


| PROCEDURE | |  |
|---|---|---|
| <p>Ref. to Legislative Frameworks:</p> <p>HESF2021: Standard 5.2 / 6.3</p> <p>SRTO2015: Standard 1.4 / 1.8 / 2.2 / 3.1 / 8.4</p> <p>National Code 2018: Standard 8.4 / 8.8 / 10</p> | Academic Misconduct and Plagiarism | |
| Version: 6.2 | Approved By: Academic Dean | Issued on: 29/11/2024 Review by: 29/11/2026 |

Revision History

| Current Version | Description of Change | Procedure Developer(s) | Effective Date |
|-----------------|--|---|----------------|
| 6.2 | <p>Updated the procedure with reference to the inappropriate use of AI and similar technology tools and the penalties associated with misconduct.</p> <p>Updated the similarity table and included the AI content table based on the index value of TURNITIN report.</p> <p>Updated responsibilities and references.</p> | Compliance Manager, Head of Academic Integrity and Academic Dean | 29/11/2024 |
| 6.1 | Updated reference to Artificial Intelligence | Compliance Manager and Academic Dean | 22/09/2023 |
| 6.0 | <p>Updated to HESF 2021</p> <p>Included definition on misrepresentation</p> | Compliance Manager and Academic Dean | 09/03/2023 |

| | | | |
|-----|--|---|------------|
| 5.0 | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Additional clarification of roles and responsibilities were included. • Changes to the Deferment, Suspension or Cancellation of a Student's Enrolment Procedure v9 were refelected in 2.3.2 | Academic Dean | 24/01/2020 |
| 4.2 | Reviewed amended and approved | Head of Academic Departments Committee (HOAD) and The Academic Quality Assurance Portfolio Holder | 23/05/2019 |

PURPOSE

This procedure sets out the strategies and sequence of actions in identifying and responding to academic misconduct, including plagiarism.

SCOPE

This procedure applies to all students enrolled in accredited training and/or higher education courses and the teaching staff members of AAPoly.

PROCEDURE

1. Detecting and Dealing with Academic Misconduct Including Plagiarism

The Academic Team may identify an academic misconduct, including contract cheating and plagiarism, using three methods:

a) Traditional methods

Baites, P & Fain, M. (2003), Detecting Plagiarised Papers, provided a checklist of indicators, such as:

- a) Strange or inconsistent **formatting** may indicate that material has been copied and pasted from other sources.
- b) Irregularities in the use of **citation** protocols, inconsistencies between in-text citation and reference lists (or bibliographies) may indicate that the student has copied and pasted sections of the submitted work from different sources. Although students often forget to list all citations in the references, or bibliography, it is also common in plagiarised work.
- c) Variations in writing **style** within an assignment can be a clue to plagiarised work. However, style questions might also point to poor or exceptional writing skills (Kern & Jackson 2000).
- d) The **content** of a plagiarised paper may not be on the topic, but be very well written. There may be material in an assignment which would be correct in another context but wrong with respect to the topic of the assignment or the aspect to which it refers. This may mean that a student has copied an original work and substituted some details.
- e) **Technical** clues may also indicate plagiarism.

b) Electronic methods

The Academic Team utilises 'Turnitin' software, search engines such as Google and software packages to detect academic misconduct, especially plagiarism.

c) Calibration

Subjects must be designed and delivered to provide opportunities for both formal and informal calibration of the assessment of student performance. Calibration can be used to identify any mismatch between student performance across different assessment tasks, where there is any suspicion of a breach of academic integrity,

such as the unauthorised use of Generative Artificial Intelligence or similar technologies to produce material for assessment and presenting as original ideas without acknowledging the source.

In the subject design phase, subjects must include at least one opportunity to undertake invigilated assessment. In the subject delivery phase, lecturers must use a range of approaches including comparing performance between invigilated and non-invigilated assessment to prompt interviews and other verification approaches to ensure academic integrity is upheld.

To control contract cheating, lecturers are encouraged to be vigilant of any high standard quality works submitted by a student especially when it is above the student's normal standard or calibrated against another piece of work submitted earlier by the student. If a lecturer is suspicious about the quality of a student's report or essay, it is recommended to interview the student and ask them about how they have answered the questions and compare the student's responses to the content in the report. The lecturer will record the interview and generate a report with the academic misconduct incident report and submit to the Head of Academic Misconduct. Calibration of student's work can be achieved through verifiable work done during tutorials or formative or invigilated assessments completed early in the semester.

2. Investigation of a Suspected Academic Misconduct

2.1. Identification

If an Academic Staff member believes that there is evidence of intentional plagiarism in work submitted by a student or that cheating, collusion or any other academic misconduct has occurred, the following steps apply.

- a) The Academic staff member documents the perceived offence in an Incident Report and forward it to Head, Academic Integrity
- b) At the first stage of academic misconduct, the Head of Academic Integrity and the academic staff responsible decides if the student is guilty of academic misconduct. The academic misconduct letter is issued to the student and the warning is recorded in Paradigm (Student Management System).
- c) If the student claims with an appeal that he/she is not guilty, then the case will be forwarded to Student Discipline Committee (SDC).
- d) If the Head, Academic Integrity believes that the student/s has committed a substantial academic misconduct act, the Head, Academic Integrity forwards the investigation outcomes to the Student Discipline Committee for determination.

2.2. Scope of Determination of the Student Discipline Committee Regarding Academic Misconduct

The Student Discipline Committee (SDC) hears allegations of academic misconduct and determines penalties (as appropriate) for **First** and **Second** Offences.

2.2.1. First Offence

1. If the offense is severe and with more than 50% of index value (Refer to AAPoly Assessment Quality-Operational Guide on the Turnitin Similarity Index and AI Writing Indicator tables below), the Head, Academic Integrity issues a warning letter to the student, and the student will receive either a pass or fail for the submitted assignment taking into consideration the work that is not AI generated or similarity. The lecturer or content expert needs to determine and make the appropriate decision of whether the student is deemed to have failed or passed..
2. If the offence is not severe (Refer to AAPoly Assessment Quality-Operational Guide on the Turnitin Similarity Index and AI Writing Indicator tables below), the Head, Academic Integrity issues a warning letter and suggest one of the following penalties depending on the severity of the breach as indicated in the penalty table below:
 - a. Resubmit the task with no more than 50% of the mark will be awarded if the student/s satisfied the task requirements.
 - b. Resubmit the task on a new topic with no more than 50% of the mark will be awarded.
 - c. If the re-submission deadline (within two weeks) is met and the task satisfies the requirements, the lecturer should mark the task and award no more than 50% of the total mark of the task. If the student did not meet the deadline, the student would receive a zero mark for the task.
3. If the student does not admit to the misconduct, he/she can appeal within five (5) working days of being notified about the penalty decision, using the Academic Misconduct Appeal process.
4. If the assessment is submitted through Turnitin, the following penalty rules will be applied:

| Penalties for Plagiarism Act Based on the Similarity Index Value of Turnitin Report | |
|---|---|
| Similarity Index* | Proposed Penalty |
| 0 - 20 % (no offence) | No Penalty if the Turnitin similarity index is less than 20% and the similarities are coming from more than one source. |
| 21% - 30% (not severe) | <p>a) A warning letter; and the student will be asked to resubmit the assessment within 5 working days or a different assessment within ten working days. Assignments to be marked according to marking rubrics with 25% penalty.</p> <p>b) If the student resubmits in time, the student may receive up to 50% of the total original mark of the assessment.</p> |

| | |
|--------------------------------|---|
| | c) If the student did not meet the assessment deadline, the student would receive a zero mark for the assessment. |
| 31% - 50% (severe) | a) A warning letter; and the student will be asked to resubmit the assessment within 5 working days or a different assessment within ten working days. Assignments to be marked according to marking rubrics with 50% penalty. b) If the student resubmits in time, the student may receive up to 50% of the total original mark of the assessment. c) If the student did not meet the assessment deadline, the student would receive a zero mark for the assessment. |
| > 51% to 100% (severe offence) | A warning letter and a zero mark for the assessment task if the Turnitin similarity index is more than 50%. |

- **The similarity index in Turnitin** is the proportion of the document that is copied from or similar to other reports submitted by other authors, or the same author but for different subjects or locations.
- **The overall similarity index reading** should not include the cover page or the reference list.
- **If a student plagiarised an assessment**, the subject lecturer should (i) fill an academic misconduct report, (ii) provide the evidence to support the claim, and if required (iii), the lecturer should conduct a recorded interview and forward it to the Head, Academic and Integrity.

| Penalties for Unauthorised use of Generative AI Based on the AI Writing Indicator Value of Turnitin Report | |
|--|---|
| AI Usage Index* | Proposed Penalty |
| 0 - 20 % (no offence) | No Penalty if the Turnitin AI writing indicator is less than 20% and the indicator displaying an asterisk (*) for the percentage. |
| 21% - 30% (not severe) | a) A warning letter; and the student will be asked to resubmit the assessment within 5 working days or a different assessment within ten working days. Assignments to be marked according to marking rubrics with 25% penalty. b) If the student resubmits in time, the student may receive up to 50% of the total original mark of the assessment. c) If the student did not meet the assessment deadline, the student would receive a zero mark for the assessment. |
| 31% - 50% (severe) | a) A warning letter; and the student will be asked to resubmit the assessment within 5 working days or a different assessment within ten working days. Assignments to be marked according to marking rubrics with 50% penalty. b) If the student resubmits in time, the student may receive up to 50% of the total original mark of the assessment. c) If the student did not meet the assessment deadline, the student would receive a zero mark for the assessment. |

> 51% to 100% (severe offence)

A warning letter and a zero mark for the assessment task if the Turnitin AI writing indicator index is more than 50%.

- **The AI writing indicator in Turnitin** exhibits the overall percentage of text detected as AI within the assessment. This includes the two categories; 1) the amount of likely AI-generated text and, 2) the AI-generated text that was also likely paraphrased,
- **The overall AI writing indicator** should not include the cover page or the reference list.
- **If a student plagiarised an assessment with AI content**, the subject lecturer should (i) fill an academic misconduct report, (ii) provide the evidence to support the claim, and if required (iii), the lecturer should conduct a recorded interview and forward it to the Head, Academic and Integrity.

2.2.2. Second Offence

If the student repeats the act of academic misconduct, the Academic staff member provides the evidence including the Turnitin report to the Head, Academic Integrity who brings it to the Student Discipline Committee for investigation.

If the student admits the offence or if the result of the investigation determines the student committed the offence, the student will receive a second warning letter and a zero mark in the assessment.

If the student did not admit the academic misconduct or disagreed with the decision, he/she can appeal within five (5) working days of being notified of the penalty decision. The appeal must be submitted through the Academic Misconduct Appeal process. The Student Discipline Committee (SDC) will investigate the offence and review the appeal to determine the final decision.

2.3. Scope of Determination of the Academic Review Committee Regarding Academic Misconduct

The Academic Review Committee will hear allegations of Academic Misconduct and determine penalties (as appropriate) for the **Third** and **subsequent** offences.

2.3.1. Third Offence

If the student repeats the academic misconduct for the third time, the relevant Academic Staff member provides the evidence, and the Head, Academic Integrity concurred that a breach of academic integrity has occurred, the matter is referred to the Academic Review Committee for investigation.

If the student admits to the offence or if the result of the investigation determines the student committed the offence, the Head, Academic Integrity issues the final warning letter to the student and will receive fail for the whole subject.

If the student disagrees with the decision, he/she can appeal within five (5) working days of being notified about the penalty decision using the Academic Misconduct Appeal process. The SDC then forwards the

results of the investigation and the appeal to the Academic Review Committee to make a decision.

2.3.2. Expulsion from the Course

If the student repeats the academic misconduct after the third time, the relevant Academic Staff member provides the evidence, and the Head, Academic Integrity concurred that a breach of academic integrity has occurred, the matter is referred to the Academic Review Committee for investigation. The Academic Review Committee may, if it is deemed appropriate, determine that the student should be expelled from the course.

If the Academic Review Committee decides to expel the student from the course, then the Chair will refer the matter, with recommendations, to the Chief Executive Officer, who will review the case within five (5) working days of receiving the report.

If the outcome of the review requires the expulsion of the student, the Designated Head of Student Services will act in accordance with the Deferment, Suspension or Cancellation of a Student's Enrolment Procedure to cancel the student's enrolment and report the student to the Department of Education via PRISMS. This record of penalty will be shown in the student's academic record.

3. Academic Misconduct Appeal Process

If student/s believes that his/her work has not been plagiarised or that he/she has not committed academic misconduct, an Appeal must be lodged in writing through Student Services within five (5) working days of being notified about the above decision.

If the student intends to appeal the decision of the academic misconduct, he/she must provide supporting evidence to substantiate his/her case and is entitled to bring an advocate.

The student's Appeal Application will be forwarded to the Head, Academic Integrity. The Head, Academic Integrity will refer the matter to the Student Discipline Committee, with supporting evidence of the Misconduct and the Appeal application. The SDC decision would be conveyed to Student Services for recording to student files and informing the student.

RESPONSIBILITIES

- 1. Academic Dean** is responsible for developing and maintaining this policy.
- 2. Associate Dean (Education)** is responsible for communicating this policy to the students and the academic staff members within their teams.

3. **The Head, Academic Integrity** is responsible for implementing the procedures and taking appropriate actions in cases of academic misconduct and plagiarism. The Head, Academic Integrity also ensures accurate and timely communication with students and ensures the safe receipt and filing of all evidence related to an academic misconduct investigation. The Head, Academic Integrity also facilitates the process involving student, academic staff, and committees (wherever it may be necessary).
4. **Academic staff** are responsible for ensuring their awareness of this procedure and follow appropriate reporting of academic misconduct and plagiarism to the Head, Academic Integrity. Academic staff are also responsible for providing unambiguous instructions and training to students on Academic Assessment preparation, highlighting examples of appropriate referencing techniques. They must provide a range of opportunities for calibration in subject delivery, including formal and informal approaches.
5. **Students** are responsible for ensuring proper referencing and signed declaration of Academic Integrity on the assessment cover sheet acknowledging original work, academic honesty, unique submission and retention of assignment copy, before submitting any assessment tasks. Students must commit to submitting only own genuine work and protect it from intentional or unintentional copying by fellow students. If unsure about the proper way of referencing or academic work preparation, students can seek assistance from appropriate lecturers if unsure about the proper way of referencing or academic work preparation. Finally, students must acknowledge the use of Generative Artificial Intelligence during assessments.
6. **The Student Discipline Committee (SDC)** hears allegations of academic and non-academic misconduct by students and reviews the initial appeals for misconduct. The AAPoly Student Discipline Committee Chair is appointed by the Academic Dean. Committee members are selected by the Academic Dean. The Committee will convene to hear allegations of student misconduct within two weeks from the date of receiving the misconduct report.
7. **The Academic Review Committee (ARC)** hears allegations of academic misconduct and makes decisions based upon the severity of the misconduct. The ARC reviews the further appeals forwarded by the SDC and makes the final decision on the forwarded appeals. The Academic Dean chairs the ARC. Members of the committee include the relevant Program Coordinator, the Associate Dean (Education), and the Head, Academic Integrity. The Committee will convene to hear allegations of academic misconduct within five working days from the date of receiving the misconduct report.

FEEDBACK

Queries or feedback about this procedure should be directed to the Academic Dean through academicdean@aapoly.edu.au. The Academic Dean will respond to the written question or feedback within two (2) weeks from the receipt unless an extenuating circumstance requires an immediate response or action. The feedback and subsequent outcome will be documented in the version register which will form a part of quality assurance and continuous improvement of AAPoly.

References

| Source | Document Title |
|----------|---|
| Internal | Learning Resources and Educational Support Policy and Procedure |
| | AAPoly Academic Misconduct and Plagiarism Procedure |
| | AAPoly Higher-Education Student Handbook |
| | AAPoly Academic Integrity, Honesty and Free Intellectual Inquiry Policy |
| External | Higher Education Standards Framework (Threshold Standards) 2021 |
| | National Code of Practice for Providers of Education and Training to Overseas Students 2018 |
| | TEQSA: Contract Cheating (2022) |
| | TEQSA Guidance note: Academic and research integrity (2024) |
| | TEQSA: Assessment reform for the age of artificial intelligence (2023) |