

Student Breaches of Academic Integrity

1.0 Purpose

2.0 Scope

3.0 Procedure

3.1 Understanding academic integrity breaches | 3.2 Academic integrity breach process | 3.3 Process: Less serious matters and more serious matters | 3.4 Possible outcomes | 3.5 Advising the student of their outcome | 3.6 Reviews and appeals | 3.7 Recording of outcomes and readmission

4.0 Definitions

5.0 Information

6.0 Related policy documents and supporting documents

1.0 Purpose

This procedure supports the *Student Academic Integrity Policy* and *Student Conduct, Safety and Wellbeing Policy* by providing a formal framework for managing student breaches of academic integrity, some of which constitute Academic Misconduct.

Additionally, students who fall within the scope of this procedure may also need to familiarise themselves with and adhere to the University's expectation for academic integrity and code of practice requirements relevant to their program of study. For example, students engaging in research are required to adhere to the Australian Code for the Responsible Conduct of Research 2018 and the University's *Responsible Conduct of Research Policy*. Students with a professional practice component to their studies will need to adhere to professional practice standards for their field.

Where a matter is consistent with the following, it is defined as Academic Misconduct:

- a student is in breach of the expected academic integrity behaviours outlined in the *Student Academic Integrity Policy* and the *Student Conduct Policy*, and
- the matter does not fall within the definition of Incomplete Academic Practice as defined in the *Student Academic Integrity Policy*.

2.0 Scope

This procedure applies to all students of the University in all career levels, modes of study and locations, physical or digital, undertaking academic work/practice towards the completion of their program or, more generally, under the auspices of the University.

For the purpose of this procedure, the term 'student' includes:

- all enrolled students and Higher Degree by Research (HDR) candidates at the University
- students with Active Enrolment Status, including those who are not 'carrying load' and students on approved leave, including leave of absence, deferment or between enrolment periods.

This procedure also applies to graduates of the University, where the University is considering revocation of an award or preventing future enrolments by a person due to Academic Misconduct uncovered after graduation. Please note that penalties other than revocation of award or prevention of future enrolment are not available for Academic Misconduct committed by graduates while they were students.

If an allegation is raised regarding a graduate of the University or a student on leave of absence from the University, the student will be notified and provided with an opportunity to respond. The University may make a finding and revoke an award without a graduate's participation in the process.

3.0 Procedure

3.1 Understanding academic integrity breaches

3.1.1 General principles

1. Academic integrity means acting with the values of honesty, trust, fairness, respect, responsibility and courage in learning. It is important for students to act honestly, be responsible for their actions, and show fairness in every part of their work.
2. Breaching academic integrity can be considered either Incomplete Academic Practice or Academic Misconduct. Incomplete Academic Practice is outlined in the *Student Academic Integrity Policy*.
3. It is important to note that students who are found to display Incomplete Academic Practice have failed to meet the required academic integrity requirements but have not committed Academic Misconduct.
4. All staff members involved in an alleged Academic Misconduct matter, whether as a Decision-maker, complainant or in any other capacity, must adhere to the principles of procedural fairness outlined in the *Student Conduct, Wellbeing and Safety Policy*.
5. The principles of confidentiality bind all Decision-makers. Details of an allegation and all supporting information, the investigation, and the correspondence should be maintained securely and restricted to the persons who need to know to carry out their role in the process.
6. The standard of proof for all Decision-makers is the balance of probabilities. A Decision-maker will make a finding of a breach of academic integrity if they are satisfied on balance that it is more likely than not that the alleged Academic Misconduct took place. The onus of proof rests with the University.

3.1.2 What conduct amounts to a breach of academic integrity?

7. The *Student Academic Integrity Policy* outlines and defines the types of conduct that constitute breaches of academic integrity. It also defines the types of conduct that will always be considered Academic Misconduct if substantiated.
8. The University's response to dealing with instances of student Academic Misconduct is based on the seriousness of the Academic Misconduct. Six factors are considered in determining the seriousness of an act of Academic Misconduct:
 - a. type of Academic Misconduct
 - b. extent of the Academic Misconduct
 - c. experience of the student (i.e., the student's academic career level, including any cultural differences in their prior education)
 - d. intent of the student
 - e. impact of the Academic Misconduct
 - f. the extent of the issue and its importance in the context of the piece of assessment or research work.

3.1.3 Types of breach of academic integrity

1. Less serious Academic Misconduct may be:
 - a. minor
 - b. due to poor judgement or inexperience

- c. a first offence that is limited in its extent
 - d. where there are no serious consequences arising from the Academic Misconduct
 - e. where the student can easily take remedial action to rectify the situation.
- 2. More serious Academic Misconduct may be:
 - a. deliberate with an intent to deceive
 - b. where the Academic Misconduct is considered extensive
 - c. where it is not a first instance of Academic Misconduct
 - d. where there are serious consequences arising from the Academic Misconduct, such as adverse effects on research participants
 - e. failure to appropriately remediate less serious Academic Misconduct.

3.2 Academic integrity breach process

3.2.1 Responding to Incomplete Academic Practice

- 3. Where an incident of Incomplete Academic Practice is identified, the breach should be addressed through the normal feedback processes in place.
- 4. Staff should consider:
 - f. The stage that the student is in with their studies and/or cultural differences in their prior education. Early in their academic career, students are more likely to display Incomplete Academic Practice without intent to deceive, as they are still learning the expectations and forms required for correct citation.
 - g. Whether there has been a genuine, although inadequate or incorrect, attempt to acknowledge sources.
 - h. The context of the student's study and practices among the cohort generally (e.g. is sharing of work commonplace, for instance, where many of the student's other coursework assessment items are part of a team-based activity).

3.2.2 Reporting and triaging an allegation of Academic Misconduct

- 1. Those with a concern of possible Academic Misconduct should:
 - i. **For Coursework Students:** outline the concern and provide materials to the Course Convenor, who is responsible for entering the concern and its supporting documentation into the Student Academic Integrity Management System. Supporting materials include but are not limited to:
 - a scanned copy of the relevant annotated coursework assessment item
 - a text matching report and/or
 - other relevant evidence.
 - j. **For HDR candidates:** outline the concern and provide associated materials to the Dean (Research), who is responsible for referring the matter to the Senior Manager HDR Operations, Griffith Graduate Research School (GGRS). If the GGRS identifies that the matter potentially involves a breach of research integrity, it may be referred to the University's *Research Integrity Breach Investigation Procedure* rather than being considered as part of the Academic Integrity process.
- 2. Cases will be referred to Decision-makers outlined in 3.2.3. Decision-makers may appoint a delegate to investigate a case on their behalf.

3. For Coursework Student cases deemed as less serious allegations, the Course Convenor can immediately progress to investigation upon entering the data as outlined in 3.3.1.

3.2.3 Decision-makers in Academic Misconduct matters

Decision-makers for Academic Misconduct cases for Coursework Students (including HDR candidates undertaking the coursework component of an HDR program) and Academic Misconduct within the research component of an HDR program are detailed in the table below.

COURSEWORK STUDENTS

DECISION-MAKER	TYPE OF BREACH
Course Convenor	Less serious allegations of Academic Misconduct.
Dean (Learning and Teaching)	more serious allegations of Academic Misconduct and/or allegations of Academic Misconduct referred by the Course Convenor and/or cases where the student seeks a review of the Course Convenor's decision.

HDR CANDIDATES

DECISION-MAKER	TYPE OF BREACH
Dean (Research)	Less serious allegations of Academic Misconduct.
Dean Griffith Graduate Research School	more serious allegations of Academic Misconduct and/or allegations of Academic Misconduct referred by the Dean (Research) and/or findings of an evaluation conducted under the <i>Research Integrity Breach Investigation Procedure</i> into an allegation of a breach by a candidate allegations of Academic Misconduct involving a thesis under examination or raised by a party external to the University.

3.3 Process: Less serious matters and more serious matters

3.3.1 Less serious matters

1. Staff managing less serious matters will provide written notice to the student with a copy to the Head of Element for Coursework Students or Senior Manager, HDR Operations GGRS and the supervisory team for HDR candidates.
2. Staff should issue the written notice (which may also be supported by face-to-face, videoconference or telephone conversations) using the appropriate template, which may be edited as necessary. The communication must include the following:

- k. details of the student conduct that represents a possible act of Academic Misconduct
 - l. whether the student's alleged conduct involves the Misrepresentation of the Student's Identity or Activities and/or undermines the core values of academic integrity
 - m. whether the student's alleged conduct falls within one of the listed categories of Academic Misconduct (as outlined in the *Student Academic Integrity Policy*)
 - n. whether the student is required to respond to the written notice in writing and/or appear before the Decision-maker (when a student is required to appear before the Decision-maker, they must be informed of their option to be accompanied by a support person, noting the role of the support person is to provide support and not to act as a legal representative)
 - o. a timeframe of 10 working days from the date of the written notice to respond to the Decision-maker
 - p. links to the *Student Academic Integrity Policy* and this *Procedure*
 - q. copies of, or an opportunity for the student to inspect, all relevant documents under consideration
 - r. advice on the outcomes and potential consequences if, on investigation, the matter is referred to a more serious Decision-maker.
3. If a meeting occurs between the student and the less serious Decision-maker, a record must be made of the conversation. A note taker may be used, but the Decision-maker must agree on the notes. This record and any correspondence from the student are entered into the Student Academic Integrity Management System for Coursework Students or recorded centrally by the GGRS for HDR candidates.
4. If a student does not respond within the timeframe and the matter remains a less serious matter, then the less serious Decision-maker reaches a decision, selects an outcome from the available options in Table 2 (clause 3.4), and records the result. This is recorded in the Student Academic Integrity Management System for Coursework Students or by the GGRS for HDR candidates. Following an investigation, if the less serious Decision-maker in a coursework matter decides that the case is actually a more serious case, they should refer their finding back to the relevant triage officer for reassignment and management as per clause 3.2.2.

3.3.2 More serious matters

- 5. If the less serious Decision-maker, after completing the investigation, decides that the case is actually a more serious case, the case will be reassigned to a more serious Decision-maker. The student must be advised that the matter is being referred and of the potential outcomes, including the possibility of exclusion from the University.
- 6. The more serious Decision-maker may reach a decision based on the previous investigation or may choose to initiate or appoint a delegate to undertake further investigations.
- 7. If a matter is triaged as potentially more serious from the outset and is assigned to a more serious Decision-maker, that Decision-maker will issue the written notice, stating all the same elements as for a less serious matter but with the addition that the student must also be informed of the potential outcomes, including the possibility of exclusion from the University and or loss of their scholarship.
- 8. The more serious Decision-maker will then follow all the procedural fairness rules as those provided to investigate less serious matters, including giving the student the opportunity to respond and the approach to managing students' failure to respond.

9. In the case of an allegation of Academic misconduct involving an HDR thesis under examination, the Dean Griffith Graduate Research School may also request that the examination panel cease examination, pending the outcome of the allegation. The HDR candidate will be advised that the examination process has been suspended while the allegation is investigated.

3.4 Possible Outcomes

1. For Incomplete Academic Practice, as well as less serious and more serious misconduct, the range of outcomes available to the Decision-maker is listed in 3.4.2.
2. The Decision-maker may conclude that the student has not engaged in Academic Misconduct. Decision-makers may apply a lower-level penalty. For instance, a Decision-maker considering a more serious matter may apply a penalty available to less serious cases and/or educative interventions, including those applicable to Incomplete Academic Practice.
3. Following the recording of a decision, the Decision-maker may be able to view any other recorded breaches of academic integrity by the student. Based on this information, they can revise the outcome/s for the student or retain the entered outcomes.

3.4.1 Suspension (not more than six months) as a penalty

1. Where a Decision-maker in a more serious matter concerning a student wishes to impose a Suspension for a period not exceeding six months, the Decision-maker needs to consider the nature of the Academic Misconduct with the impact of the Suspension on the student's ability to complete their study or project in a timely manner including where there are visa and scholarships impacts. The following scenarios may apply:
 - a. **Immediate Suspension and cancellation of enrolment without academic or financial penalty:** The Suspension may cause the cancellation of a Coursework Student's enrolment in one, several or all courses for the trimester/teaching period with no fail grades recorded and without liability for tuition fees, student contribution or loss of scholarship.
 - b. **Immediate Suspension and cancellation of enrolment with academic and financial penalty:** The Suspension may cause the cancellation of a Coursework Student's enrolment in one, several or all courses for the trimester/teaching period with fail grades and with full fee liability or loss of scholarship. This penalty is applicable where the student has already effectively ceased studying a course(s), such that the student will be awarded fail grades.
 - In this situation, the Academic Misconduct should not remove the grade(s) associated with course assessment marks already completed unless they are part of the breach.
 - c. **Immediate Suspension of HDR candidate enrolment:** The Suspension will cause the cessation of research activities for the Suspension period and will not be counted towards the period of candidature for the degree. The Decision-maker will notify candidates of any impacts on their studies resulting from the Suspension period and determine if scholarship holders have their scholarship payments suspended.
 - d. **Suspension in the next trimester/teaching period:** The student is permitted to complete the current trimester/teaching period's enrolment or research activities but is prohibited from enrolling in certain or all courses or undertaking certain research activities in the next.
2. In all cases, the advice of the Suspension must be conveyed to Student Integrity who will liaise as appropriate with Student and Academic Services, the Griffith Graduate Research School and Griffith International to apply the Suspension.

3. Note that applying a Suspension to an international student may affect their student visa. If a Decision-maker wishes to impose a Suspension on an international student, please contact Student Integrity.

3.4.2 Outcomes of breaches of academic integrity

The available outcomes are detailed in the table below.

COURSEWORK STUDENTS

INCOMPLETE ACADEMIC PRACTICE (NOT MISCONDUCT)	LESS SERIOUS MATTERS (ACADEMIC MISCONDUCT)	MORE SERIOUS MATTERS (SERIOUS ACADEMIC MISCONDUCT)
EDUCATIVE AND TEACHING RESPONSES <ul style="list-style-type: none"> provide verbal or written feedback to the student explaining where academic integrity has been breached refer the student to University resources and guides on developing good academic practice deduct the marks allocated in the marking rubric for correct referencing, explaining why (note: mark deduction must only affect the portion of the mark that is allocated for referencing or citation, for example, 10%) if Incomplete Academic Practice is evident throughout the cohort, devote some class time before the next assessment to clarify academic integrity expectations. 	EDUCATIVE INTERVENTIONS AND WARNINGS <ul style="list-style-type: none"> give the student a warning require the student to seek appropriate study skills advice from the Library require the student to undertake the academic integrity Student Tutorial within one month of receiving the letter from a Decision-maker advising them to do so allocate a mark for the student's assessment item based on the portion of the assessment item unaffected by the Academic Misconduct allow the student to resubmit the assessment item to achieve a mark no higher than a "Pass" for the item allow the student to undertake a re-attempt assessment item to achieve a mark no higher than a "Pass" for the item and/or require the student to undertake a supplementary assessment to be awarded a grade no higher than a "4" for the course. 	EDUCATIVE INTERVENTIONS <ul style="list-style-type: none"> require the student to exclude the affected work from an honours/postgraduate coursework dissertation/thesis and/or require the student to rewrite an honours/postgraduate coursework dissertation/thesis in a specified timeframe PENALTIES <ul style="list-style-type: none"> a "ZAI" zero mark for the assessment item affected by the Academic Misconduct a grade of 3 or less for the course in which the Academic Misconduct occurred Suspension from attending all or any specified classes for a specified period not exceeding six months and/or exclusion from the University.

HDR CANDIDATES

INCOMPLETE ACADEMIC PRACTICE (NOT MISCONDUCT)	LESS SERIOUS MATTERS (ACADEMIC MISCONDUCT)	MORE SERIOUS MATTERS (SERIOUS ACADEMIC MISCONDUCT)
<p>EDUCATIVE RESPONSES</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> provide verbal or written feedback to the candidate explaining where academic integrity has been breached refer the candidate to University resources and guides on developing good academic practice instruct the candidate to undertake additional training or counselling to prevent further occurrences. 	<p>EDUCATIVE INTERVENTIONS AND WARNINGS</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> provide the student with a warning together with advice about what is acceptable academic conduct instruct the student to undertake any remedial action to rectify the situation (this may include the need to revise the research work) instruct the student to undertake additional training or counselling to prevent further occurrences. 	<p>EDUCATIVE INTERVENTIONS</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> rectify the situation by redoing or revising, and resubmitting the research work or carrying out the research (this may include the need for additional data collection) require the candidate to revise and resubmit the HDR thesis in a specified timeframe and/or another educational response appropriate to the case. <p>PENALTIES</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Suspension or termination of a University scholarship Suspension or restriction of the candidate's access to specified research facilities or activities for a specified period termination of the candidate's candidature exclusion from the University record a fail outcome for the thesis.

3.5 Advising the student of their outcome

1. Once an Academic Misconduct matter has been decided, the student must be informed of the result.
2. A closure letter is issued by the Decision-maker, which must include the following:
 - a. details of the conduct
 - b. the findings as to whether the student has or has not engaged in student Academic Misconduct
 - c. the reasons for the decision
 - d. the educational or (if relevant) penalty response/s applied

- e. potential serious consequences of subsequent breaches, where applicable
- f. references to the *Student Conduct, Wellbeing and Safety Policy*, this *Procedure* and the *Student Academic Integrity Policy*
- g. the process to seek a review or appeal (if applicable) of the decision
- h. a notification that if a student seeks admission to a Legal Practitioner's Admission Board, they must disclose a Breach of Academic Integrity.

3.6 Reviews and Appeals

Students who have a finding made of Academic Misconduct may be entitled to a review and, in some situations, appeal their outcome as outlined in the *Student Review and Appeals Policy and Procedure*.

3.7 Recording of outcomes and readmission

- 3. Only "Exclusion from the University" penalties are recorded on the student's Official Academic Transcript. The Official Academic Transcript will bear the annotation "excluded from the University on (date) for disciplinary reasons".
- 4. All educational interventions and penalties are recorded on the Student Academic Integrity Management System for Coursework Students or by the GGRS for HDR candidates.
- 5. A student excluded on disciplinary grounds may apply for readmission three years from the date specified in the notation on the Official Academic Transcript. Coursework Students may apply for readmission to the Deputy Vice Chancellor (Education) via lodgement of a Request for Readmission form. HDR candidates may apply for readmission to the Deputy Vice Chancellor (Research) via email. Decisions on readmission are final.

4.0 Definitions

Academic Misconduct, whether intentional or negligent, encompasses behaviour:

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

Active Enrolment Status refers to a student who has:

- accepted an offer of admission to a program and shall have completed the enrolment procedures prescribed by the University
- paid such fees and charges as the University may require to be paid as a condition of enrolment
- fulfilled the conditions prescribed for Commonwealth supported students, in the case of a student admitted to a program as a Commonwealth supported student and
- completed any other procedures which may be required as a condition of enrolment.

Coursework Students are those enrolled at the University in a program of teaching and learning that leads to the acquisition of skills and knowledge and does not include a major research component. Bachelor's programs and postgraduate coursework programs are all coursework programs.

Decision-maker refers to academic and professional staff who, through their role or position, are authorised as the responsible officer within a University policy or delegation schedule to make decisions about those matters.

Higher Degree by Research (HDR) refers to a Research Masters or Research Doctorate where:

- Research Masters means a Level 9 qualification as described in the AQF and where a minimum of two-thirds of the program of learning is for research, research training and independent study.
- Research Doctorate means a Level 10 qualification as described in the AQF and where a minimum of two years of the program of learning, and typically two-thirds of the qualification, is research.

Incomplete Academic Practice occurs when:

- a student makes a genuine attempt to reference their work but has inadequate referencing skills or
- a student early in their academic career displays a lack of awareness that the content used should be cited (e.g. using verbatim content from course note materials or their own notes of a lecturer's material that use phrases without acknowledgement) or
- a student reuses their own original work for an assessment item that has previously been presented for assessment, at Griffith or elsewhere, without acknowledgment, whilst not understanding that this is not permitted or
- a student shares material with another student in a spirit of collegiality without being aware that such sharing may amount to collusion.

Misrepresentation of the Student's Identity or Activities occurs when a student:

- presents an untrue statement about attendance or participation in any learning activities
- includes citations to non-existent or incorrect sources
- does not disclose any information or matter where there is a duty to disclose such information.

It includes submitting falsified documentation in support of an assessment application (assessment extension, deferred assessment, special consideration).

Suspension can mean the Suspension of access to services and/or campuses or of enrolment.

5.0 Information

Title	Student Breaches of Academic Integrity Procedure
Document number	2024/0000021
Purpose	<p>This procedure supports the <i>Student Academic Integrity Policy</i> and <i>Student Conduct, Safety and Wellbeing Policy</i> by providing a formal framework for managing student breaches of academic integrity, some of which constitute Academic Misconduct.</p> <p>Additionally, students who fall within the scope of this procedure may also need to familiarise themselves with and adhere to the University's expectation for academic integrity and code of practice requirements relevant to their program of study. For example, students engaging in research are required to adhere to the Australian Code for the Responsible Conduct of Research 2018 and the University's <i>Responsible Conduct of Research Policy</i>. Students with a professional practice component to their studies will need to adhere to professional practice standards for their field.</p> <p>Where a matter is consistent with the following, it is defined as Academic Misconduct:</p>

- a student is in breach of the expected academic integrity behaviours outlined in the *Student Academic Integrity Policy* and the *Student Conduct Policy*, and
- the matter does not fall within the definition of Incomplete Academic Practice as defined in the *Student Academic Integrity Policy*.

Audience	Students
----------	----------

Category	Academic
----------	----------

Subcategory	Learning & Teaching
-------------	---------------------

UN Sustainable Development Goals (SDGs)	This document aligns with Sustainable Development Goal/s: 4: Quality Education
---	---

Approval date	18 March 2024
---------------	---------------

Effective date	Trimester 1 2024
----------------	------------------

Review date	2029
-------------	------

Policy advisor	Registrar
----------------	-----------

Approving authority	Vice Chancellor
---------------------	-----------------

6.0 Related Policy Documents and Supporting Documents

Legislation	Australian Code for the Responsible Conduct of Research 2018 Higher Education Standards Framework (Threshold Standards) 2021
-------------	---

Policy	Admission Policy Assessment Policy Higher Degree by Research Policy Student Charter Framework Student Conduct, Wellbeing and Safety Policy Student Critical Incident Management Policy
--------	---

Student Review and Appeals Policy
Responsible Conduct of Research Policy

Procedure

Academic Progress Procedure
Higher Degree by Research Academic Decisions Schedule
Higher Degree by Research Academic Progress Procedure
Research Integrity Breach Investigation Procedure
Staff Direction: Identifying and Preventing Breaches of Academic Integrity
Student General Conduct Procedure
Student Review and Appeals Procedure

Local Protocol

Student Academic Integrity Management System

Form

Readmission After Exclusion form
