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 includes any form of activity that negates the academic integrity of the student or another student and/or their work. Academic integrity breaches include, but are not limited to:
- Recycling
- Plagiarism
- Collusion: 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
- Contract cheating occurs when a student seeks to obtain an unfair advantage in an examination or in other written or practical work required to be submitted or completed for assessment, engaging someone else to produce or contribute to the production of an assessment, for example, by using a contract cheating site
- Fabricating data, information or sources
- Assisting another student to obtain an academic advantage by dishonest or unfair means
- Inappropriately publishing, uploading or sharing an assessment, or part of an assessment, including responses to CIHE assessment questions, to a website, or a file-sharing or other online platform
- Inappropriately publishing or uploading CIHE teaching or course material to a website, or a file-sharing or other online platform
- Exam cheating
- Inappropriately using digital or information technology to complete an assessment task, including but not limited to: (i) generating content using artificial intelligence; or (ii) using paraphrasing or translation software to disguise plagiarism, collusion, contract cheating or other academic integrity breach

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.

2.1 Use of generative artificial intelligence (AI)

2.1.1 What is permissible?

CIHE does not totally ban the use of AI. We recognize that AI tools such as ChatGPT have applications that foster student learning and understanding and if students use these tools to learn (just like they would study with a classmate or ask a friend for advice), they are permitted to use these tools. There might even be instances where some use of AI is encouraged or even required (TEQSA, 2023a[1]). However, digital information technology must only be used if the unit of study allows it. In the instances where the use of AI is permitted, CIHE requires students to use AI models in ethical and responsible ways that are consistent with institutional learning, assessment and academic integrity policies and procedures, and the terms of use of the AI. Ethical and responsible use of generative AI involves:

- Following institutional guidelines regarding the use of generative AI in any unit or course, and an understanding that it may not be appropriate to use generative AI in all circumstances.
- **Appropriately citing and referencing** any text or output generated by AI in the assignment, along with any other sources that are used. The student should clearly indicate where in the assessment task AI-generated material is used.
- **Understanding the AI tool's limitations** and using it in conjunction with other sources to verify the credibility and reliability of the AI information generated. The student needs to check the accuracy of all information generated by AI tools.
- **Ensuring that final product is student's own work**, and not just copied from an AI generator.

2.1.2 Guidelines for Students

CIHE follows the guidelines set forth by (AAIN, 2023[2]) for using AI in completing the assessments. Students should check any output from generative AI against reliable sources of information and understand that they will be responsible for any errors or omissions in material generated by AI. They are required to identify AI models, tools and/or prompts that are appropriate for their discipline and acknowledge the use of AI in written assessments following any guidelines provided by the institution from time to time.

If it is not possible to identify and cite the original sources used in output from AI, this may result in a charge of plagiarism and academic misconduct. Students also need to be aware of the possibility of "hallucinated references" or the tendency of generative AI language models to make up references from constituent parts of actual references. Students must acknowledge the use of generative AI language models in assessment tasks, following any guidelines provided by the teaching staff. They should describe the way they have used the tool and integrated the results into their work, as appropriate to the specific guidelines within their discipline, unit or course. The unauthorised use of AI language models or paraphrasing tools may be a form of cheating and may result in academic misconduct. Work submitted (including work generated by AI), and not cited or referenced, must be student's own original work.

---

[1] TEQSA (28 Feb 2023a). Artificial intelligence: advice for students. Tertiary Education and Quality Standards Agency. http://www.teqsa.gov.au/students/artificial-intelligence-advice-students.

[2] These guidelines are a snapshot in time, created by a working group of the 'Australian Academic Integrity Network (AAIN) Generative AI Working Group, Deakin University'. Any derivative guidelines need updating as the area of generative AI continues to change and develop.

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 Academic Misconduct

In order to assist in the prevention of academic misconduct, the institution has a responsibility to educate students and staff, both in 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. Students will be required to submit all papers in electronic format so that they can be subject to electronic scanning to detect plagiarism.

PROCEDURES

1. Detecting Breaches of Academic Integrity

While marking assessments, 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 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.

Contracting out may be spotted with reference to the following indicators:

- A Turn-it-In report that identifies the assignment as having been submitted to another institution.
- Symbol drift, whereby scientific or mathematical notations change throughout the assignment or symbolic language varies such that it exposes inconsistencies in style.
- There are Gaps in the argument.
- The assignment runs Beyond the scope, is contrary or tangential to the instructions or
- Uneven quality or otherwise inconsistent styles.
- Varies only cosmetically from.
- Response has metadata from a known contract teaching site.

If one or more of these indicators exist, the staff member must exercise judgment. The standard for the evidence must be a balance-of-probability, not-a-beyond-reasonable doubt judgement or a beyond-any-doubt judgement. Where students deny the contracting offense, but the indicators point to the offense on the balance-of-probability, the staff member must penalise in accord with the table of levels and penalties and record the offense on the misconduct register. Denial does not provide mitigation and the offense is to be considered as having been committed.

Where doubt exists as to originality after all indicators have been taken into account the staff member may require the student face an informal viva, where the staff member asks the students a small selection of questions to probe the student's understanding of their own answers. The Viva will be given without notice to the student, so that the student is unable to prepare a response and the answers will be taken as a removal of doubt.

A template criterion will be inserted within every rubric to be called "originality". In cases of a category one or two breach, the marks to be deducted for a failure to meet the originality criterion will be 10% of the total available for that assignment. For Category three and four breaches, the penalty is to be determined through the process as prescribed in Section 5 below.

2. 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.

The process for student academic misconduct is as follows and <u>must</u> be followed <u>and</u> recorded:
1. Academic staff member suspects academic misconduct.
2. Course Coordinator informed in writing of suspected academic misconduct.
    i. Even if the Course Coordinator is the lecturer making the notification, then a written record must still be kept in the student management system.
    ii. Evidence must 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 <u>upheld</u>, a penalty must be determined and recorded. A note will be placed on the students record in the student management system.
    ii. If the allegation is <u>not upheld</u>, no penalty will be applied.

        In both instances (i), 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 the student management 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.

3. 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.

4. 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).

4.1 Unintentional Minor Breach (Category One)
Where the Lecturer determines that academic misconduct was unintentional and minor, she/he/they may take one of the following possible actions:

- Warn and counsel the student (warning must be communicated in writing to the student and will be kept on the student's file).
- Mark the assessment item without penalty.
- Require attendance at an academic integrity workshop.

4.2 Intermediate Breach (Category Two)
It is the responsibility of the Unit Coordinator (UC) to thoroughly evaluate student's response in relation to misconduct allegation. If the student fails to respond to an allegation of intentional academic misconduct or cannot convince that the academic misconduct was unintentional, the UC will determine the appropriate penalty for the finding of intentional academic misconduct, which may be one or more of the following:

- A penalty of 40% (of the total marks for the assessment) may be imposed to the assessment.
- Student may be required to undertake additional or alternative assessment (the maximum mark possible being a Pass grade).
- Require attendance at an appropriate academic integrity workshop.

4.3 Major Breach (Category Three)
An intermediate breach involves a substantial part of the assignment, or additions to an examination (that would be sufficient to materially increase the overall grade). In such cases, the matter must be

referred directly to the Course Coordinator (CC), who will call a meeting with the student and document the results.

A determination may include any of the following:

- Either, a penalty of 50%.
- Or a 'Fail' grade in the assignment amounting to zero marks.
- No opportunity for resubmission.
- Require completing an academic integrity module before submission of the next assessment.

4.4   Multiple or Repeated Breach (Category Four)

The most serious penalties may be considered in the case of repeated academic misconduct. A category Four breach would occur where the academic misconduct has been determined to be intentional, constitutes greater than 60% of the assignment or causes malicious damage to any student or the institution. Category four cases are to be heard and determined by the Dean (See Academic Freedom, Integrity and Free Intellectual Enquiry Policy for the constitution of this committee). Any finding and 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 Sanction
Category one – Unintentional minor breach (up to 10% plagiarism)	Educational intervention by Lecturer
Category two – Intermediate breach (11% - 30% plagiarism)	Unit Coordinator to determine whether the student should be required to undertake an additional or alternative assessment or receive 40% penalty for existing submission.
Category three – Major breach (31%-59% plagiarism)	Course Coordinator to determine to impose either 50% penalty or zero marks for the assessment, no opportunity should be given for resubmission. The student must complete an academic integrity module before submission of the next assessment. Breach must be recorded in the intervention log.
Category four – Multiple or repeated breach (greater than 60% plagiarism); instances of academic integrity violations and repeat offenses; a breach that constitutes malicious harm to another student or the institution.	Penalties to be determined by the Dean or Head of the School, breach must be recorded in the intervention log, failure in the unit and referral or termination (exceptional cases).

Notes:
  ➢ All percentages include detection of the use of artificial intelligence.

> The Lecturer undertakes the task of investigating, effectively communicating, and receiving the student response for misconduct cases (categories 2,3, and 4) and reporting to the Unit Coordinator for further investigation and course of action.

5. Recording incidences of academic misconduct

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

6. 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.

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 a schedule of categories of misconduct and programmed responses
2.2	Academic Board	17.9.2021	Aligned the schedule of categories with the rest of the policy and included a role for the Lecturer in Charge of a unit
2.3	Academic Board	9.12.2022	To appropriately address contract cheating, correctly delegate and clarify roles and responsibilities to ensure compliance with the HESF and best practice. **Recommendation12:** Develop an institution-wide academic misconduct register. (High)
3.0	Academic Board	25.5.2023	Introduce a balance of probability criteria and a Viva option to determine misconduct
3.1	Academic Board	Work in progress	Addition of section 2, clear separation of policy and procedure section, changes to penalties of procedure section.

Next Review Date: 8 December 2025
Document owner: Executive Dean