan	Incorporation of feedback from Policy review, restructure and tightening of definitions, stages and procedures. Addressing TEQSA's Guidance Notes (2017) for Contract Cheating
v1.1	22 October 2018	Draft	Silke O'Callaghan	Endorsed by the Higher Education Academic Board
v1.1	21 November 2018	Draft	Rhonda Loftus	Approved by the Higher Education Governing Council
v2.0	28 November 2018	Final	Jana Chadid	Update Logos, Published Version
v2.0	18 January 2019	Final	Silke O'Callaghan	Change of title to appropriately reflect the content in the name of this document

IMPLEMENTATION CHECKLIST – COMPLIANCE SELF ASSESSMENT

Assessed by:	Date of Assessment:		
IMPLEMENTATION REQUIREMENTS	Not commenced	Partial compliance	Full compliance
1. Presentation of key changes and messages was provided to all key stakeholders			
	Notes: Training session was conducted Jan/Feb 2019		
2. Quizzes were conducted to assess all key stakeholders knowledge and application to practice of the updated policy clauses			
	Notes: Relevant Director conducted and assessed the quiz Jan/Feb 2019		
3. Reflection/evaluation; Training session to assess progress of implementation			
	Notes: Session planned for June/July 2019		
4.			
	Notes:		
5.			
6.			
	Notes:		

Attachment 1

RISK ASSESSMENT

<Document Title>

1.	Policy/Process being assessed	Notes
	Student Academic Misconduct Policy v1.1	
	Document Number	
	Publication date	
	Scheduled review date	
	Date of this risk assessment	
	Name & position of assessing officer	
2.	Summary of policy purpose (from PD Cover Page)	
3.	Agency (HETI) key roles & responsibilities as per PD	
4.	Risk Assessment	
4.1	Identification of risks – what might happen & how?	
	1.	
	2.	
4.2	Analysis of risks – combined estimate of the consequence & likelihood of the risk, using NSW Health Risk Matrix (attached)	
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Consequence: • Likelihood: • Risk rating : 	
4.3	Evaluation of risks – comparison of the level of risk as determined against a predetermined criteria to determine whether a level of risk is acceptable or needs to be treated. Risk level assessed after implementing treatment:	
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Consequence: • Likelihood: • Risk rating : 	
	Evaluation –	

Risk Assessment Approval

Name & position of approving T2 Officer:	
Date:	