



## Academic Misconduct Policy

### 1. PURPOSE

- 1.1. To assist the Portfolio and higher education staff in teaching and supervision roles to understand the academic conduct expected of students at North Metropolitan TAFE (the college).
- 1.2. To outline the management of plagiarism in student work and establish a standard for ethical scholarship.

### 2. APPLICATION

- 2.1. This policy applies to all part-time and full-time students undertaking Higher Education courses of study.
- 2.2. The scope of academic misconduct is extended, but not limited, to:
  - a) Collusion;
  - b) Inappropriate collaboration;
  - c) Plagiarism;
  - d) Misrepresenting or fabricating data or results or other assessable work;
  - e) Inappropriate electronic data sourcing/collection;
  - f) Breaching rules specified for the conduct of examination in a way that may compromise or defeat the purposes of assessment.

### 3. EXCEPTIONS

- 3.1. None

### 4. DEFINITIONS

- 4.1. *Unauthorised Material*: Any material, excluding clear drinking bottles, that has not had prior approval to be admitted into an examination venue

### 5. POLICY STATEMENT

- 5.1. The following principles are to be observed in all cases of alleged academic misconduct:
  - 5.1.1. Cases of alleged and established misconduct must be treated confidentially by staff. Discussion of cases should be limited to those who have a direct line of procedural responsibility in such matters.
  - 5.1.2. Lines of responsibility for investigating cases of suspected misconduct must be rigorously adhered to by all learning areas.
  - 5.1.3. Course co-ordinators must advise students that they are suspected of committing academic misconduct no later than when assessment items are returned to other students. This advice must be confidential and coupled with information on potential appeals and disciplinary courses of action.

5.2. If a case of academic misconduct is established, the degree of misconduct will be defined according to a system of two levels, as follows:

5.2.1. Level One: Minor Academic Misconduct

- a) Where the misconduct may be reasonably judged to result from careless practices and/or neglect of specific guidelines relating to assessment requirements by students, whose outcome compromises the purpose of an assessment to a limited extent only.
- b) Inadequate or inconsistent referencing or paraphrasing too close to the original.
- c) Minor copying of material, such as copying one or two sentences, including copying where a student utilises a verbatim transcription in their notes and presents it as their own words.

5.2.2. Level Two: Major Academic Misconduct

- a) Where the misconduct may be reasonable judged to be a serious and substantial breach of ethical scholarship.
- b) Cheating in examinations including:
  - i) Bringing in and/or referring to unauthorised material in an examination, including written notes, formulae or other banned materials
  - ii) Communicating in an unauthorised manner with others during examinations
  - iii) Reading the work of other examinees during the exam
  - iv) Engaging in, or agreeing, to any act of imposture whereby an enrolled examinee examination is undertaken by another who assumes their identity
- c) Fabricating or falsifying data, experimental results in an assessment item
- d) Colluding with another student about assessable work and representing that as individual work
- e) Recycling an item of assessment from one unit and resubmitting it in complete or substantial form for another assessment.

5.3. For acts academic misconduct that involve plagiarism:

5.3.1 The degree of plagiarism will be defined according to a two-tier schedule:

- a) Level One Plagiarism: Conduct that is not dishonest or unfair in connection with any academic work such as inadequate or misleading citing, referencing or paraphrasing arising from a student's limited knowledge of plagiarism or how to conform to academic conventions, or from carelessness or neglect rather than an intention to deceive.
- b) Level Two Plagiarism: Conduct that is dishonest or unfair in connection with any academic work. It includes inappropriate or fraudulent acts, work arising from a student's ignorance of Academic Integrity/Conventions (where adequate knowledge would have been expected), and where intention to deceive an assessor or cheat by way of plagiarism is apparent. The effect or consequence of the plagiarism must compromise the assessment process in some way.

5.3.2 In determining the seriousness of plagiarism, the following should be considered:

- a) Whether the plagiarism is dishonest or unfair in connection with any academic work;
- b) The experience of the student;

- c) The nature of the plagiarism;
  - d) The extent of the plagiarism; and
  - e) Where evidence is available, the intention of the student to plagiarise.
- 5.4. In determining the level of academic misconduct that has occurred and the appropriate penalty to be applied the Course Coordinator, in conjunction with the Portfolio Director, may take into account one or more mitigating circumstances that is deemed to bear upon the case.
- 5.5. Penalties for academic misconduct vary according to the seriousness of the case and may include:
- a) The requirement to do further work or repeat work,
  - b) Deduction of marks;
  - c) The award of zero marks for the assessment;
  - d) Failure of one or more units;
  - e) Suspension from a course of study;
  - f) Exclusion from the college.

## 6. PRINCIPLES

- 6.1. Promote ethical scholarship and develop guidelines to reduce instances of academic misconduct.
- 6.2. Ensure that plagiarism is correctly dealt with so to reflect its serious nature.

## 7. RELATED DOCUMENTS

- 7.1. *Academic Misconduct Procedure*
- 7.2. *Student Appeals Info Sheet*

## 8. OWNERSHIP and CONTACTS

<b>Policy Owner</b>	General Manager Training Services 1
<b>Contact</b>	Manager of Higher Education
	Phone: 9202 4792
	Email: susan.jacobs@nmtafe.wa.edu.au
<b>Approval Authority</b>	Academic Board
<b>Review Date</b>	Maximum 3 years following approval

## 9. REVISION HISTORY

Version No.	Approved/ Amended/ Rescinded	Date	Approval Authority	
5.0	Approved	19 Aug 2016	HE Standing Committee	Changes to reporting reflect new structure