



Staff Academic Integrity Policy and Procedure

Purpose

1. The Australian International Institute of Higher Education ('the Institute') recognises that ensuring the academic integrity of staff scholarly work is essential to maintaining high-quality academic and professional practice and the reputation of the Institute and for providing appropriate modelling for students.
2. This Policy defines academic integrity and categories of academic misconduct and provides guidance for identifying, preventing, and responding to instances of academic misconduct.

Scope

3. This Policy applies to:
 - a) all academic staff whether full-time, part-time, sessional or contract
 - b) academic visitors to the Institute when engaging in any academic work associated with the Institute
 - c) the full range of academic activities and practices conducted by academic staff including their own scholarship and teaching.

Definitions

4. For the purposes of this Policy:
 - a) **Academic integrity** is the ethical practice of academic activities centred on a commitment to values such as honesty, trust, fairness, respect, responsibility, and courage
 - b) **Academic misconduct** is a breach of academic integrity and includes misrepresentation, fabrication, plagiarism and misuse of intellectual property
 - c) **Plagiarism** is 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.

Policy

Principles

5. Academic misconduct is not tolerated at the Institute.
6. Institute academic staff are expected to observe the highest ethical standards in all their own academic endeavours and to play a key role in cultivating good scholarship practices in their students and in minimising instances of academic misconduct in student work.
7. The role of academic staff in the promotion of academic integrity and the reporting and managing of instances of academic misconduct in the student body is outlined in the *Student Academic Integrity Policy and Procedure*.
8. All staff of the Institute will have a sound awareness of academic integrity expectations. This is



supported through the following measures:

- a) academic staff induction includes a component on academic integrity and training in the use and interpretation of the Institute's detection and reporting mechanisms
 - b) Course Coordinators are responsible for informing teaching staff about the latest issues around academic integrity in the sector, such as emerging technologies for cheating, and for organising annual academic integrity sessions for teaching and other relevant staff
 - c) staff are informed about findings arising from the collection and analysis of academic misconduct data at the Institute and through sector benchmarking.
9. Where the academic integrity of staff work is in question, the Institute will follow a consistent and fair process of investigation.
10. Where academic misconduct is established, appropriate consequences will be applied as outlined in this Policy and Procedure.

Defining academic misconduct as it applies to staff

11. Any breach of the principles of academic integrity constitutes academic misconduct.
12. Academic misconduct by staff may be characterised by, but not limited to the following:
- a) disseminating false or dishonest information in relation to the performance (academic, teaching or scholarship) of other scholars and students
 - b) biased marking of assessments
 - c) plagiarising or presenting the thoughts, words, phrases or works of another as one's own, by:
 - i. failing to or incorrectly acknowledging text, images, videos and other artefacts sourced from others in teaching materials, works of scholarship or research outputs
 - ii. copying or paraphrasing material from any source without due acknowledgment in teaching materials, works of scholarship or research outputs
 - iii. using another's expression or ideas without appropriate recognition or due acknowledgement (e.g. by failure to use an academic referencing system) in teaching materials, works of scholarship or research outputs
 - iv. falsifying or fabricating data obtained from experiments, interviews, surveys, or similar activities in works of scholarship or research outputs.
 - d) acquiring, attempting to acquire, possessing, or distributing (either physically, electronically or orally) restricted assessment-related material or information, such as examination questions or an examination question paper, without the prior authorisation of the relevant Course Coordinator
 - e) providing a student with the opportunity to copy or plagiarise work completed by another person in order that the student can include that work in the material to be submitted for assessment:
 - i. by enabling the student to copy answers produced during an examination
 - ii. providing the student with a copy of work that has been completed by another student on the same or a similar assessment task and is to be submitted for assessment or had been assessed previously.
 - f) offering or accepting bribes for academic or career gain.



Categories of staff academic misconduct

13. Allegations of staff academic misconduct will be classified into minor or major misconduct based on a number of criteria:
 - a) the type of misconduct
 - b) the extent of the misconduct
 - c) the experience of the person
 - d) the intent of the misconduct
 - e) the impact of the misconduct.
14. The matrix in Appendix One provides a guide to assess whether academic misconduct is a minor or major offence.

Procedure

Reporting, assessment and determination of allegations

15. Where a staff member suspects an instance of academic misconduct, they must immediately report the allegation, together with accompanying evidence, to the Academic Integrity Officer, Academic Dean or to the Chief Executive Officer (CEO).
16. The Academic Integrity Officer will make a preliminary assessment of the allegation within 10 working days.
17. Based on the information and evidence the Academic Integrity Officer will determine:
 - a) there is no case to answer
 - b) there is sufficient evidence to warrant further investigation.
18. Where it is determined there is no case to answer, the report and the reasons for not proceeding will be placed on the staff member's file.
19. Where further inquiry is warranted, the Academic Integrity Officer will consult the Academic Dean and conduct the following:
 - a) notify the staff member against whom the allegation has been made (the Respondent), the Chair of the Academic Board and the CEO
 - b) appoint an external investigator who is of sufficient academic seniority and expertise and is without conflict of interest and provide them with copies of all relevant documentation.
20. Within 20 working days of being appointed the investigator will:
 - a) review all relevant documentation
 - b) gather any additional evidence and conduct interviews as required
 - c) provide a report on the findings to the Academic Integrity Officer and the Academic Dean.
21. Within five working days of receipt of the investigator's findings, the Academic Dean will advise the Respondent of the outcome. The Academic Dean will take the actions from this step forward and the Academic Integrity Officer will support them.
22. Where the finding is:
 - a) in favour of the Respondent the matter will be deemed closed, the Chair of the Academic Board and the CEO will be advised, and all records will be filed
 - b) of a possible minor or major offence, the Respondent has the right to reply in writing to the Academic Dean within 10 working days of receipt of the findings.



23. Where the Respondent:

- a) does not invoke the right of reply, the Academic Dean will advise the Chair of the Academic Board and the CEO to initiate action in the form of an appropriate penalty
- b) pursues the right of reply, the Chair of the Academic Board will review all records pertaining to the allegation and provide a review report within 20 working days of receipt of the reply from the Respondent.

24. Within five working days of receipt of the review report the Academic Dean will advise the Respondent of the outcome.

25. Where the outcome of the review report is:

- a) in favour of the Respondent the matter will be deemed closed, the CEO will be advised, and all records filed
- b) to uphold the original decision in relation to a minor or major offence the Respondent is advised of the outcome and their right of appeal under the appeal provisions of the relevant industrial award.

26. Where the Respondent does not exercise their right of appeal the CEO is advised of the final outcome and authorises the initiation of all required action in the form of an appropriate penalty.

Determination of penalties

27. In determining the penalty for proven academic misconduct, the following circumstances are required to be taken into consideration:

- a) whether the person is relatively new and inexperienced
- b) whether the person has a history of academic misconduct
- c) any admissions by the particular person in relation to the misconduct
- d) the nature and extent of the misconduct
- e) whether the misconduct was a deliberate act of deception or cheating
- f) the extent to which the misconduct approximates an offence in the wider community that under the law might lead to legal proceedings, e.g. theft, fraud, false representation.

28. Where appropriate, disciplinary and/or termination proceedings may be implemented for proven academic misconduct, in accordance with the *Human Resources Management Policy and Procedure* and the relevant industrial award.

Grievances and appeals

29. Staff dissatisfied with any action or outcome associated with this Policy may lodge a grievance under the relevant provisions of the *Human Resources Management Policy and Procedure*.

Confidentiality

30. All information associated with reports, investigations and outcomes associated with individual instances of academic misconduct must be treated as confidential and not released to any third party or external agency unless required by law or the person has expressly consented to its release in writing.

Monitoring and improvement

31. The Academic Board is responsible for the overall monitoring of academic integrity at the Institute.

32. The Academic Dean will ensure that reports on staff academic integrity are provided to the



Academic Board:

- a) following the resolution of specific instances, with appropriately de-identified information
 - b) a summary report annually, with appropriate analysis and any recommendations where required.
33. The Academic Board will include data on staff academic misconduct in its annual academic risk report to the Audit and Risk Committee.

Responsibilities

34. Academic staff are responsible for:
- a) observing the principles of academic integrity in all their scholarship and teaching
 - b) reporting instances of potential academic misconduct in fellow staff.
35. The Academic Integrity Officer is responsible for:
- a) general oversight of academic integrity matters at the Institute
 - b) making initial determinations as to whether an allegation has substance
 - c) appointing an investigator, by consulting with the Academic Dean, where an allegation appears to have substance
 - d) communicating outcomes at various stages of an investigation and review to the Respondent and designated officers.
36. The Academic Dean is responsible for:
- a) overseeing the work of the Academic Integrity Officer
 - b) overseeing the process if any staff academic misconduct is found in the investigation
 - c) reporting on staff academic integrity matters to the Academic Board.
37. The CEO is responsible for
- a) assessing allegations and appointing an external investigator when these functions cannot be fulfilled by the Academic Dean
 - b) authorising the initiation of appropriate actions and penalties following the exhaustion of any relevant appeal processes.
38. The Academic Board is responsible for
- a) monitoring and reviewing all academic integrity matters of the Institute
 - b) providing academic integrity-related information in its annual academic risk report.



Associated information

Approving body	Academic Board
Date approved	17 September 2020
Date of effect	Commencement of operation
Scheduled review	Two years from when policy commences
Current version approval date	30/07/2024
Next review date	30/07/2026
Policy owner	Academic Dean
Policy contact	Academic Dean
Related AIIHE Documents	Academic Freedom Policy Human Resources Management Policy and Procedure Intellectual Property Policy and Procedure Quality Assurance Framework Records Management Policy and Procedure Learning and Teaching Plan
Higher Education Standards Framework (Threshold Standards) 2021 (Cth)	Standard 3.2, ss 2, 3 Standard 5.2, ss 1 – 4 Standard 6.1, ss 4 Standard 6.2; ss 1 Standard 6.3; ss 2 Standard 7.3; ss 3
Other related external instruments/documents	Related Legislation <ul style="list-style-type: none">Higher Education Standards Framework (Threshold Standards) 2021 (Cth)Tertiary Education Quality and Standards Agency Act 2011 (Cth)National Code of Practice for Providers of Education and Training to Overseas Students 2018 (Cth) Good Practice Documents <ul style="list-style-type: none">TEQSA Guidance Note: Academic and Research Integrity, Version 2.0TEQSA Good Practice Note: Addressing contract cheating to safeguard academic integrity, October 2017.

Document history

Version	Author	Changes	Approval Date
1.0	Not applicable	Original version	17 September 2020
1.1	Compliance Officer	Reviewed to align with the HESF 2021, reviewed to align with the updated relevant TEQSA Guideline Note on Academic and Research integrity, responsibilities were clarified and updated along with adding the functions of the Academic Integrity Officer, and the footer was updated with current addresses.	30 July 2024

N.B. The document is uncontrolled when printed! The current version of this document is maintained on the AIIHE website at www.aaiihe.edu.au.



Appendix 1: Academic Misconduct Penalties Matrix¹

CRITERIA	An overall judgement as to whether a case is Minor or Major is made on the basis of an overall qualitative assessment based on the criteria set out in this matrix. Where the offence straddles Minor and Major, the person should in general, for a first offence, be treated as a Minor offence unless the intent and impact are such to warrant a full investigation. Second or subsequent offences in the middle range will generally be investigated as Major offences.		
	MINOR OFFENCE	<<<<<<<<<< >>>>>>>>>>	MAJOR OFFENCE
History of Misconduct	No prior history	Previous Minor offence	Previous Minor Offence(s) or multiple Major offence(s)
Type of Misconduct Nature of the breach	Referencing or attribution of work is not clear or inadequate, or has numerous errors; Inappropriate paraphrasing	Failure to reference and/or cite adequately. Copying fragments of material from websites, books or other publications. Acquiring, attempting to acquire, possessing, or distributing restricted assessment-related material or information such as examination questions or an examination question paper without the prior authorisation of the relevant Course Coordinator	Disseminating false or dishonest information in relation to the performance of other scholars and students Deliberately biased marking of assessment. Falsifying or fabricating data. Providing a student with the opportunity to copy or plagiarise work completed by another person; offering or accepting bribes for academic or career gain
Extent of Misconduct Amount or proportion of assessment item or work that is not the person's own. The extent to which the process is compromised.	A few paragraphs, or graphics	A proportion or segment of the work.	Comprises minimal original work Significant appropriation of ideas or artistic work. Multiple pages or sections of text or graphics copied. Selling, procuring or hawking a number of exam papers, exam scripts or assignments.

¹ Based on matrix developed by Griffith University



CRITERIA	An overall judgement as to whether a case is Minor or Major is made on the basis of an overall qualitative assessment based on the criteria set out in this matrix. Where the offence straddles Minor and Major, the person should in general, for a first offence, be treated as a Minor offence unless the intent and impact are such to warrant a full investigation. Second or subsequent offences in the middle range will generally be investigated as Major offences.		
	MINOR OFFENCE	<<<<<<<<<< >>>>>>>>>>	MAJOR OFFENCE
Experience of the Person An expectation that the person should be aware of the seriousness of their actions	Early career academic staff member.	Early career academic staff member.	Experienced academic staff (5 years or more)
Intent of Person Intentionality of the act	Plagiarism appears accidental, unintentional or due to lack of knowledge. Solicitation occurs through cultural considerations or by accident. Cultural considerations/mitigating circumstances e.g. no prior instruction or unclear instructions given the intent to cheat unlikely or doubtful.	Misconduct appears intentional but without malicious intent.	Misconduct appears deliberate and planned
Impact of the Misconduct Impact of the act on others	Nil or limited academic impact on other staff and/or students	Limited to moderate impact on other staff. Nil impact on students.	The reputation of the Institute is impacted. Both students and other staff members are impacted.