

ACADEMIC INTEGRITY POLICY (HE & VET)

1. Purpose and Objectives

1.1 This policy details the processes and procedures that maintain and promote academic integrity among Le Cordon Bleu Australia (LCBA) students and staff. It provides the management framework for the administration of student academic misconduct.

2. Scope

2.1 This policy applies to all LCBA staff and students enrolled in LCBA undergraduate higher education (HE) and vocational education (VET) programs.

2.2 It applies to all the academic activities in which staff and students engage, in particular all assessments submitted towards a result for a unit of study, including but not limited to written assessments, oral presentations, graphic presentations, group work and work integrated learning assignments.

3. Related Policies

- Assessment Policy (HE)
- Assessment Policy (VET)
- Academic Appeals Policy (VET)
- Enrolment Policy
- Privacy and Personal Information Policy
- Student Code of Conduct
- Complaints and Appeals Policy
- Work Integrated Learning Policy

4. Definitions

‘Academic integrity’ refers to undertaking academic activity in a responsible way to ensure information and ideas are generated and communicated in an honest and ethical way and that use of others’ ideas and writing are acknowledged.

‘Academic Integrity Officer (AIO)’ refers to an academic member of staff who manages cases of academic misconduct.

‘Academic misconduct’ refers to:

- plagiarism (see definition below),
- breaches of the examination procedures,
- presenting data that has been copied, falsified or in any way obtained improperly,
- including material in individual work that has involved significant assistance from another person, unless this is specifically allowed in the unit of study outline or assessment guidelines,

ACADEMIC INTEGRITY POLICY (HE & VET)

- providing assistance to a student in the presentation of individual work, unless this is specifically allowed in the unit of study outline or assessment guidelines,
- falsifying or misrepresenting academic records, or any other documents,
- providing assessments to other current or future students,
- using a writing service or individual to write assessments (irrespective if payment is made or not), and any other actions that contravene the principles of academic integrity.

‘Assessment’ is a process of gathering and evaluating evidence of a student’s performance to determine their achievement of the expected learning outcomes.

‘Assessment task’ refers to all forms of tasks set for assessment purposes, including a range of written and oral methods and practice or demonstration.

‘Contract cheating’ is a form of academic misconduct in which students employ or use a third party to undertake their assessed work for them.

‘Delivery partners’ refers to the institutions that provide teaching and assessment in LCBA’s education programs.

‘Examination’ refers to a form of assessment where a student is required to undertake a specified academic task within a specified period of time. The location of the examination and access to external assistance is regulated. LCBA examinations can be closed book, open book, or part-open book:

- closed book examinations do not allow students to bring any materials into the examination room. Students who are eligible for an agreed variation are entitled to bring the materials allowed as agreed,
- open book examinations allow students to bring all relevant materials into the examination room except books from the LCBA and/or delivery provider’s library,
- part-open book examinations allow students to bring materials into the examination room, as specified by the unit of study teacher and in the unit of study outline or assessment guidelines.

‘Learning and Teaching Quality Committee (LTQC)’ refers to the internal committee responsible for Le Cordon Bleu Australia’s higher education academic quality assurance processes, including policy development and review of academic policies.

‘Mark’ refers to a quantitative value, often expressed as a percentage, which is awarded for an assessment task.

‘Plagiarism’ refers to

- directly copying any material from electronic or print resources without acknowledging the source,
- closely paraphrasing sentences or whole passages without referencing the original work,

ACADEMIC INTEGRITY POLICY (HE & VET)

- submitting another student's work in whole or in part, unless this is specifically allowed in the unit of study outline,
- using another person's ideas, work or research data without acknowledgment,
- appropriating or imitating another's ideas unless this is specifically allowed in the unit of study outline,
- submitting a piece of work that has previously been submitted for assessment at LCBA or another education provider in whole or in part, unless allowed for in the unit of study assessment.

'Program Manager' refers to an academic staff member who is responsible for providing academic leadership of a program.

'Study Period' refers to a defined teaching and study period specified by a faculty for the completion of units of study.

'Unit' (Higher Education (HE)) refers to a component of a course of study having a discrete designated code and title in which students enrol and complete specific work requirements.

'Unit of competency' (Vocational Education and Training (VET)) is the specification of knowledge and skill, and the application of that knowledge and skill, to the standard of performance expected in the workplace. A unit of competency is the smallest unit that can be assessed and recognised.

'Unit of study' - a 'unit' (HE) or 'unit of competency' (VET).

'VET Quality Management Group' refers to the internal committee responsible for Le Cordon Bleu Australia's vocational education academic quality assurance processes, including policy development and review of academic policies.

5. Responsibilities

5.1 All academic staff are responsible for acting with academic integrity and upholding and promoting the values of academic integrity with students.

5.2 Lecturers are responsible for:

- educating students about academic integrity
- identifying possible breaches of academic integrity by students
- referring cases of possible breaches of academic integrity to the Academic Integrity Officer.

5.3 Academic Integrity Officers (AIOs) are responsible for:

- managing breaches of academic integrity as referred to them by lecturing staff by conducting an initial inquiry
- referring serious breaches of academic integrity to Program Managers for formal inquiry
- completing relevant records and providing to Program Managers and LCBA Student Services

ACADEMIC INTEGRITY POLICY (HE & VET)

- recording breaches of academic integrity on the Academic Misconduct Register.

5.4 Program Managers are responsible for:

- reviewing cases of breaches of academic integrity referred to them by AIOs
- participating in and overseeing formal inquiries into breaches of academic misconduct
- completing relevant records and providing to LCBA Student Services
- reporting breaches of academic integrity to the VET Quality Management Group (VQMG) or Learning and Teaching Quality Committee (LTQC).

5.5 Academic Integrity Panels are responsible for conducting formal inquiries into possible breaches of academic integrity.

5.6 LCBA Student Services is responsible for maintaining records of breaches of academic integrity on the student file.

5.7 The Chairs of the LTQC and VQMG are responsible for reporting academic integrity matters, including the implementation of this policy, to the Academic Board.

5.8 The Academic Board is responsible for overseeing the implementation of this policy.

6. Policy

6.1 Academic Integrity

6.1.1 LCBA is committed to fostering and preserving the scholarly values of curiosity, experimentation, critical appraisal and integrity. Students are expected to demonstrate the highest standards of academic integrity. Failure to demonstrate these standards may constitute academic misconduct.

6.1.2 Academic integrity cases will be managed as an educative process for students.

6.1.3 Information about academic integrity is made available to students in teaching material, through Academic Support (from the LCBA delivery partners), and in library resources.

6.2 Academic misconduct

6.2.1 LCBA acts to identify cases of academic misconduct and take appropriate action by following the procedures for Initial Inquiry and Formal Inquiry as detailed in this policy.

6.2.2 LCBA 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 extent of the misconduct,
- the student's evident intention,
- the stage/level of the program,
- the number of previous offences,

ACADEMIC INTEGRITY POLICY (HE & VET)

- the student's learning background,
- academic conventions within the relevant discipline,
- the impact of a particular outcome on a student's progression,
- information provided to the student about academic integrity as part of their unit of study,
- information about the student held in the central database, if applicable.

6.2.3 A breach of academic integrity may be deemed 'level 1 academic misconduct' or 'level 2 academic misconduct'

- 'level 1 academic misconduct' warrants an outcome equal to, or less serious than, failure of an assessment component of a unit of study with a zero score (HE) a result of Not Satisfactory (NS) (VET).
- 'level 2 academic misconduct' warrants an outcome more serious than failure of an assessment component of the unit of study with a zero score (HE) or a result of Not Satisfactory (NS) (VET).

6.3 Academic integrity declarations

6.3.1 All text-based assessments are required to be submitted via Turnitin unless explicitly waived by the LCBA LTQC or VQMG because the nature of the assessment task is not suitable for that form of submission.

6.3.2 Students declare that:

- they authorise LCBA to test any work submitted for assessment using Turnitin for instances of plagiarism,
- they understand this may involve LCBA or its delivery providers copying their work and storing it on a database to test work submitted by others.

6.3.3 Each time a student submits a piece of work for assessment he or she tenders a declaration that the work is his or her own, except where acknowledgment of sources is made; and that he or she has not previously submitted the work for another assessment at LCBA or another education provider, in whole or in part. This declaration also requires the student to confirm that they have read and understood this policy.

6.4 Each campus has at least one Academic Integrity Officer (AIO). These are academic staff who have undertaken professional development to manage cases of academic misconduct. Their role enables:

- consistent interpretation and implementation of policy,
- streamlined management of reportable instances of academic misconduct, up to the level of formal committees,
- management of alternative outcomes, for example referral to the academic support unit of study on each campus,
- consistent use of plagiarism detection tools in sampling and targeting student work,

ACADEMIC INTEGRITY POLICY (HE & VET)

- consistent judgments to be made on cases of academic misconduct,
- consistent outcomes when academic misconduct is proven,
- regular reporting to relevant Program Managers, Academic Committees and the LTQC/VQMG.

6.4.1 If required, the Dean or delegate may authorise another staff member to act as a delegate for the AIO for a period of time, or to manage a particular case. It is expected that the authorised nominee will have undertaken professional development to manage cases of academic misconduct within their discipline.

6.4.2 In the procedures relating to academic integrity outlined below an academic staff member nominated by the Dean, may act for the Dean.

7. Procedure

7.1 Initial inquiry

7.1.1 If a staff member suspects that a student has committed academic misconduct as defined in this policy, the staff member will discuss the issue with the campus AIO.

7.1.2 If the AIO believes the issue warrants further investigation, the AIO will notify the student of their concerns in writing within five working days, and request that the student attend a meeting with the AIO and the lecturer (optional) to discuss the issue. The meeting should occur within 10 working days of the initial notification. If the student is unable to attend the meeting, the discussion may occur via email or phone/internet communications.

7.1.3 The student must respond to the request for a meeting within five working days and attend meetings as requested by the AIO.

7.1.4 The student may be assisted or represented at the meeting by:

- an independent person, or
- a representative of the LCBA partner institution, or
- any LCBA staff member or student.

7.1.5 The AIO will decide on the most appropriate outcome, irrespective of whether the student chooses to participate in the initial inquiry.

7.1.6 The AIO may determine one of the following outcomes.

7.1.6.1 No academic misconduct was involved. No further action will be taken, and no information will be recorded in the central database.

7.1.6.2 Academic misconduct level 1 has occurred. The AIO will provide academic counselling to the student and may apply one of the following further outcomes:

- re-submission of the assessment task, or
- another outcome appropriate to the case but with an impact less serious than failure with a zero score (HE) or Not Satisfactory (VET) in the assessment component of the unit of study, or

ACADEMIC INTEGRITY POLICY (HE & VET)

- failure with a zero score (HE) or Not Satisfactory (VET), in the assessment component of the unit of study.

7.1.6.3 There is a strong likelihood that academic misconduct level 2 has occurred.

7.1.7 If the AIO determines that academic misconduct (level 1 or 2) has occurred, they will:

- record the case in the central database,
- provide a report to the student and the unit of study teacher within ten working days of the meeting with the student,
- provide a copy of the report to the relevant Student Services office to be retained on the student's file.

7.1.8 The student must advise the AIO in writing that they either accept or reject the proposed outcome within five working days from the date specified in the AIO's report. The student's failure to respond will not alter the outcome.

7.1.9 The student may accept the proposed outcome in writing at any time before a formal inquiry.

7.1.10 If the student rejects the proposed outcome, the AIO advises the Program Manager, provides them with a record of the initial inquiry and recommends that the Program Manager initiate a formal inquiry.

7.1.11 Cases of academic misconduct that do not relate to a particular unit of study are referred to the Program Manager to undertake a formal inquiry.

7.2 Formal inquiry

7.2.1 If, as a result of the preliminary investigation, the Program Manager finds that the student's actions constitute academic misconduct level 2, the Program Manager establishes a Panel consisting of:

- the Program Manager as chair,
- a member of academic staff nominated by the Program Manager and not involved in the unit(s) of study concerned,
- one other member of academic staff,
- a nominee of the Dean,
- Minute Taker.

7.2.2 The formal inquiry may proceed even if all members are not present, provided there is a quorum of three which must include the chair, the Dean (or nominee) and does not include the minute taker.

7.2.3 The academic staff member and/or AIO who initiated the case may present their concerns to the inquiry, but is not permitted to serve as a member of the committee.

7.2.4 The Program Manager will write to the student at least five working days before the formal inquiry is due to commence. The letter will:

ACADEMIC INTEGRITY POLICY (HE & VET)

- provide information about the alleged misconduct,
- invite the student to attend the inquiry,
- include a copy of the documentation that is provided to the formal inquiry committee,
- include a copy of this policy.

7.2.5 If the student is unable to attend in person, alternative options such as telephone, email or video conferencing communications may be considered.

7.2.6 The chair of the formal inquiry is responsible for ensuring that confidentiality is maintained where required.

7.2.7 The student may be assisted or represented at the inquiry by:

- an independent person, or
- a representative of the LCBA partner institution, or
- any LCBA staff member or student.

7.2.8 The formal inquiry may proceed whether or not the student responds or attends.

7.2.9 The formal inquiry may determine that:

- the student's actions do not constitute academic misconduct, and no further action will be taken. If the inquiry arose following the removal of a student from a placement, the student may be reinstated in the existing placement or arrangements made to undertake an alternative placement.
- the student's actions constitute academic misconduct level 1. The student is allowed to resubmit the assessment if re-submission is permitted in the unit of study, or another appropriate outcome is applied that is less serious than failure with a zero score (HE) or Not Satisfactory (VET) in the assessment component of the unit of study. Where appropriate, the matter will be referred back to the AIO for implementation. If the inquiry arose following the removal of a student from a placement, the student may be reinstated in the existing placement or arrangements made to undertake an alternative placement, following academic counselling from the AIO.
- the student's actions constitute academic misconduct level 2. The formal inquiry committee notifies the student in writing within five days of their decision to apply one of the following outcomes:
 - failure (HE) or a result of Not Competent (VET) in the unit of study, or
 - failure (HE) or a result of Not Competent (VET) and suspension from the course for a period not exceeding one year, or
 - suspension from LCBA for a period not exceeding three years, or
 - another outcome appropriate to the case but with an impact less serious than expulsion from LCBA, or

ACADEMIC INTEGRITY POLICY (HE & VET)

- expulsion from LCBA.
- 7.2.10 In cases of fraud, the matter may also be referred to police.
- 7.2.11 If the formal inquiry concludes that the action of the student warrants suspension from LCBA, the letter to the student includes advice that:
- re-admission to any program at LCBA will not normally be considered during the suspension
 - application for re-admission to LCBA will follow normal procedures and is not guaranteed, and
 - students who gain re-admission will be classified as new students for the purposes of assessing fees and eligibility for Commonwealth support or assistance.
- 7.2.12 The chair will communicate the outcome of the inquiry in writing to the following people, within five working days:
- the student
 - the relevant AIO
 - the unit of study teacher and Program Manager
 - the LCBA partner administration office to be retained on the student's file.
- 7.2.13 The Program Manager includes a copy of this policy in correspondence to the student, and advises the student of their right of appeal.
- 7.3 Appeals
- 7.3.1 The student has the right of appeal against the decision of the formal inquiry committee in accordance with the *Complaints and Appeals Policy*.
- 7.4 Recording information about academic misconduct
- 7.4.1 LCBA will store information about academic misconduct and breaches of examination procedures in a central database and in the student file. The information will be stored for a minimum period of seven years from the date of the last recorded incident.
- 7.4.2 If the AIO determines that no academic misconduct or breach of examination procedure occurred then no information will be recorded.
- 7.4.3 All AIOs will have access to information in the central database, for consideration when determining whether a student's actions constitute academic misconduct, and determining the appropriate outcome.
- 7.4.4 If an AIO determines that a student has breached an examination procedure but that the breach does not constitute academic misconduct, the following information will be recorded in the central database:
- details about the student, the program, the unit of study and the examination
 - the type of breach, and

ACADEMIC INTEGRITY POLICY (HE & VET)

- the counselling provided to the student.
- 7.4.5 If an AIO's initial inquiry determines that academic misconduct occurred, the following information will be recorded in the central database and/or the student file:
- details about the student, the program, the unit of study and the assessment task
 - the type of academic misconduct
 - the factors taken into consideration
 - the information on which the determination is based
 - the outcome and reasons for the outcome, and
 - whether the student agreed or rejected the proposed outcome.
- 7.4.6 If a case is referred to the Program Manager, the Program Manager has access to the information stored regarding the initial inquiry relating to that case, and to any other cases recorded against that student, in order to assist in their determination.
- 7.4.7 If the Program Manager concludes that the student's actions constituted academic misconduct, they record the outcome and the factors taken into consideration, in the central database and/or student file.
- 7.4.8 If a formal inquiry is convened, the committee has access to the information stored regarding the initial inquiry and to any other cases recorded against that student. The committee records its determination in the central database and/or student file, including:
- the factors taken into consideration in determining an outcome
 - the information on which the determination is based, and
 - the outcome, and reasons for that outcome.
- 7.4.9 If a student appeals the outcome of a formal inquiry, the person/s considering the appeal has access to the information stored in the database regarding the initial inquiry, the formal inquiry, and any other cases recorded against that student.
- 7.4.10 In addition to the information stored in the central database, copies of any decisions communicated to a student resulting from an investigation into academic misconduct or breaches of examination procedures must be provided to LCBA partner administration office to be retained on the student's file.

ACADEMIC INTEGRITY POLICY (HE & VET)

8. Change and Version Control

Version	Authored by	Description	Effective Date
1.0	Academic Director (MM)	New policy, replaces Academic Misconduct Policy	
2.0	National Academic Quality Manager	See comments in SharePoint Policy Review workflow	
2.1	National Academic Quality Manager	Correct formatting error in definition of 'Plagiarism'	
3.0	National Academic Quality Manager	'LCBA approved Advocacy Officer' changed to 'an independent person' Definition of 'assessment' revised	
3.1	National Academic Quality Manager	New statement 5.5.3 which enforces the student responsibility regarding an initial enquiry into academic integrity	
3.2	Academic Registrar (Acting)	Introduction of terminology 'academic misconduct level 1' and 'level 2' to differentiate the seriousness of misconduct cases	
4.0	Academic Registrar (Acting)	Academic Misconduct Policy (VET) replaced by revised version of the HE Academic Integrity Policy, which now applies to VET and HE.	5 th March 2019