

# Policy and Procedure: Academic Integrity

Responsible Officer	Compliance Manager
Approved by	CEO
Last Reviewed	May 2017
Next Reviewed	May 2018

## 1. PURPOSE

**1.1 Scope:** The purpose of this policy is to ensure that the RTO meets the ASQA Standards for clause 1.8-2 Rules of Evidence, to ensure all work submitted by Learners is Authentic.

**1.2 Policy Scope:** This policy applies to all VET and accredited programs offered by the RTO.

## 2. AUDIENCE

**2.1 Who:** Individual Learners, Staff and consultants.

## 3. DEFINITIONS

<b>ASQA</b>	Australian Skills Quality Authority; national vocational education and training regulator.
<b>Learning</b>	Means the process followed by a learner. There are three types: a) <b>Formal learning</b> refers to learning that takes place through a structured program of instruction and is linked to the attainment of a formal qualification or award (for example, a certificate, diploma or university degree); b) <b>Non-formal learning</b> refers to learning that takes place through a structured program of instructions, but does not lead to the

	<p>attainment of a formal qualification or award (for example, in-house professional development programs conducted by a business); and</p> <p>c) <b>Informal learning</b> refers to learning that results through experience of work-related, social, family, hobby or leisure activities (for example the acquisition of interpersonal skills developed through several years as a sales representative).</p>
<b>RPL</b>	<p>Recognition of Prior Learning (RPL) means an assessment process that assesses the competency/s of an individual that may have been acquired through formal, non-formal and informal learning to determine the extent to which that individual meets the requirements specified in the training package or VET accredited courses.</p> <p>a) formal learning refers to learning that takes place through a structured program of instruction and is linked to the attainment of an AQF qualification or statement of attainment (for example, a certificate, diploma or university degree);</p> <p>b) non-formal learning refers to learning that takes place through a structured program of instruction, but does not lead to the attainment of an AQF qualification or statement of attainment (for example, in-house professional development programs conducted by a business); and</p> <p>c) informal learning refers to learning that results through experience of work-related, social, family, hobby or leisure activities (for example the acquisition of interpersonal skills developed through several years as a sales representative).</p>
<b>RTO</b>	Registered Training Organisation
<b>Student/Learner</b>	Means an individual who is receiving, responding to and processing information in order to acquire and develop competence. This incorporates the processes of preparing and presenting for assessment
<b>Training and assessment strategy</b>	Training and assessment strategies and practices are the approach of, and method adopted by, an RTO with respect to training and

	assessment designed to enable learners to meet the requirements of the training package or accredited course.
<b>Training Package</b>	Means the components of a training package endorsed by the Industry and Skills Council or its delegate in accordance with the Standards for Training Packages. The endorsed components of a Training Package are: units of competency; assessment requirements (associated with each unit of competency); qualifications; and credit arrangements. The endorsed components form part of the requirements that an RTO must meet under these Standards. A training package also consists of a non-endorsed, quality assured companion volume/s which contains industry advice to RTOs on different aspects of implementation.
<b>Units of competency</b>	Mean the specification of the standards of performance required in the workplace as defined in a training package.
<b>VET</b>	Vocational Education Training
<b>VIC Roads</b>	Victorian Roads Authority
<b>VWA</b>	Victorian WorkCover Authority

#### 4. POLICY STATEMENT

4.1 The values that underpin the AGB policy on academic integrity are honesty and responsibility on the part of students, staff and consultants. Any breach of the requirements of academic integrity are deemed as academic misconduct and this includes plagiarism, collusion, fabrication, falsification, double submission of work. This list is not exhaustive as there may be other forms of dishonest or irresponsible conduct which may be deemed as academic misconduct by AGB. Depending on the circumstances and the nature of the academic misconduct, consequences including penalties may be expected to follow.

4.1.1: Plagiarism: defined as submitting another person's words or ideas as one's own. This includes use of ideas, sentences, paragraphs, or other extracts from books, articles, and other published or unpublished work,

without acknowledging their sources. This means that unacknowledged use of quotations or ideas from materials including but not limited to books, articles, the internet, or another student's work is plagiarism.

4.1.2: Collusion: refers to a situation where a student advertently or inadvertently assists, or is assisted by, someone else with assessment work that should have been the work of an individual student. This includes a student giving or sharing an assessment with another student, making an assessment available to others for potential use, using an assessment written by someone else and writing an assessment together. Collusion comprises any way of submitting assessment work as if it reflects individual effort while in reality it includes the work of another person, as determined by AGB; hence, collusion includes 'ghost-writing'. It is not academic misconduct if the assessment instructions specifically identify the work as a group assessment; however, collusion occurs if two or more students fail to abide by directions from the assessor regarding the permitted level of collaboration on an assessment. Students must not publish their work or related AGB materials (such as publishing their assignments or assessment questions online or in chat rooms).

4.1.3: Fabrication: refers to results or data that does not exist and have been made up.

4.1.4: Falsification: refers to results or data that have been manipulated to reach a specific conclusion.

4.1.4: Double submission: This occurs when a student submits substantially the same piece of work for more than one subject unless agreed upon with the facilitators of the different subjects

## **5. RESPONSABILITIES OF THE RTO**

### 5.1 The RTO is responsible for:

- 5.1.1 Providing information about this policy via its website to all students and staff,
- 5.1.2 Providing access to resources that explain academic integrity,
- 5.1.3 Ensuring the materials provided to students advise them of the assessment methods, clearly identifying when an assessment is a group assessment (since the standard assessments are individual assessments) and explain what level of collaboration is appropriate for work that is a group assessment,
- 5.1.4 Ensuring consistent and equitable application of this policy,
- 5.1.5 Ensuring timely investigation of allegation of academic misconduct,
- 5.1.6 Providing access to an appeal process.

### 5.2 AGB Trainers and assessors are responsible for:

- 5.2.1 Being familiar with the AGB policies and procedures in relation to academic integrity;
- 5.2.2 Appropriately acknowledging the work of others in the delivery of training;

5.2.3 Providing students with appropriate guidance and feedback on academic integrity;

5.2.4 Designing assessment tasks that minimise the potential for academic misconduct.

5.3 The CEO (or nominee) is responsible for:

5.3.1 Ensuring that staff understand their responsibilities under this policy

5.3.2 Taking steps to ensure that the policy is implemented

5.4 Students are responsible for:

5.4.1 Familiarising themselves with this policy and complying with it

5.4.2 Seeking additional assistance if in doubt about any aspects of what is required.

## **6. PROCEDURES FOR ACADEMIC MISCONDUCT BY STUDENTS**

6.1 Allegation of plagiarism, collusion, falsification, fabrication and double submission with respect to assessments

6.1.1 For the purpose of this section 6.1, AGB identifies three levels of academic misconduct as follows:

6.1.1.1 Minor Academic Misconduct – this refers to any instances of academic misconduct which the CEO (or nominee) deems it to be a minor breach of this Academic Integrity Policy (or any such

academic misconduct rules). Examples may include (but are not limited to) minor plagiarism or a first instance of academic integrity breach:

6.1.1.2 Moderate Academic Misconduct – this refers to any instance of academic misconduct which the CEO (or nominee) deems to be a moderate breach of this Academic Integrity Policy (or any such academic misconduct rules). Examples may include (but are not limited to) moderate plagiarism or collusion, or the second breach of academic integrity:

6.1.1.3 Major Academic Misconduct – this refers to any instance of academic misconduct which the CEO (or nominee) deems to be a major breach of this Academic Integrity Policy (or any such academic rules). Examples may include (but are not limited to) the following:

- (a) Third breach of academic integrity;
- (b) Major plagiarism;
- (c) Any serious case of collusion, double submission, fabrication or falsification.

6.1.2 When an assessor believes that a student may be involved in a case of academic misconduct (“Case”), they must collate any evidence and recommend the alleged level of academic misconduct or plagiarism.

- 6.1.3 The CEO (or Nominee) will determine whether the Case amounts to academic misconduct. If it is deemed to not amount to academic misconduct an appropriate note is to be made in the student management system. If it does amount to academic misconduct, the CEO (or nominee) shall determine the level of the academic misconduct (taking into account relevant factors including but not limited to, the exact nature of the alleged plagiarism or collusion, the extent of the student's academic experience, the student's previous record of academic misconduct) and action to take.
- 6.1.4 The CEO (or nominee) will determine in their absolute discretion the appropriate penalty to be applied, according to the categories below:
- 6.1.4.1 If the Case is deemed to be Minor Academic Misconduct, the student may be issued with a warning and/or the assessment may be required to redone.
- 6.1.4.2 If the Case is deemed to be Moderate Academic Misconduct, the assessment will need to be redone and resubmitted.
- 6.1.4.3 If the Case is deemed to be a Major Academic Misconduct, the assessment will need to be redone or the student may be withdrawn from the course as Not Yet Competent.
- 6.1.5 In cases of severe or ongoing breaches of academic integrity (of any type and any level), the CEO (or nominee) may withdraw the student. If such a decision is made, then all fees paid by or on behalf of the student to date will be forfeited and the student will not be permitted to continue with their course or later return to undertake the course.



6.1.6 Students who receive any warnings for academic misconduct are encouraged to arrange for a student support session with their trainer/assessor at an AGB Campus. Students are entitled to appeal the allegation or the process in accordance with the Grievance policy.

## **7. PROCEUDRES FOR ACADEMIC MISCONDUCT BT STAFF OR CONSULTANTS**

7.1 Academic misconduct by staff (whether full-time, part-time or sessional) or consultants is a serious transgression. Alleged academic misconduct is investigated by the CEO (or nominee). Where misconduct is confirmed, the matter is forwarded to the Human Resource Department.

7.2 Confirmed and intentional academic misconduct is likely to lead to termination of employment at or contract with AGB.

## **8. RECORDING OF ACADEMIC MISCONDUCT**

8.1 A record of all alleged and proven breaches of academic integrity will be maintained by AGB in the student management system or another confidential location.

8.2 The CEO (or nominee) shall arrange for an appropriate note (including details of the alleged misconduct, action taken and penalty applied) to be made in the student management system.

8.3 Access to information in these records in the student management system is restricted.

8.4 Where an allegation of academic misconduct is found to be substantiated, this information will not be printed on the student transcripts.

8.5 Students are entitled to have access to view a copy of any entries relating to their academic misconduct on the student management system.

## **9. REFERENCES**

1. Australian Qualification Framework (AQF) and its Policies
2. Standards for Registered Training Organisations (RTOs) 2015
3. ASQA General directions
4. Education Services for Overseas Students Act 2000
5. Education Services for Overseas Students Regulations 2001
6. National Code of Practice for Registration Authorities and Providers of Education and Training to Overseas Student 2007
7. VET Funding Contract Victorian Training Guarantee Program
8. Vic Roads Training Standards
9. WorkSafe Training Standards