

Academic Honesty Policy

1. Purpose

To ensure SIBT takes a consistent, equitable and transparent approach to academic honesty among its staff and students.

2. Application

This policy applies to all students and staff at SIBT.

3. Policy Statement

Academic honesty is an integral part of the core values and principles outlined in the SIBT Student Code of Conduct. Its fundamental principle is that all staff and students act with integrity in the creation, development, application and use of ideas and information. This means that:

- all academic work claimed as original is the work of the author making the claim;
- all academic collaborations are acknowledged;
- academic work is not falsified in any way; and
- when the ideas of others are used, these ideas are acknowledged appropriately.

The key principles of this policy are that SIBT will:

1. expect all students to do their academic work honestly;
2. use a range of approaches to educate students in the practice of honest academic work ;
3. take consistent and equitable action to manage dishonest behaviours by:
 - a) communicating that any piece of academic work can be checked at any time using an appropriate process;
 - b) applying a common penalty framework across the institute;
 - c) applying appropriate, consistent procedures for detecting and investigating alleged academic dishonesty; and
 - d) providing and communicating the appeal process.
 - e) model academic honesty in practice (eg referencing sources)
 - f) embed academic honesty in learning so students understand what is expected of them.

Examples of dishonest behaviours are contained in the Glossary.

4. Principles of Academic Honesty

Throughout their studies at SIBT, students are expected to conduct themselves in an honest and ethical manner and in accordance with accepted standards outlined in the SIBT Student Code of Conduct. Behaviour contrary to these standards, including plagiarism and deception, are understood to be academic misconduct. The approach taken by SIBT to academic honesty is one that is appropriate to a learning organisation, with equity, respect, fairness and responsibility the core values that underpin the learning environment. If a student is found to have breached standards of SIBT Student Code of Conduct they will be subject to penalties.

5. Promoting Academic Honesty

In fulfilling its commitment to promoting and maintaining the highest standards of academic integrity, SIBT will ensure that students are supported and encouraged to conduct themselves honestly. To support this:

- academic honesty is dealt with at every level from policy, through processes, to individual staff practices;
- academic expectations are explained to students during the orientation process;
- this policy is made available to all staff and students via the portal and reference to the policy is included in all Unit Outlines which are distributed and covered in the first week of class;
- discipline specific Academic Literacy units designed to develop appropriate academic communication skills and practices and to gain an increased understanding of the values that underpin academic culture are set as required units for all Diploma courses;
- plagiarism and collusion software is used for detection purposes;
- the importance of adhering to writing and referencing conventions is addressed by tutors/lecturers in conjunction with major written assessments;
- graduate capabilities or generic skills outcomes direct teaching and assessment and support teaching staff in educating students about effective communication, critical thinking, analysis and interpretation.

6. Determining Academic Misconduct and Penalties

Academic misconduct includes, but is not limited to, behaviours outlined in the glossary of this document. The Academic Working Committee is responsible for investigating reports of academic misconduct and deciding whether a penalty should be imposed. The Academic Working Committee consists of the Academic Manager, no less than two Program Convenors, the Director of Student Administration (or nominee) and any other suitable person appointed by the Academic Manager as required from time to time. The Academic Working Committee may delegate authority to investigate and decide penalties to any two of its members. A record of any penalties imposed will be recorded in the student's record.

The Academic Working Committee will impose penalties in accordance with the penalty framework outlined below and with the provision that:

- A second incidence of academic misconduct will be penalized more severely than the first incidence;
- A third incidence of academic misconduct may result in exclusion.

7. Penalty Framework

The Academic Working Committee shall look at each case and determine what level it fits into. The Academic Working Committee may decide that it does not fit any of the levels and close off the case informally.

Level	Penalty	Where one of the conditions listed below is met, the penalty for that level is the minimum to be applied.
1	One of: <input type="checkbox"/> Warning letter <input type="checkbox"/> Reduced mark for the assessment task	<input type="checkbox"/> First offence of plagiarism. <input type="checkbox"/> Unauthorised items or technology in exam room (may not have been used or not relevant to assessment task)

Level	Penalty	Where one of the conditions listed below is met, the penalty for that level is the minimum to be applied.
	<input type="checkbox"/> Required resubmission with reduced maximum mark issuance of a caution.	<input type="checkbox"/> any other misconduct that the committee considers deserves this level of penalty
2	Fail for assessment task (with mark of zero).	<input type="checkbox"/> Previous level 1 breach or <input type="checkbox"/> Final examination breach not otherwise escalated or <input type="checkbox"/> Second offence of plagiarism <input type="checkbox"/> Cases of copying and plagiarism in which more than 50% of the content of an assessment submission is not the work of the student. <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <input type="checkbox"/> which may have been unintentional, or <input type="checkbox"/> for which the student may have gained no or only minor advantage, or <input type="checkbox"/> where a student has been found carelessly assisting other students in academic misconduct, or <input type="checkbox"/> where assignments fail to meet acceptable standards of academic honesty, or <input type="checkbox"/> any other misconduct that the committee considers deserves this level of penalty
3	Fail for unit (with mark of zero).	<input type="checkbox"/> Previous level 2 breach <input type="checkbox"/> Third or more offence of plagiarism <input type="checkbox"/> Persuading or organising others into a breach of Policy <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <input type="checkbox"/> which has been intentional, or <input type="checkbox"/> where intentional assistance has been given to another student to act dishonestly, or <input type="checkbox"/> where examination rules have been breached regardless of whether unfair advantage has been obtained, or <input type="checkbox"/> where assignments significantly fail to meet acceptable standards of academic honesty, or <input type="checkbox"/> there has been a prior history of academic misconduct that was penalized at a lower level, or <input type="checkbox"/> any other misconduct that the committee considers deserves this level of penalty
4	Referral to the Academic Director for consideration (Exclusion from SIBT may be imposed.)	<input type="checkbox"/> Previous level 3 or 4 breach. <input type="checkbox"/> Buying or selling any component of an assessment task <input type="checkbox"/> Fraud, such as identity fraud in examinations. <input type="checkbox"/> Threatening or violent behaviour. <input type="checkbox"/> Any other misconduct that the committee considers deserves this level of penalty

8. Appeals

Students who wish to appeal this decision will need to provide proof that there was insufficient opportunity to present their case, or the process was not carried out in accordance with SIBT policy or procedure or the decision was made contrary to the evidence provided or there is new information or evidence available that has or has not previously been considered may appeal to the Appeals Committee. Appeals must be in writing and submitted to the Secretary of the Appeals Committee (Quality and Compliance Manager) no later than 10 working days from the time the decision was made and communicated to the student. The Appeals Committee will respond to such appeals within 10 working days of receiving the appeal.

4. Definitions

- *Plagiarism*

Using the work or ideas of another person and presenting this as your own without clear acknowledgement of the source of the work or ideas. This includes, but is not limited to, any of the following acts:

- a) copying out part(s) of any document or audio-visual material or computer code or website content without indicating their origins;
- b) using or extracting another person's concepts, results, or conclusions without acknowledgement;
- c) summarising another person's work without acknowledgement;
- d) submitting substantially the same final version of any material as another student in an assignment ;
- e) use of others (paid or otherwise) to conceive, research or write material submitted for assessment;
- f) submitting the same or substantially the same piece of work for two different tasks (self-plagiarism).

- *Deception*

Includes, but is not limited to, false indication of group contribution, false indication of assignment submission, collusion, submission of a work previously submitted, presenting collaborative work as one's own without acknowledging others' contributions, cheating in an examination or using others to write material for examination.

- *Sabotage*

Includes, but is not limited to, theft of work, destruction of library materials.

5. Related Documents

- Assessment Policy
- Grade Review Procedure
- Standard 13 of the National Code 2007
- Student Code of Conduct

Amendment History

Department:	Academic	
Approval Authority:	Academic Board	
Initial Approval Date:	27 February 2009	
Date for Next Review:	March 2019	
Revision Date		
Version	Summary of changes	
27/02/09	1	Original
04/05/10	2	Changed title from Academic Honesty & Integrity, levels of misconduct reduced to 3
29/11/10	3	Updated to show correct web links
06/10/11	4	Updated formatting in line with UPD
18/06/12	5	Added statement - <i>SIBT may commence applicable disciplinary procedures if a person to whom this policy applies breaches this policy (or any of its related procedures).</i>
09/11/12	6	Removed reference to Examination Process from related documents and changed Grade Review Process to Procedure
22/01/15	7	Reviewed and updated Penalty Framework Table
17/04/15	8	Reviewed and updated the appeals process to include the Appeals Committee. Clarified the Penalty Framework.
11/03/16	9	Updated and approved by Interim Academic Board