

Institutional Framework for Promoting Academic Integrity among Students

Adapted from the Lancaster University Framework with their permission

Approving authority	University Council
Approval date	4 December 2017 (5/2017 meeting)
Advisor	Academic Registrar, Academic Administration academic-registrar@griffith.edu.au (07) 373 57334
Next scheduled review	2023
Document URL	http://policies.griffith.edu.au/pdf/Framework for Promoting Academic Integrity.pdf
TRIM document	2017/8005063
Description	This document provides a University-wide framework for promoting the core values of student academic integrity (honesty, trust, fairness, respect and responsibility) among students. The framework sets out definitions of student academic misconduct and outlines the University's strategy for promoting academic integrity and preventing academic misconduct. The framework also explains the roles and responsibilities of various officers and of students and provides a matrix to assist staff to assess the seriousness of an act of student academic misconduct.

Related documents

[Student Academic Misconduct Policy](#)

[Assessment Policy](#)

[Assessment Procedures for Staff](#)

[Assessment Procedures for Students](#)

[Reasonable Adjustments for](#)

[Assessment – Students with](#)

[Disabilities Assessment Types in](#)

[Use at Griffith University](#)

[Guidelines for Undertaking a Dissertation in Bachelor \(Honours\), Masters Coursework and Extended Programs](#)

[Student Review and Appeals Policy](#)

[Student Review and Appeals Procedures](#)

[Staff Guidelines on Decision-Making in Student Cases](#)

[Academic Transcripts](#)

[Role Statement Course Convenor](#)

[Role Statement Program Director](#)

[Role Statement Honours Program Director](#)

[Student Charter](#)

[Griffith University Code for the Responsible Conduct of Research](#)

[Student Communication Policy](#)

[SMS for Current Student Guidelines](#)

[Student Academic Integrity Website](#)

[Queensland Ombudsman](#)

[\[Student Academic Integrity\]](#) [\[Definition of Student Academic Misconduct\]](#) [\[Promoting Academic Integrity and Preventing Student Academic Misconduct\]](#) [\[Managing Student Academic Misconduct - Roles and Responsibilities\]](#) [\[Seriousness of Student Academic Misconduct\]](#)

1. STUDENT ACADEMIC INTEGRITY

Student academic integrity means acting with the values of honesty, trust, fairness, respect and responsibility in learning. It is important for students to act in an honest way, be responsible for their actions, and show fairness in every part of their work.

The core values of academic integrity, which are honesty, trust, fairness, respect and responsibility, lie at the heart of all the University's activities.

Academic integrity is important because, without its core values, true academic discourse becomes impossible, learning is distorted and the evaluation of student progress and academic quality is seriously compromised. Consequently, the University is committed to:

- defending the academic credibility and reputation of the University;
- protecting student achievement standards and the standards of its awards;
- ensuring that students receive due credit for the work they submit for assessment;
- making reasonable adjustments to assessment that maintain the integrity of the University's courses and awards;
- protecting the interests of those students who do not cheat;
- advising its students of the need for academic integrity, and providing them with guidance on best practice in studying and learning; and
- educating students about what is intellectual property, why it matters, how to protect their own, and how to legitimately access other people's work.

The University discharges this commitment by focusing on preventing academic misconduct by students. Prevention of misconduct takes many forms including the education of students, the professional development of staff, and the ongoing development of procedures to detect academic misconduct and to deal appropriately and fairly with those found guilty of it.

This Framework provides an overview of the University's strategies for promoting academic integrity and the processes for dealing with academic misconduct. The Framework applies to all items submitted by students for assessment by the University in all non-award, undergraduate and postgraduate coursework programs, including dissertations and theses.

2. DEFINITION OF STUDENT ACADEMIC MISCONDUCT

Student academic misconduct encompasses all behaviour:

- involving the misrepresentation of academic achievement; or
- undermining the core values (honesty, trust, fairness, respect and responsibility) of academic integrity; or
- breaching academic integrity;

whether intentional or unintentional. Student academic misconduct includes doing as well as attempting to do any of the acts, omissions or things described in this section.

Student academic misconduct includes, but is not limited to:

- 2.1 Cheating in examinations, tests and quizzes** occur when a student fails to comply with the requirements, conditions and instructions specified for their conduct, including but not limited to:
- 1) communicating, or attempting to communicate, with a fellow student or individual who is neither an proctor or a member of University staff;
 - 2) copying, or attempting to copy from a fellow student;
 - 3) attempting to introduce or consult during the examination, any unauthorised printed or written material, or electronic calculating or information storage device; or mobile phones or other communication device;
 - 4) recording, transmitting or disseminating questions and/or answers to themselves or another person;

- 5) impersonating another student; or
 - 6) failing to comply with an instruction by a University officer appointed to supervise the examination.
- 2.2 Fabrication of results** occurs when a student claims to have carried out tests, experiments or observations that have not taken place, makes up results or presents results not supported by the evidence.
- 2.3 Misrepresentation** occurs when a student presents an untrue statement about attendance or participation in practical, performance or professional learning activities, or includes citations to non-existent or incorrect sources or does not disclose any information or matter where there is a duty to disclose such information or matter.
- 2.4 Plagiarism** occurs when the work of another is represented, intentionally or unintentionally, as one's own original work, without appropriate acknowledgement of the author, creator or the source. This category of academic misconduct includes but is not limited to the following:
- 1) collusion, where a piece of work¹ prepared by working closely with one or more individuals or in a group is represented as if it were the student's own, this includes:
 - a. producing the piece of work together;
 - b. determining the method or approach to a question or assessment task together;
 - c. sharing answers or giving access to questions and answers or completed assessment tasks;
 - 2) acquiring or commissioning a piece of work, which is not his/her own and representing it as if it were, by:
 - a. purchasing the assessment task from a commercial service, including internet sites, whether pre-written or specially prepared for the student concerned;
 - b. submitting an assessment task produced by a third party, including a friend, family member, fellow student or a staff member of the University;
 - 3) self-plagiarism by duplicating the same or almost identical work for more than one assessment item without permission;
 - 4) copying ideas, concepts, research data, images, sounds or text;
 - 5) paraphrasing a paper from a source text, whether in manuscript, printed or electronic form (e.g. article spinning, text rewriting and content creation tools), without appropriate acknowledgement;
 - 6) word for word copying, cutting or pasting statements from a single source or multiple sources or piecing together work of others and representing them as original work;
 - 7) submitting as one's own work all or part of another student's work, even with the student's knowledge or consent.
- 2.5 Solicitation** occurs when a student requests, offers, encourages, induces or advertises for another individual/student to contract, commission, pay, procure, or complete on their behalf, assessment tasks and items (e.g. exam papers, model exam answers, exam questions, exam scripts, on-line quizzes, and other types of assessment as described in [Assessment Types in Use at Griffith University](#)) that are likely to result in their use for the purpose of cheating, misrepresentation and/or plagiarism. A student who willingly assists another to circumvent the purpose of assessment through solicitation, cheating, misrepresentation or plagiarism (for example by willingly sharing their own work, giving them access to their own work, using a file swapping site or advertising the availability of their own work or someone else's work) is also breaching academic integrity, and may be subject to disciplinary action.
- 2.6 Intentional and inadvertent plagiarism**
- Some students who plagiarise do so intentionally, with intent to deceive. This conscious, pre-meditated form of academic misconduct is a particularly serious breach of the core values of academic integrity and one of the worst forms of fraudulent academic behaviour.

¹ Piece of work as described in *Assessment Types in Use at Griffith University*.

Many students who plagiarise do so unintentionally, for example as a result of a lack of familiarity with academic writing skills and academic referencing conventions.

In response to incidences of unintentional plagiarism in the early years of study, the University may require that students complete the [Academic Integrity Student Tutorial](#) or seek help from a Learning Advisor. If a student fails to complete such a requirement, this is taken into account in determining the response to be applied if they plagiarise again.

2.7 Why is plagiarism a problem?

Plagiarism is a problem for four main reasons -

1. It involves unacceptable practices, particularly theft (stealing someone else's intellectual property, and breach of copyright) and academic deception (in order to gain a higher grade).
2. It prevents the student who plagiarises from knowing how well they could have performed (by yielding a false grade), thus denying them the opportunity for deep learning, to improve their study skills, knowledge and understanding.
3. If plagiarism goes undetected and uncorrected, it effectively penalises and can demoralise those students who do not plagiarise.
4. It undermines the commitment of the University to graduate students who will be honest, trustworthy, fair, respectful and responsible.

The University pursues cases of academic misconduct seriously and ensures any findings of academic misconduct are dealt with through appropriate Educational Responses and/or Penalties.

3. PROMOTING ACADEMIC INTEGRITY AND PREVENTING STUDENT ACADEMIC MISCONDUCT

The University's strategy for promoting academic integrity and preventing student academic misconduct involves:

Institutional commitment: implementation of a University-wide framework for academic integrity across all academic areas. The University Assessment Committee is responsible for monitoring the application of this Framework across the University.

Promotion of core values: the University explicitly communicates the positive value placed on academic integrity through this Framework and states why academic integrity (in teaching and research) is valued <http://www.griffith.edu.au/academic-integrity>.

Transparency and dissemination: this Framework is widely publicised within the institution, to all staff (<https://intranet.secure.griffith.edu.au/teaching/academic-integrity-staff>) and students (<https://intranet.secure.griffith.edu.au/student/academic-integrity>).

This Framework is promoted through:

- an academic misconduct statement included in every course profile;
- course convenors discussing with their students (at an early stage, and particularly during the first few weeks of each trimester) what academic misconduct is and how to avoid it;
- an institution-wide Student Academic Integrity Website, that defines and promotes best practice, providing resources for staff and students and publishes the number of breaches identified and the outcomes (individuals are not identified). This website is promoted to all students during Orientation Week.

Setting assessments in accordance with good practice: assessments are set using methods that are relevant, valid, fair and appropriate to each course. Setting assessments in accordance with good practice in the higher education sector is one component of an institutional strategy to minimise student breaches of academic integrity. Data on the number of breaches specific to assessment types are provided to School Assessment Boards to inform course assessment plans.

Educating students about best practice: students are helped to learn best practice in academic writing, each school/department provides discipline-specific annotated examples to show work which is clearly plagiarised, work which is acceptably paraphrased and work which is correctly referenced.

Support for academic study skills: study skills support is provided to students, particularly support designed to promote good practice in academic writing. The Library offers a range of workshop and training opportunities that focus on the preparation of academic skills, computing skills, and library research skills suitable for university students. Details of these are available at: <http://www.griffith.edu.au/library/workshops-training> and <http://app.griffith.edu.au/study-smart/>.

Staff awareness: all teaching staff are regularly made aware of the Academic Integrity Framework and procedures.

Supporting ESL (English as a second language) students: whilst recognising that all students can engage in academic misconduct, the University provides a range of resources prior to and during their degree studies specifically to support ESL students in their study and writing skills.

Academic integrity declaration: each student is required to sign an academic declaration on every assessment item they submit. The University has a standard form of words for the declaration, and every school/department and program is required to use it. This requirement includes students undertaking a dissertation in Bachelor Honours, and Masters Degree Coursework and Extended programs.

Institutional reporting: The Framework commits all staff and students to reporting academic integrity breaches, as part of their responsibilities in promoting the core values of academic integrity,

Proportional responses: the Framework recognises that a distinction should be drawn between less serious instances of academic misconduct which may involve simply inexperienced academic study and writing skills and more serious instances which may involve intentional misconduct and misrepresentation. The former (Tier 1) requires an educational or developmental response and only the latter (Tier 2) deserves Penalties. As a result when concerns are first raised the framework allows for the provision of opportunities for students to learn; whereas subsequent offences are more likely to be intentional, and the outcomes may become progressively more severe. Further guidance regarding assessing the seriousness of academic misconduct is given at [5. below](#).

Centralised tracking/management system: the University supports academic staff in dealing with sustained academic misconduct by recording incidences where concerns have been detected, monitoring actions taken in response to breaches of academic integrity, including the warnings and penalties applied to students for breaches. The Student Academic Integrity Management System facilitates the tracking of allegations made against students across all elements of the University. The system is managed by a Student Academic Integrity Coordinator for the purpose of referring the concern to the Course Convenor (Tier 1 Decision Maker) or the Dean (Learning & Teaching) (Tier 2 Decision Maker). Records of academic misconduct are confidential and only the Student Academic Integrity Coordinator has the security access to view these records in the Student Academic Integrity Management System. Once a finding of academic misconduct has been determined by a Tier 1 or Tier 2 Decision Maker, the Student Academic Integrity Coordinator advises the decision maker of previous breaches to assist them in determining the appropriate Tier 1/Tier 2 Educational Response and/or Penalty to be applied to the student. Reports detailing the number and types of academic misconduct cases are produced from the Student Academic

Integrity Management System and published at the following website: <http://www.griffith.edu.au/academic-integrity> for the purpose of deterring students from engaging in academic misconduct.

Educating decision makers: the University supports decision makers to make fair and consistent decisions through the use of the Seriousness Matrix, the support of the Student Academic Integrity Coordinator, the *Staff Guidelines on Decision-Making in Student Cases*, and the provision of regular good decision making training.

Institutional use of 'text matching' software: the University supports the institutional use of 'text matching' software to deter students from academic misconduct by reducing the opportunities for misconduct. The software is available for use by students as an educational tool and to assist academic staff in the detection of breaches of academic integrity. Text matching software also assists academic staff in the detection of work purchased from a commercial site or obtained via a file sharing site.

Institutional procedures for the conduct of examinations, assessment submission and return: the University outlines the responsibilities of both students and staff in taking the necessary safeguards to secure assessment questions, answers and tasks in the conduct of examinations as well as the process of submitting, marking and returning assessment items in order to prevent academic misconduct. These procedures are outlined in the University's *Assessment Policy, Assessment Submission and Return Policy* and *End of Trimester Centrally Administered Examinations Policy and Procedures*.

4. MANAGING STUDENT ACADEMIC MISCONDUCT - ROLES AND RESPONSIBILITIES

The following may detect and report a possible breach of academic integrity:

Examiner: An individual who is responsible for assessing any aspect of a student's performance in a course. The examiner may be internal or external to the University.

The primary responsibility for detecting concerns about possible breaches of academic integrity rests with individual examiners, who should be alert to the possibility of finding misconduct in students' work. The use of 'text matching' software facilitates this process. However, the examiner must use their specialist knowledge and academic judgement in deciding what is and what is not acceptable. If an examiner has concerns about the student's work they must report these concerns to the relevant Course Convenor.

Proctor: An academic staff member, postgraduate student (not invigilating postgraduate courses) or person external to the University employed on a casual basis, responsible for the proper and efficient conduct of an examination.

A proctor is responsible for detecting student behaviour that could be construed as cheating or another form of misconduct in an examination. In such cases the proctor may ask the student concerned to move to another position or, in the event that the student is creating a disturbance, ask the student to desist. If the student fails to comply, the proctor may require the student to leave the examination room. Immediately following the conclusion of the examination, the proctor is required to make an incident report to the Senior Manager, Examinations and Timetabling that includes evidence of alleged cheating or other misconduct. The Senior Manager, Examinations and Timetabling conveys the incident report to the Student Academic Integrity Coordinator and provides a copy of the report to the relevant Course Convenor. If the examination is not centrally managed by Exams and Timetabling, the incident report is provided by the proctor to the relevant Course Convenor.

University staff: University staff, other than those bound by professional standards relating to client confidentiality, who in the course of their work have knowledge of a possible breach of academic integrity, are required to report these concerns to the Student Academic Integrity Coordinator along with the evidence of the breach.

Students: Students of the University who witness or have knowledge of possible breaches of academic integrity are encouraged to report the matter to the relevant Course Convenor or to the Student Academic Integrity Coordinator.

The following have a role in dealing with a concern of academic misconduct:

Student Academic Integrity Coordinator: University staff member responsible for keeping a record of all concerns and proven breaches of academic integrity. The duties of the Coordinator include keeping a record of all cases, including reports from Course Convenors, and from cases heard by the Dean (Learning & Teaching), giving information and other support to Course Convenors to assist them in discharging their duties and managing the Student Academic Integrity Management System.

Head of School: The academic staff member responsible for assigning convenors to courses.

The Head of School receives a copy of emails and attachments prepared by the Student Academic Integrity Coordinator advising the Course Convenor that they are the decision maker, so they are informed of all academic integrity concerns being managed within their school.

Program-based Support: University staff responsible for the program (e.g. Program Director, First Year Coordinator) in which the course is taught and the student is enrolled.

The Course Convenor may seek support from the Program Director, and/or First Year Coordinator for the program, in which the student is enrolled, in making contact and meeting with the student about whom a concern is raised.

Course Convenor: The academic staff member appointed by the Head of School to have responsibility for the teaching and assessment of a course.

The responsibilities of the Course Convenor include initial receipt or identification of concerns about possible breaches in academic integrity at non-award, undergraduate and postgraduate coursework levels, reporting concerns to the Student Academic Integrity Coordinator, providing the Student Academic Integrity Coordinator with evidence of the concern, acting as the Tier 1 Decision Maker and reporting outcomes to the Student Academic Integrity Coordinator for recording on the Student

Academic Integrity Management System.

Dean (Learning & Teaching): The academic staff member appointed by the University Council who reports to the Group Pro Vice Chancellor and is responsible for the determination of grades from individual examiners, individual student cases, monitoring of results and for the provision of advice on student achievement, in respect of all programs which are the responsibility of that Group with the exception of higher degrees by research.

The Dean (Learning & Teaching) acts as the Tier 2 Decision Maker as set out in the policy on Student Academic Misconduct.

Learning Advisors: Staff providing academic skills consultations, workshops and online resources to students identified as having an academic integrity breach.

University Assessment Committee: The University Assessment Committee has a role in monitoring academic integrity concerns and outcomes associated with findings of academic misconduct. The Committee makes recommendations to the Learning and Teaching Committee on the quality and integrity of student assessment. In this capacity the University Assessment Committee provides advice on the assurance of learning outcomes, consensus moderation, integrity of student assessment, marking, and grading practices.

5. SERIOUSNESS OF STUDENT ACADEMIC MISCONDUCT

Five factors are considered in determining the seriousness of an act of academic misconduct:

- the type of misconduct;
- the extent of the misconduct;
- the experience of the student;
- the intent of the student;
- the impact of the misconduct.

The University has a two-tiered response for dealing with instances of student academic misconduct.

Tier 1

Some students who engage in academic misconduct do so unintentionally, because of inadequate study skills and a lack of familiarity with academic writing conventions. In response to incidences of inadvertent misconduct in the early years of study, the University provides for an Educational Response.

Tier 2

Some students who engage in academic misconduct do so intentionally, with intent to deceive. This conscious, pre-meditated form of misconduct is a particularly serious breach of the core values of academic integrity for which the University may impose Penalties.

To assess the seriousness of an act of student academic misconduct and for the purpose of determining whether it is a Tier 1 or a Tier 2 Case the following Academic Misconduct Seriousness matrix is to be used as a guide². On the evidence of the assessment item alone a judgement on the first two criteria is made. Evidence of the experience of the student, the student's GPA and the status of the student's academic good standing including the records in the Student Academic Integrity Management System are used by the Student Academic Integrity Coordinator for the purpose of determining whether a case should be referred to the Tier 1 Decision Maker or the Tier 2 Decision Maker in accordance with the Student Academic Misconduct Policy. Intent is assessed by the Tier 1 or Tier 2 Decision Maker after investigation in which the student has been given the opportunity to respond to a concern about a possible breach of academic integrity. Intent is determined on the basis of the evidence that is available to the decision maker. The decision maker will determine whether, on the balance of probabilities the student has acted intentionally or whether the student's academic misconduct is the result of ignorance, inadvertence or lack of attention. Impact is assessed by the Tier 1 Decision Maker or the Tier 2 Decision Maker after considering the likely affect/s of the student's academic misconduct on other students, the University community and its institutional culture of academic integrity

² Adapted from the work of Yeo, Shelley and Chien, Robyn (2007), 'Evaluation of a Process and Pro forma for making Consistent Decisions about the Seriousness of Plagiarism Incidents,' Quality in Higher Education, 13:2, 187 - 204

Criteria	TIER 1 CASE		TIER 2 CASE	
Type of misconduct Nature of the breach.	For example: Referencing or attribution of work is not clear or adequate, or has numerous errors Inappropriate paraphrasing Possession of unauthorised examination materials in the exam venue.	For example: Failure to reference and/or cite adequately Copying segments of other students' assignment work False indication of contribution to group work Copying fragments of material from websites, book or other publications Recycling parts of previous assignments Resubmitting parts of previous assignments without the permission of the University Completing individual assessment tasks with peers	For example: Fabricated references or citations Significant amount of work copied (from students or other sources) Purchased assignment Selling, procuring or hawking examination materials and assessment items Stealing others' work Cheating in an examination Use of file swapping sites	
Extent of misconduct Amount or proportion of assessment item or work that is not the student's own. Extent to which the assessment process is compromised.	For example: A few paragraphs, or graphics Few elements of computer source code Selling, procuring or hawking a single exam question with a model answer or a portion of an assignment.	For example: A proportion or segment of the work Multiple segments of computer source code Selling, procuring or hawking a single exam paper, exam script or assignment.	For example: 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	
Experience of the student Relates to your expectation that the student should be aware of the seriousness of their actions.	For example: First year student, first trimester undergraduate student who has not previously attempted this type of assessment Early draft of dissertation/thesis	For example: Students after first trimester of program but before final year After completion of known instruction in avoiding plagiarism Mid-course dissertation/thesis drafts	For example: Final year, experienced student Where student is expected to fully understand and exhibit academic integrity Final dissertation/thesis drafts/submitted dissertation/thesis	
Intent of student Intentionality of the act	For example: 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 intent to cheat is unlikely or doubtful.	For example: Plagiarism appears intentional Intent to cheat is probable Two or more students involved Solicitation occurs among a group of students	For example: Plagiarism appears deliberate and planned Actions contravene clear instructions Intent to cheat is evident Solicitation is addressed broadly to students in a range of course/s or program/s with/ without commercial conditions and terms.	
Impact of the Misconduct Impact of the act on others	For example: The academic achievement of other students completing the assessment task; and/or the academic achievement of other students enrolled in the course are impacted.	For example The academic achievement of other students enrolled in the program and the reputation of the degree are impacted.	For example The reputation of the University is impacted.	