

## Academic Integrity Procedure

<b>Web Link</b>	
<b>Category</b>	Procedures
<b>Version</b>	1.2
<b>Policy Contact</b>	Director of Academic Programs
<b>Approving Authority</b>	Director of Academic Programs (DAP)
<b>Endorsing Authority</b>	Head of School
<b>Approval Date</b>	<b>24.4.25</b>
<b>Effective Date</b>	<b>24.4.25</b>
<b>Review Date</b>	4.8.26
<b>Related Documents</b>	<p>AFP Complaints and Feedback (<a href="http://afp.gov.au/about-us/contact-us/complaints-and-feedback/complaints">afp.gov.au/about-us/contact-us/complaints-and-feedback/complaints</a>)</p> <p>The National Student Ombudsman (<a href="http://nso.gov.au">nso.gov.au</a>)</p> <p><b>AIPM Policy and Procedure</b></p> <p>Academic Integrity Policy</p> <p>Assessment Procedure</p> <p>Grievances, Complaints and Appeals Procedure</p> <p>Records Management Procedure</p> <p>Research and Scholarship Policy and associated Procedure</p> <p>Student Charter</p>

### 1. Purpose

- 1.1 This procedure supports the Academic Integrity Policy of the Australian Institute of Police Management (AIPM). Its purpose is to ensure that an educative approach is taken towards academic integrity within programs offered by the Institute and that suspected breaches of academic integrity are managed in a consistent and equitable way in accordance with the Policy.

### 2. Scope

- 2.1 This procedure applies to students enrolled in higher education programs offered by the AIPM and staff associated with these programs.

### 3. Acting with Academic Integrity

#### *Academic Integrity Principles*

- 3.1 As set out in the Student Charter, students are responsible for managing their own learning and upholding the highest standards of academic integrity whilst they are a student of the AIPM.
- 3.2 The core values of academic integrity underpin all activities at the AIPM and include the values of honesty, trust, fairness, respect, and responsibility.
- 3.3 Academic integrity forms a central part of a student's intellectual and personal development. It teaches students how to uphold values, develop appropriate skills in thinking, writing and research, and conduct themselves in an ethical manner.
- 3.4 Students have a duty to maintain the highest standards of academic integrity in their work. This means avoiding cheating, plagiarism, collusion and other forms of academic misconduct.
- 3.5 The AIPM is committed to defending the academic credibility and reputation of the Institute and protecting the student achievement standards and the standards of its awards. This includes educating students on the importance of academic integrity and providing them with guidance on best practice in their study and learning activities.
- 3.6 New students must complete an academic integrity module as part of the Higher Education Enabling Program (HEEP) at the AIPM to ensure that they understand their obligations and responsibilities. The module will help students develop an understanding of academic integrity and how to act with integrity in their learning and research activities. This will include gaining an understanding of what is intellectual property and how to legitimately access other people's work.
- 3.7 In order to meet the commitment stated in 3.5, the AIPM will take actions to prevent academic misconduct by students. These will include the education of students, the professional development of staff, and the ongoing monitoring of procedures to detect academic misconduct and deal appropriately and fairly with those found guilty of it.

### *Student Academic Misconduct*

- 3.8 Student academic misconduct encompasses all behaviour, whether intentional or unintentional:
  - involving the misrepresentation of academic achievement
  - undermining the core values of academic integrity
  - breaching academic integrity.
- 3.9 Academic misconduct is a disciplinary offence. It involves a range of unethical behaviours that are designed to give a student an unfair and unearned advantage over their peers. Refer [Academic Integrity Policy, clause 4.7](#). More common examples may include, but are not restricted to:
  - Plagiarism:
    - unintentional such as careless or inadequate referencing which is usually treated as poor academic practice or negligence
    - intentional which is treated as academic misconduct
    - includes self-plagiarism where the same or almost identical work is duplicated for more than one assessment item without permission.

- Contract cheating and unauthorised sharing (e.g. using an online file-sharing site to obtain or share answers for assessable items, submitting the work of another person as one's own, undertaking an assessment task for another person).
- Unapproved use of artificial intelligence (AI) software (including Generative AI tools) or paraphrasing tools as a form of contract cheating.
- Collusion (where a piece of work prepared by working closely with one or more individuals or in a group is represented as if it were the student's own).
- Cheating in examinations, tests and quizzes (e.g. copying or attempting to copy from a fellow student or consulting unauthorised material).
- Accessing examination materials without consent.
- Changing the work of another student in a group without their consent.
- Falsifying or misrepresentation of data or results.

### *Promoting Academic Integrity*

- 3.10 The academic integrity content is designed to assist students in understanding plagiarism and how to avoid unintentionally plagiarising, such as following the recommended referencing system and meticulously referencing their work.
- 3.11 Guidelines for staff will be developed to further detail staff responsibilities in relation to raising awareness of and encouraging academic integrity practices within the units they supervise or teach.
- 3.12 Additional study skills support will be available while a program is running to assist students in learning how to avoid plagiarism and to reference correctly.
- 3.13 The AIPM supports the institutional use of 'text matching' software and academic writing support software (such as Turnitin Draft Coach™) as a learning feedback tool as well as to deter students from academic misconduct by reducing the opportunities for such misconduct. It also assists staff in the detection of breaches of academic integrity.

## **4. Suspected Breach of Academic Integrity**

### *Informal / Minor Breach*

- 4.1 The AIPM recognises that academic misconduct can occur through lack of familiarity with academic conventions. All allegations of academic misconduct will be considered in the context of the following factors:
  - the nature and extent of the academic misconduct
  - the student's evident intention
  - the student's learning background
  - the impact of the academic misconduct on other persons

- any matters that demonstrate a pattern of behaviour by reference to the student progression record including whether the student has previously participated in remedial support activities
  - the student's explanation of the situation
  - any mitigating circumstances (for example, acknowledgement of error or similar admission of unintentional action by the student).
- 4.2 Suspicion of a breach of academic integrity, such as suspected plagiarism, will be managed at an informal level by the Director of Academic Programs in the first instance. This will include if a report of alleged academic misconduct by a student is received from a staff member or other student.
- 4.3 Students will be offered educational support and counselling to reduce the likelihood of repeat offences. A notation will be placed on the student progression record that such support has been recommended to allow management of recidivist behaviour within the same enrolment period.
- 4.4 If the student admits that there was an intent of academic dishonesty or the Director of Academic Programs determines that there has been a repeat incidence e.g. of plagiarism despite support being offered, the matter is recorded as potential academic misconduct.

### *Allegation of Academic Misconduct*

- 4.5 Once recorded as potential academic misconduct but before the student is formally notified of an academic misconduct allegation (refer Section 5), the Director of Academic Programs may:
- Undertake an informal investigation into the alleged academic misconduct including seeking information from other persons who may have been involved or witnessed the situation in order to determine the validity and extent of the allegation.
  - Determine that no further action should be taken because the allegation concerns conduct of a trivial nature and it would inexpedient to impose any penalty, or the allegation is frivolous, or the alleged conduct does not fall within the scope of the policy. The student must be made aware that no action is being taken on the allegation. It is at the discretion of the Director of Academic Programs as to whether a notation is placed on the student progression record and whether the student's home jurisdiction should be informed.
  - Decide that the student has engaged in non-intentional academic misconduct and refer the student to remediation support and counselling services. A minor penalty may also be issued as set out in clause 6.1 of these Procedures.

## **5. Academic Integrity Misconduct Hearings**

- 5.1 The Director of Academic Programs may refer a matter to the Higher Education Assurance and Regulation (HEAR) Committee for consideration when a student misconduct incident is considered sufficiently serious or involves recidivist behaviour.
- 5.2 As soon as the Director of Academic Programs suspects that the academic misconduct should be investigated as intentional, the student's home jurisdiction is informed.

- 5.3 The HEAR Committee's role is to determine if the matter represents a case of intentional academic misconduct and provide a recommendation as to the appropriate penalty to the Head of School.
- 5.4 The student must be given a reasonable opportunity to advise whether they admit or wish to contest the allegations of misconduct and provide any evidence or submissions that they wish to rely upon to contest the allegations or which relate to the appropriate penalty.
- 5.5 The Director of Academic Programs will conduct a further formal investigation of the misconduct allegation and provide the findings together with any relevant documentation for consideration by the HEAR Committee. A copy will be provided to the student (refer 5.6).
- 5.6 On conclusion of the investigation by the Director of Academic Programs, the student will be issued with an academic misconduct allegation notice which enables the student to understand and respond to the allegation. The following will be included:
- Details of the student conduct that represents a possible breach of academic integrity enclosing copies of evidence where appropriate.
  - Advice that the allegation has been reported to the student's home jurisdiction.
  - A statement on how the behaviour or incident undermines the core values of the AIPM and the student responsibilities as set out in the Student Charter.
  - The academic misconduct record of the student as recorded in the student progression record, including whether the student has previously been counselled or has previously engaged in academic misconduct and a penalty applied.
  - Links to the Academic Integrity Policy and Procedure that set out academic misconduct processes.
  - Advice that the allegation of misconduct will be heard by the HEAR Committee and give the student a copy of, or opportunity to inspect, all relevant documents referred to them.
  - A reasonable opportunity for the student to discuss the allegation with the HEAR Committee; the interview can be held remotely. The student may be accompanied by a support person (who is not a legal representative). Their role is to provide support to the student through the interview process, they are not there to advocate on a student's behalf.
  - Advice on the outcomes and penalties that may be applied if the allegation is proven.
  - A timeframe, usually of seven (7) calendar days from the date of the allegation notice, for the student to provide a written response via email to the allegations.
- 5.7 When hearing a case of alleged academic misconduct, the HEAR Committee must:
- Proceed in a way that is considered appropriate, without being bound by the rules of evidence.

- Give the student a copy of, or an opportunity to inspect, all relevant documents held by them.
  - Give the student a reasonable opportunity to advise whether they admit or wish to contest the allegations of academic misconduct and provide any evidence or submissions they wish to rely upon to contest the allegations or which relate to the possible outcome or penalty. This will include an opportunity to appear before the Committee (this can be remotely). The student may be accompanied by another person who is not legally qualified. A record of the interview /conversation must be made.
  - Meet to consider the case as soon as practicable after receiving the student's response.
- 5.8 When two or more students are alleged to have engaged in academic misconduct in circumstances that are related, the HEAR Committee may decide to consider the cases jointly and the students may be invited to interview together.
- 5.9 The HEAR Committee may request that the Director of Academic Programs arrange further inquiries, or may request supplementary documentation.
- 5.10 In making a recommendation the Committee considers:
- The factors set out in clause 4.1 including whether the student has or hasn't engaged in academic misconduct previously and if so, the educative response or penalty applied.
  - The findings on any material questions of fact.
  - The evidence or other material on which those findings were based.
  - Evidence presented by the student or any witnesses.
  - Whether on consideration of the above, the Committee is satisfied on the balance of probabilities that the allegation is proven.
- 5.11 The HEAR Committee will make a recommendation with respect to the academic misconduct allegation and recommend appropriate penalties to the Head of School.
- 5.12 In considering the recommendation and appropriate penalty, the Head of School may discuss the academic misconduct with the student's home jurisdiction, for example where there is a history of repeated offences.
- 5.13 Wherever possible, there will be a maximum four week timeframe from the referral to the HEAR Committee to case closure.
- 5.14 As soon as practicable after a decision has been reached, the student will receive written notification of the decision. This will include:
- The decision and penalty imposed and the reasons for these.
  - The potential consequences of subsequent offences.
  - The student's right to appeal and applicable timeframes (refer Section 7 of this Procedure).
  - The advice to be forwarded to the student's home jurisdiction.

- 5.15 If a student does not respond to the academic misconduct allegation notice within the seven (7) day timeframe then the Head of School in consultation with the HEAR Committee may reach a decision based on the investigation, select an appropriate penalty in consultation with the student's home jurisdiction if relevant, and forward advice to the student's email address (refer clause 5.13).
- 5.16 All documentation relating to student academic misconduct is kept confidential and only disclosed to those persons who have a role in the Student Academic Misconduct Process or as required by law. The student progression record will be notated accordingly and the relevant documentation maintained on the student's file in accordance with [Records Management Procedure](#).
- 5.17 Students have the right of appeal (refer Section 7 of this Procedure).
- 5.18 If a student has been given an academic misconduct allegation notice under this procedure, the student's academic results may be withheld until the misconduct investigation (including an appeal) is finalised or until any penalty has been served or discharged to the satisfaction of the Head of School.

## 6. Penalties

- 6.1 The Director of Academic Programs may impose one or more of the following penalties for unintentional or minor academic misconduct:
- Provide a written warning.
  - Require that the student undertake appropriate study skills workshops or other educative activities.
  - Direct that the student be allowed to resubmit or amend an assessment item to achieve a mark no higher than 50% for the item.
  - Direct the student receive a nil mark for the assessment item affected by the academic misconduct.
  - Direct there be a reduction in the total marks or the imposition of a limit on the grade the student may be awarded in the unit in which the misconduct occurred (for example, be awarded a grade no higher than 'PS').
- 6.2 On recommendation by the HEAR Committee that a case of academic misconduct is proven, the Head of School may choose to impose one or more of the penalties listed in 6.1 and/or in consultation with the student's home jurisdiction, one or more of the following:
- Direct the student receive a fail grade for the unit in which the academic misconduct occurred (and which will initiate a deferral of their current program to the next practicable intake).
  - Refuse or cancel credit for a unit in a program so that the unit will need to be repeated (and which will initiate a deferral of their current program to the next practicable intake).
  - Impose a probationary enrolment that is provisional on the student's good behaviour.

- Withdraw the student from their program.
  - With the approval of the Academic Governance Board, revoke an award.
- 6.3 The fact that the AIPM has imposed a penalty based on a finding of academic misconduct, shall not be recorded on a student's academic transcript, with the exception of the penalty of withdrawal from a program at the AIPM. When this applies the academic record will bear the annotation (date) "withdrawn with academic penalty".
- 6.4 Students withdrawn on academic misconduct grounds may apply for readmission in a future financial year subject to the approval of their home jurisdiction.

## 7. Appeals

- 7.1 If a student wishes to appeal a decision made by the Director of Academic Programs in relation to academic misconduct, and informal discussions with the Director do not resolve the situation, then the case will be referred to the HEAR Committee and shall proceed under the processes set out in Section 5. The student should initiate this process by lodging an appeal in writing to the HEAR Committee through Client Services within seven (7) calendar days of communication of the decision by the Director of Academic Programs.
- 7.2 A student may appeal the finding of academic misconduct and / or the penalty from the Head of School and HEAR Committee to the AIPM Academic Appeals Committee (refer [Student Grievances, Complaints and Appeals Procedure, Section 6](#)).
- 7.3 The Academic Appeals Committee will proceed in the manner set out in the [Student Grievances, Complaints and Appeals Procedure, Section 6](#).
- 7.4 The decision of the Academic Appeals Committee is final and there is no further recourse to appeal within the AIPM. Where the student remains dissatisfied with the outcome of an appeal process the student may lodge a complaint with the National Student Ombudsman (NSO) (refer [Student Grievances, Complaints and Appeals Procedure, Section 8](#) for more detail or see the website [nso.gov.au](http://nso.gov.au)).

## 8. Definitions

**Academic integrity** is the expectation that teachers, students, researchers and all members of the academic community act with honesty, trust, fairness, respect and responsibility.

**Academic misconduct** is conduct by a student that is intended or likely to have the effect of obtaining, for that student or any other person, an advantage in the performance of assessment tasks by unauthorised, dishonest, unethical or unfair means whether or not the advantage was obtained.

**Allegation notice** is the notice which contains the allegations of academic misconduct and which the AIPM gives to a student to commence formal academic misconduct proceedings.

**Collusion** is unauthorised collaboration. It occurs where more than one student contributes to an assessment task that is submitted as the work of an individual student where the collaboration is not permitted for the assessment task. Collusion may also occur in group work where unauthorised collaboration occurs between groups.



**Contract cheating** is the use of outsourced material for the purpose of submission by a student for assessment. The person submitting the work is being dishonest by representing the work as their own. This differs from traditional forms of plagiarism, which more commonly involves copying of existing submitted or published work. Contract cheating can take on many forms and is not limited to the purchasing of assessment material from on-line sources. Students may obtain assessments from peers or 'tutors' and the arrangement may not involve a financial exchange. Significantly, the submitted work is usually original in nature making it difficult to detect using text matching plagiarism software.

**Copying** occurs when paragraphs, sentences, a single sentence or significant parts of a sentence, or the key points or structure of another person's work, have been used in an assessment without acknowledging the source.

**Decision-maker** is the person or body who has been delegated the responsibility to hear allegations of academic misconduct and to determine if the student is guilty or not guilty of these allegations and assign an appropriate penalty from those set out in Section 6 of these Procedures.

**Documentation** comprises the statements and other documentation provided to the decision-maker (and the student) to provide the factual basis for the hearing and determination of the allegation of academic misconduct and any appropriate penalty. The documentation may include, for example and without limitation, the investigation report, Turnitin reports, and document verification checks.

**Fabrication** occurs when a student claims to have carried out tests, experiments, research or observations that have not taken place.

**Falsification** involves the misrepresentation of research data, source material or results, or the presentation of results that are not supported by the evidence. It may also refer to tampering with an examination script, class work or grade.

**Generative Artificial Intelligence** is a form of artificial intelligence technology that can produce various types of content including text, imagery, audio and synthetic data based on data that they have been trained on.

**Impersonation** involves the completion and submission of an assessment task by another person who dishonestly misrepresents themselves as the person to whom the assessment task was assigned. Impersonation can also take place in the context of invigilated assessment wherein a person completes the assessment on behalf of another while dishonestly misrepresenting their identity.

**NSO** is the National Student Ombudsman, a free national complaints service for students. **Plagiarism** is the presentation of the work, idea or creation of another person as though it is one's own. Plagiarism is a form of cheating and is a serious academic offence that may lead to withdrawal from the AIPM and notification of the offence to the student's home jurisdiction who may take further action. Plagiarised material can be drawn from, and presented in, written, graphic or visual form, including electronic data and oral presentations. Plagiarism occurs when the origin of the material used is not appropriately cited.

**Staff** includes continuing, fixed-term, casual, affiliate and visiting staff associated with the learning, teaching and scholarly activities of the AIPM.

REVISION HISTORY				
Version	Endorsed By	Approved By	Approval Date	Description of changes
1.0	Head of School	DAP	4.8.23	New document.
1.1	Head of School	DAP	31.10.23	Minor revisions to remove reference to Visiting Fellows and clarify timing of involvement of home jurisdiction
1.2	Head of School	DAP	24.4.25	Insertion of reference to the National Student Ombudsman