Academic Integrity Policy and Procedure

Document Properties

Policy Owner	Principal, HAWTHORN-MELBOURNE
Key Stakeholders	Academic Managers, Senior Teachers, Teachers and Students
Related Policies	Assessment Validation, Standardisation and Moderation for Academic English Courses Policy Assessment, Examinations and Special Consideration Policy Monitoring, Recording and Assessment of Course Progress Policy
Supporting Documentation	Exam Incident Form Academic Integrity Breach spreadsheet
External Standards	National Code 2018 Standard 8 ELICOS Standards P4 – Assessment of ELICOS Students
Review date	12/05/2028

Intent

This Policy outlines the principles, requirements and responsibilities for supporting the academic integrity among staff and students at HAWTHORN-MELBOURNE.

Scope

This Policy applies to all HAWTHORN-MELBOURNE students and staff and across all works assessed diagnostically, formatively and summatively.

Objectives and Principles

HAWTHORN-MELBOURNE is committed to promoting and ensuring the highest standards of integrity through teaching, learning and research practices. The primary aim of this Policy is to educate students about the expected academic conventions for writing exams and assignments, and research, as well as about the appropriate use and acknowledgement of intellectual material and the risks and consequences of any breach.

The core principles of academic integrity are respect, honesty, accountability and fairness.

- The intellectual property of others must be acknowledged with proper citation.
- All work submitted by students must truthfully represent their efforts and findings without deception.
- Students must take full responsibility for their actions and the integrity of their work and accept the consequences of any suspected and/or proven breach.
- No student should gain an unfair advantage or be unfairly disadvantaged.

Definitions

Academic Integrity refers to standards of conduct expected of students in an English-speaking tertiary education environment. A student with academic integrity understands and operates within a defined ethical code to avoid acts of academic misconduct, including as outlined below.

i) **Plagiarism** occurs when a student presents ideas or the work of others as their own original work or fails to acknowledge the original writer of the material they present.

Examples of plagiarism include:

a. Copying sentences or paragraphs word for word from one or more sources without clearly identifying their origin by referencing.

b. Closely paraphrasing sentences or paragraphs from a source without appropriate referencing.

c. Failing to use quotation marks when directly copying the words of another writer.

ii) **Back Translation** is a sub-category of plagiarism and occurs when a student copies sections of text from a translation tool and presents that writing as their own writing.

iii) **Self-plagiarism** occurs when a student reuses previously written work or data in a new piece of writing without referencing its previous use. An example of self-plagiarism:

a. A student submits a whole paper or a substantial portion of a paper that they have previously submitted for another assignment.

This type of plagiarism is often identified by the Turnitin originality report.

iv) **Collusion** occurs when a student presents work that has been undertaken collaboratively with others as their own work. Examples of collusion may include:

a. Submitting work that includes material obtained as a result of significant assistance from another person.

b. Copying or submitting another student's work.

c. Providing work for another student to use.

If a student lends an assignment to another student and their assignment is copied and handed in by that student, both students are guilty of collusion and the pathway institution will be notified of the academic integrity breach.

v) **Contract Cheating** occurs when a student submits work that has been prepared for them by another writer.

Penalties for contract cheating or using a ghost-writer are severe.

vi) **Generative Artificial Intelligence (GenAI)** is a type of AI system capable of responding to prompts or questions by generating texts, images, and other media. It can produce essays, scripts, reflective statements, images, audio, and videos based on an understanding of human language.

Notable examples of GenAI are ChatGPT, Gemini and Copilot, and online translators such as Google Translate and DeepL. GenAI may only be used to help formulate ideas for written and spoken assignments. Academic misconduct using GenAI occurs when any text generated by GenAI is used by students for written and spoken assessments (e.g. in the take-home written essay or report, and in the spoken seminar presentation).

vii) **Cheating** refers to any dishonest conduct in an assessment. Examples of cheating may include:

a. Taking unauthorised written notes, digitally saved files and/or unauthorised technology such as mobile phones, smart watches and AI glasses into an exam.

b. Communicating with others, including online, during an exam.

c. Looking at another student's paper during an exam.

d. Contributing little or nothing to a group task and claiming equal contribution and share of the marks.

e. Leaving notes outside or inside a classroom, or digital material including translation tools on the device to access during an exam.

viii) **Misrepresentation** is the act of presenting an untrue statement or not disclosing complete and accurate information. Examples of misrepresentation may include:

a. Falsifying a doctor's certificate for the purpose of gaining extensions, special consideration or deferred assessment.

A viva is an oral examination designed to ensure that students have produced and understood the written or spoken assignment submitted. In a viva, the student may be asked to explain in detail how they researched their assignment, what sources they consulted and what tools they used.

Penalties and processes around academic misconduct have an emphasis on educative and corrective action and can result in informal and formal warnings. However, depending on the severity of the

misconduct, there may be a reduction in marks or the student may be awarded a fail grade for the assignment or course.

Responsibilities

All staff and students are responsible for maintaining the reputation and integrity of HAWTHORN-MELBOURNE.

While a supportive and educative approach is taken in the preparation of assignments, ultimately, acts of serious academic misconduct must be reported to an Academic Manager.

Academic Managers at HAWTHORN-MELBOURNE are responsible for creating an environment in which academic integrity is recognised, understood and respected. This is achieved through:

- Ensuring that best practice in academic integrity is circulated amongst staff and students.
- Ensuring that courses provide students with clear guidelines on what constitutes academic misconduct.
- Ensuring course materials support students' development in techniques to maintain academic integrity.
- Administering the Academic Integrity Policy as required.

Teachers at HAWTHORN-MELBOURNE help students to understand the importance of academic integrity by:

- Exploiting course materials aimed at detailing and exemplifying academic conventions.
- Educating students about acceptable and unacceptable use of Artificial Intelligence.
- Providing feedback and support on students' work so that they can improve paraphrasing and referencing skills.
- Creating opportunity for students to check their own originality reports on Turnitin prior to submitting final work.
- Providing and informing students of secure arrangements for the submission and collection of assessment items.
- Reporting on breaches of academic misconduct.

Students at HAWTHORN-MELBOURNE are accountable for the authorship and originality of the work they submit. To maintain academic integrity, students must:

- Reference thoughts, ideas, definitions, theories or research from other writers.
- Develop skills to paraphrase these thoughts and ideas to avoid over-using direct quotation.
- Ensure assignments are not available for others to access or copy.
- Never copy the work of others.
- Never contract a writer or use computer-aided tools and/or GenAI to complete their work.

Procedure

Communicating Expectations to Students

Expectations around academic integrity are communicated to students in the following ways:

- The Hawthorn-Melbourne Student Code of Conduct refers to academic misconduct. Students are required to read this document before signing their written agreement when enrolling at HAWTHORN-MELBOURNE.
- Week 1 orientation features a teacher-led presentation and activities including Moodle Quizzes, a GenAI workshop and discussions about academic misconduct scenarios to address any misconceptions or cultural misunderstanding around academic integrity, including the use of AI, and align student understanding with the standards and expectations of HAWTHORN-MELBOURNE and the UNIVERSITY.
- Course Student Guides provide a clear outline of what constitutes academic misconduct, and the penalties associated with it.

- Assessment rubrics and marking sheets refer to breaches of academic integrity.
- Formative exams ensure that students understand the boundaries of what constitutes acceptable behaviour in an exam setting prior to a summative exam.
- Drafting stages for assignments provide an opportunity for students to receive feedback on how their work is progressing and identify any adjustments that need to be made to avoid breaches of academic integrity.
- Any substantiated breach in a formative exam or at the drafting stage of a research assignment results in a counselling session with an academic manager.
- Students are reminded, ahead of their weighted exams, of the importance of academic integrity and shown how to disable language assist applications on their devices.

Informing and Empowering Teachers

Teachers are given the following resources and training so that they can educate their students and help maintain academic integrity:

- Access to the Academic Integrity Policy and Student and Teacher Guides.
- An overview of the assessment tasks undertaken during the course.
- Areas of potential integrity risk and methods of administration to reduce the risk.
- Training on the use of Turnitin to identify academic integrity issues, providing student feedback, and grading assessments.
- The process for reporting on integrity concerns and possible actions/outcomes.
- Weekly meetings to discuss the importance of academic integrity and specific instances of – and strategies to reduce the risk of – integrity breaches.
- Guidance and support from the Academic Management Team, comprised of the Principal, Directors of Studies, Senior Teachers and Team Leaders.

Identifying and Investigating Suspected Integrity Breaches

In exam conditions:

- The student suspected of or identified as using, unwittingly or otherwise, AI or other computer-aided tools receives a verbal warning to immediately disable the technology in question.
- Should the breach continue, the student is required to close their device and complete the task either on a school device or paper.
- For severe or disruptive misconduct, the student may be dismissed from the exam venue but permitted, at the discretion of course leadership, to re-sit a different version of the exam in a private, one-on-one setting, on a school device or paper.
- The above applies to any student copying from another student, providing answers to another student or possessing unauthorised material.

For in-class writing and take home-assignments

- All submissions are processed through Turnitin's plagiarism and AI detector to identify any concerns around the origin of the work and trigger further investigation.
- Should there be a suspicion that part or all of the submitted assessment has been produced using generative AI, course leadership will compare the submission to previously completed diagnostic, formative and summative tasks.
- If the levels of English differ substantially, the student will be invited to meet with an academic manager to defend their submission.
- If the student fails to convince the academic manager that the work was produced unaided, then an appropriate penalty is determined.
- If resubmission is permitted, the student is given instructions on the steps.

Penalties

In the application of penalties, HAWTHORN-MELBOURNE leadership follows two key principles:

i) Their role in supporting international students to develop skills and adapt to the academic conventions of western tertiary education.

ii) Their obligation to pathway partners to ensure students pass their programs on the merit of their own work.

Consequently, penalties around academic misconduct have an emphasis on educative and corrective action and are outlined in the course Student Guide (see Appendix 1).

- Students may be issued with a verbal warning for minor infractions with the incident noted as a minor breach of academic integrity.
- For a formative task, a corrective course of action may be employed to rectify any issues ahead of any summative assessment without penalty.
- Students may be asked to resubmit work following corrective action and/or to re-complete tasks in strict exam conditions. The resubmission is capped at the student's target exit score.
- Students may have their final grades in certain criteria amended or capped to reflect academic integrity issues.
- In more egregious cases, students may have their overall result for a task (or course) capped, or be awarded a 'fail' grade.
- Cancellation of a student's enrolment may occur for a significant breach or repeated breaches of academic integrity in line with the HAWTHORN-MELBOURNE Student Code of Conduct.

Appeals

If a student wishes to appeal against the decision or penalty related to a breach of academic integrity, they are entitled to do so in line with HAWTHORN-MELBOURNE's Complaints and Appeals Policy and Procedure.

Appendix

Appendix 1

Plagiarism (lifting) in writing exams:

Breach	Description	Penalty
Level 1	11%-15% similarity	Deduct 0.5 band from Lexical Resource
Level 2	16%-25% similarity	Deduct 1 band from Lexical Resource
Level 3	26%-35% similarity	Deduct 1.5 bands from Lexical Resource
Level 4	36%-50% similarity	Deduct 2 bands from Lexical Resource
Level 5	51%+ similarity	Penalty based on meeting with an academic manager

Plagiarism (lifting) in take-home assignments:

Breach	Description	Penalty
Level 1	16%-20% similarity	Deduct 1 band from Lexical Resource
Level 2	21%-25% similarity	Deduct 2 bands from Lexical Resource
Level 3	26%-35% similarity	Deduct 3 bands from Lexical Resource
Level 4	36%+ similarity	Penalty based on meeting with an academic manager