



Academic Integrity and Honesty Policy

Academic Board Approved Policy

Table of Contents

1. Preamble	3
2. Scope.....	3
3. Policy Statement.....	3
4. Policy Principles.....	3
5. Breaches of Academic and Research Integrity.....	4
6. Academic Misconduct.....	5
7. Procedures – Coursework Program.....	5
8. Academic Integrity Committee	6
9. Procedures – Master of Research Program	7
10. Penalties – Coursework Program.....	8
11. Penalties – Master of Research Program	8
12. Examinations	9
13. Appeals	9
Appendix 1: Academic Misconduct Register	10
Appendix 2: Academic Misconduct Flowchart.....	10

Version Control

Version	v3.3
Date effective	31 May 2024
Review	The Academic Board will review this Policy in accordance with the Institute's <i>Policy Documents Review Schedule</i> .
Approving body	Academic Board
Approval date	31 May 2024
Approval meeting	Academic Board meeting held on 31 May 2024
Policy owner	Dean
Policy contact	Dean
Related Documents	<p>Ethics Clearance Policy</p> <p>Glossary of Terms</p> <p>Human Resources Management Policy</p> <p>Intellectual Property Policy</p> <p>Quality Assurance Policy</p> <p>Records Management Policy</p> <p>Scholarly Activity and Academic Freedom Policy</p> <p>Student Code of Conduct</p> <p>Student Grievance Management Policy</p> <p>Teaching and Learning Plan</p>
Related Legislation	<p>Privacy Act 1988</p> <p>Privacy and Personal Information Protection Act 1998</p> <p>Public Interest Disclosure Act 2022</p>
Higher Education Standards Frameworks (Threshold Standard) 2021 (Cth)	<p>BI.1 "Higher Education Provider" Category</p> <p>Standard 3.1, ss 2</p> <p>Standard 3.2, ss 1, 3</p> <p>Standard 4.1, ss 2</p> <p>Standard 4.2, ss 2</p> <p>Standard 5.2, ss 1 – 4</p> <p>Standard 6.1, ss 4</p> <p>Standard 6.2; ss 1</p> <p>Standard 6.3; ss 3</p> <p>Standard 7.2; ss 2</p> <p>Standard 7.3; ss 3</p>

1. Preamble

1.1 Purpose

The Canterbury Institute of Management ('the Institute' or 'CIM') recognises that ensuring the academic integrity of student work is critical to maintaining high quality academic and professional practice and reputation of the Institute. Academic Integrity and Honesty Policy ('the Policy') is aligned with the *Higher Education Standards Framework (Threshold Standards) 2021* and requires that students are ethical and honest in the development and presentation of their work and careful to distinguish and identify their own work from that of others as mandated in the Institute's *Student Code of Conduct*. This Policy defines coursework and research-based academic integrity and provides guidance for identifying, preventing, and responding to academic misconduct.

2. Scope

This Policy applies to all students enrolled at the Institute. The Policy also applies to the full range of academic/research activities and practices within the Institute, including but not limited to examination, assessment tasks, thesis submission and related allegations of misconduct in research.

3. Policy Statement

The Institute ensures that academic integrity of coursework and research-based programs is managed by fair, timely and transparent procedures, based on clearly defined, consistent and equitable criteria. Failure to maintain academic and research integrity requires corrective and disciplinary action as mandated in this Policy.

4. Policy Principles

- 4.1 CIM considers the development of academic integrity of coursework and research-based programs as central to educational success and student attainment of the Institute's Graduate Attributes.
- 4.2 All allegations of academic misconduct will be dealt with the procedures and penalties mentioned in this Policy;
- 4.3 CIM provides clear advice and opportunity for the development and rehearsal of academic integrity for all students in coursework and research-based programs. Appropriate referencing and citation knowledge and skills related to a wide range of text types which are provided in the program outline and in individual course outline(s). In addition, the Institute conducts regular learning skills support workshops and provide information on the mandatory plagiarism/originality report submission process.
- 4.4 All submitted assessment tasks must include a signed cover sheet by which a student takes responsibility for their work and declares their work is free from breaches of academic integrity.
- 4.5 CIM employs a range of strategies to support the academic integrity of students enrolled in coursework and research-based programs. CIM has an expectation that academic, library and learning support staff will provide consistent guidance and opportunity for students to understand and develop integrity in their coursework and assessment tasks to help all students act with academic integrity and honesty in their studies and research.
- 4.6 The Program Directors design assessment tasks that minimise opportunities for academic misconduct and help develop student skills necessary to demonstrate academic integrity in their learning, assessment submission and research. Also, in all courses, and where appropriate to an assessment tasks, the use of text/code-matching software is required before an assessment tasks can be submitted.
- 4.7 The text matching software is used as an educational tool for students in promoting appropriate acknowledgement practice, and a detection tool for staff in detecting suspected cases of academic misconduct.

- 4.8 The Lecturers and Tutors support their students to become aware of academic expectations and what constitutes academic misconduct, considering their level of educational experience and their social and cultural background. Lecturers also provide feedback to students on acknowledgement practice and refer them to sources of advice when necessary.
- 4.9 In the case where the academic integrity of a student's work is in question, CIM follows a consistent and fair process of establishing and penalising academic misconduct as described in this Policy.
- 4.10 A complaint made via a whistleblower will be managed as per the privacy requirements and other relevant laws, regulations and guidelines;
- 4.11 All staff who are responsible for investigating an allegation of academic misconduct reach conclusions based on a fair hearing and will respect the privacy and confidentiality of all parties.

5. *Breaches of Academic and Research Integrity*

The Institute identifies a range of practices as breaches of academic and research integrity, including:

- 5.1 *Plagiarism*: intentionally or unintentionally using the work of another person, copying (in whole or in part) the work or data of another person, paraphrasing closely or presenting substantial extracts from written, printed, electronic or other media in a student's written, oral, electronic, online or group assessment task without due acknowledgment;
- 5.2 *Recycling (Self-Plagiarism)*: This occurs when students submit work or large sections of previous assessments from their own work for different assessments either in the same or subsequent course. The submission for an assessment task of a student's own work, or of work which is substantially the same, where:
 - a. the work has previously been counted towards the satisfactory completion of another course of study credited towards the same or another program at the Institute or another provider; and
 - b. the Course Lecturer or the Program Director has not granted prior written consent for the student to reuse their own work.

This can also occur where a student is required to repeat a course and the work completed when the student first undertook the course is submitted again.

- 5.3 *Cheating*: any dishonest, fraudulent, or deceitful conduct associated with assessment, including collusion.
- 5.4 *Contract Cheating*: When a student commissions another party - either paid or unpaid - that is offering its services to produce academic work on the student's behalf. This may occur when a student seeks help with their assessment tasks through:
 - a. an online company specialising in producing work for a fee for students;
 - b. an un-authorised editing service advertised via social media or on the Institute's campus;
 - c. another student or non-student who has offered to help.

The work commissioned is most commonly in the form of essays or reports, computer code or any other technical course material. Students found to have outsourced their academic work may not only receive a fail grade for that assessment task and/or course but may be suspended from their studies or even expelled from the Institute. To help reduce the possibility of contract cheating, lecturers may request that students provide early drafts of submitted assessment tasks.

- 5.5 *Unauthorised use of generative artificial intelligence*: When a student uses material generated by a generative artificial intelligence in an assessment and submits it as their own work, without authorisation.

- 5.6 Any behaviour that constitute a breach of the Australian Code (2018), as set out in the Guide to Managing and Investigating Potential Breaches of the Australian Code for the Responsible Conduct of Research. These behaviours include, but are not limited to:
- a. *Fabrication*: the intentional act of making up data or results and recording or reporting them.
 - b. *Falsification*: manipulating research material, equipment, or processes, or changing or omitting/suppressing data or results without scientific or statistical justification, such that the research is not accurately represented in the research record. This would include the 'misrepresentation of uncertainty' during statistical analysis of the data, plagiarism, or deception in proposing, carrying out or reporting the results of research.
 - c. *Breach of ethical standards*: such as conducting research without the required ethical clearance or failing to comply with the terms of a project's ethical clearance.
- 5.7 CIM pursues cases of academic misconduct seriously and ensures any findings of academic misconduct are dealt with through appropriate procedures and/or penalties.

6. Academic Misconduct

Academic misconduct refers to any breach of academic integrity by students at the Institute. The Institute identifies the following:

6.1 Academic Misconduct

Academic Misconduct is defined as normally occurring in the first year of study and where the lecturer deems the misconduct to be the consequence of inadequate understanding of academic and research integrity requirements (such as poor writing and/or referencing skills where some acknowledgment to the source is made). Hence, remedial rather than punitive consequences are considered appropriate.

Students are alleged to have committed serious academic misconduct where they engaged in activities that may include:

- a. bringing in or referring to unauthorised material in an exam room;
- b. communicating with other students during an exam condition;
- c. reading the work of other students in an exam condition; and/or
- d. engaging in or agreeing to any form of dishonest act;
- e. submission of assessable material that is identified by an academic staff member as comprising more than ten percent of unattributed work not authored by the student.

7. Procedures – Coursework Programs

If an academic staff member identifies a case of suspected academic misconduct by a student, the following procedure applies (*also refer to Appendix 2 – Academic Misconduct Flowchart*).

- 7.1 If the academic staff member involved in assessing coursework is suspicious that plagiarism has occurred, he or she highlights the passage or elements in question and inform their concerns to the relevant Program Director. The Program Director will review the evidence presented by the academic staff and refer the matter to the Academic Integrity Manager (AIM).

All academic misconduct referrals must be recorded in the Institute's *Academic Misconduct Register (AMR)* which is managed and monitored by the Academic Integrity Manager. Students who are alleged to have breached academic integrity conditions are to be informed in writing by the Academic Integrity Manager of the nature of the breach and refer to this Policy (Section – Penalties) for further details on possible penalties that applies if the student is unable to dispute alleged misconduct. An entry into *AMR* is to be completed with supporting evidence.

- 7.2 The AIM, on behalf of the Program Director will write to the student stating the allegation and evidence and the proposed penalty that would be applied to the student's work. The student is provided an opportunity to respond to the allegations within fourteen (14) working days from the date of communication as part of the process of establishing student intention and culpability.
- 7.3 If the student fails to respond to allegations of academic misconduct within fourteen (14) working days, the Program Director enacts a fair decision. The AIM on behalf of the Program Director formally informs the student of the outcome.
- 7.4 All decisions are entered in the *AMR* against the student's ID except where the AIM is satisfied that the allegation of plagiarism or copying is unfounded.
- 7.5 The AIM informs the student of the outcome on all decisions of misconduct communicating the nature of the misconduct and the penalty applied and informing the student that the misconduct has been recorded in the *AMR*. All students are informed of their right to appeal decisions on academic misconduct within ten (10) working days of notification using the process outlined in the *Student Grievance Management Policy*.
- 7.6 The students registered on the *AMR* receive mandatory referral to Learning Support Manager & Librarian to develop improved referencing and citation techniques and clarify good practice contributing to academic integrity.
- 7.7 In the alternative to the procedures set out above, the Program Directors have the discretion to issue an 'Academic Honesty Penalty' ('AHP') to any student suspected of engaging in academic misconduct in relation to any formative assessment task.
- An AHP penalises the student for suspected academic misconduct by way of a deduction of marks for the whole or part of an assessment task.
 - Before imposing an AHP, the assessing Program Director must clearly particularise the allegation and inform the student of the seriousness of the breach of the alleged academic misconduct and the penalty that has been applied.
 - The student whose assessment work has been penalised will have fourteen (14) working days in which to dispute the allegation and penalty in writing to the Dean. In that case the matter is resolved by reference to the procedures set out in this Policy.
 - All AHPs are recorded on the Academic Misconduct Register.
 - The Program Directors discretion to issue an AHP must not be exercised where a student is to be given penalty of more than 50 percent of the available marks for the assessment task in question.
 - The Program Directors discretion to issue an AHP must not be exercised in relation to a summative assessment task, such as a final examination.

8. Academic Integrity Committee

CIM Academic Board has established clear guidelines for dealing with academic integrity matters. CIM will form an Academic Integrity Committee (AIC), which will be responsible of ensuring that the academic integrity of all research activities meet the appropriate standards of all legislative, statutory and industry requirements.

The Committee may consist of the following members:

- Dean (Chair);
- Director of Research;
- Nominated member of the Academic Board;

- d. Nominated member of the Supervisory Panel.

9. Procedures – Master of Research Program

- 9.1 For Master of Research program students, if the Supervisory Panel has reason to suspect that academic misconduct has occurred, they will inform the Director of Research with evidence of academic misconduct. The Director of Research will review the evidence presented by the Supervisory Panel against the Australian Code (2018) and will report the matter to the AIM. All academic misconduct referrals and allegations must be recorded in the Institute's *Academic Misconduct Register (AMR)* which is managed and monitored by AIM under the supervision of AIC. Students who are alleged to have breached academic integrity conditions are to be informed in writing by the Academic Integrity Manager of the nature of the breach and refer to this Policy (Section–Penalties) for further details on possible penalties that applies if the student is unable to dispute alleged misconduct. An entry into *AMR* is to be completed with supporting evidence.
- 9.2 The AIM, on behalf of the AIC, will write to the student stating the allegation and evidence and the proposed penalty that would be applied to the student's work. The student is provided an opportunity to respond to the allegations within fourteen (14) working days from the date of communication as part of the process of establishing student intention and culpability.
- 9.3 If the student fails to respond to allegations of academic misconduct within fourteen (14) working days, the Supervisory Panel enacts a fair decision. The AIM on behalf of the AIC formally informs the student of the outcome.
- 9.4 All decisions are entered in the *AMR* against the student's ID except where the AIC is satisfied that the allegation of academic and research misconduct is unfounded.
- 9.5 The AIM on behalf of AIC informs the student of the outcome on all decisions of misconduct communicating the nature of the misconduct and the penalty applied and informing the student that the misconduct has been recorded in the *AMR*. All students are informed of their right to appeal decisions on academic misconduct within ten (10) working days of notification using the process outlined in the *Student Grievance Management Policy*.
- 9.6 The students registered on the *AMR* receive mandatory referral to Learning Support Manager & Librarian to develop improved referencing and citation techniques and clarify good practice contributing to academic and research integrity.
- 9.7 In the alternative to the procedures set out above, the AIC has the discretion to issue an 'Academic Honesty Penalty ('AHP') to any student suspected of engaging in academic misconduct in relation to any formative assessment task.
 - a. An AHP penalises the student for suspected academic misconduct by way of a deduction of marks for the whole or part of an assessment task.
 - b. Before imposing an AHP, the assessing Supervisory Panel must clearly particularise the allegation and inform the student of the seriousness of the breach of the alleged academic misconduct and the penalty that has been applied.
 - c. The student whose assessment work has been penalised will have 14 days in which to dispute the allegation and penalty in writing to the Director of Research. In that case the matter is resolved by reference to the procedures set out in this Policy.
 - d. All AHPs are recorded on the Academic Misconduct Register.
 - e. The Supervisory Panel discretion to issue an AHP must not be exercised where a student is to be given penalty of more than 50 percent of the available marks for the assessment task in question.
 - f. The Supervisory Panel discretion to issue an AHP must not be exercised in relation to a summative assessment task, such as a final examination.
- 9.8 The Supervisory Panel will report all academic integrity matters, allegations or potential breaches

to the AIC on quarterly basis.

10. Penalties – Coursework Program

10.1 First Offence

Where a student has no prior record of academic misconduct in the *AMR*, the breach is treated as a first offence. A first offence may result in a warning or a penalty.

The Program Director/Director of Research may consider the following when deciding a fair penalty:

- a. whether the student is a first-year student with limited opportunity to learn and develop good citation practices;
- b. whether instructions regarding collusion, plagiarism and proper acknowledgement of sources were unavailable or unclear;
- c. the degree and extent of plagiarism in the student's work.

The student is advised in writing of the warning or penalty imposed, that this offence has been entered in the *AMR* and that any further breaches are automatically deemed as academic misconduct with associated penalties. The normal assessment rubrics are applied, and marks are deducted consistent with the percentage of misconduct detected.

10.2 Second Offence

If a student is found to have a pre-existing record of academic misconduct or warning registered on the Institute's *AMR*, marks are deducted based on the severity of the misconduct (e.g. as identified through text matching technology).

The matter is recorded in *AMR*. The student is informed that he or she risks an outcome of unsatisfactory academic progression. Students may be required to attend mandatory referral mentioned above.

10.3 Third Offence

If a student has two (2) prior records of academic misconduct or warnings recorded in the *AMR*. The outcome may result in a penalty of zero for the assessment item, zero for the course, exclusion for a specified period of time or termination from study and, the case of an international student, the cancellation of the student's CoE.

Note: If the period of exclusion or suspension is greater than a term of study, in order to be considered for re-enrolment, the student must first submit an application for re-admission for the next term of study where the outcome is determined by the Dean.

11. Penalties – Master of Research Program

11.1 Educational responses – less serious to higher degree research academic misconduct

On determination that less serious academic misconduct has taken place, the educational response which may be imposed on the candidate is one or more of the following:

- a. Provide the candidate with a warning together with advice about what is acceptable academic conduct;
- b. Instruct the candidate to undertake any remedial action to rectify the situation. This may include the need to revise the research work;

- c. Instruct the candidate to undertake additional training or counselling to prevent further occurrences.

11.2 Educational responses – more serious higher degree research academic misconduct

On determination that more serious academic misconduct has taken place, the matter will be reported to the Academic Integrity Committee (AIC). AIC will provide educational response which may be imposed on the candidate is one or more of the following:

- a. Rectify the situation by redoing or revising, and resubmitting the research work, or carrying out the research. This may include the need for additional data collection;
- b. If an allegation of academic misconduct is upheld against a candidate who has submitted a thesis for examination, the candidate will be required to revise and resubmit the thesis;
- c. Another educational response or appropriate to the case.

11.3 Penalties

On determination that more serious academic misconduct has taken place, the penalty which may be imposed on the candidate is one or more of the following:

- a. If an allegation of academic misconduct is upheld against a candidate who has submitted a thesis for examination, a fail result shall be recorded;
- b. Suspension or termination of Institute scholarship;
- c. Restrict the candidate's access to specified research facilities for a specified period;
- d. Termination of candidature;
- e. Exclusion from the Institute.

Where a candidate has been found guilty of academic misconduct on more than one occasion and has previously been penalised, the penalty shall normally be exclusion from the Institute unless in the opinion of the Dean, there are mitigating circumstances.

12. Examinations

If a student is suspected of academic misconduct during an exam, the following applies:

- 12.1*** an exam supervisor/academic staff member may confiscate any item in the student's possession such as mobile phones and other electronics that indicates a breach of academic and research integrity has occurred; the student may be given a Fail (F) grade and reported to the Dean for immediate action;
- 12.2*** a student may be refused entry to an exam, or expelled from an exam room, if the student fails to hand over to the exam supervisor/academic staff member anything that indicates the alleged breach of academic and research integrity; the student may be given a Fail (F) grade and reported to Dean for immediate action;
- 12.3*** the exam supervisor/academic staff member who suspects that academic misconduct by a student has occurred is permitted to initiate an investigation as outlined in the above-mentioned procedures.

13. Appeals

- 13.1*** A student may appeal against a decision made under this Policy. The grounds for appeal are that the decision is inconsistent with this Policy.
- 13.2*** Appeals are considered in accordance with the Institute's *Student Grievance Management Policy*.

Appendix I: Academic Misconduct Register

[illegible]

Appendix 2: Academic Misconduct Flowchart

