



## Academic Misconduct Policy

### Purpose:

Evolution Hospitality Institute (“EHI”) upholds the principle of academic integrity and independently achieved intellectual enquiry. Failure to comply with this principle will result in appropriate and recorded sanctions based on the extent of the breach.

The Academic Misconduct Policy provides guidelines for EHI academic staff and students on the procedures for handling allegations of academic misconduct.

EHI will ensure that:

- (a) Students maintain academic integrity and not claim ownership of concepts or ideas of another person without incurring consequences.
- (b) All reported incidences of academic misconduct will go through a published process with clearly defined lines of communication to ascertain validity of claims of academic misconduct and appropriate consequences.
- (c) Students will be entitled to representation (not including legal) at all stages of the process of determining academic misconduct.
- (d) All allegations of academic misconduct will be assessed under impartial conditions to ensure fair and equitable outcomes.
- (e) All allegations of academic misconduct will be recorded on student files where appropriate.
- (f) Staff and students will be made aware of the Academic Misconduct Policy through induction, orientation and handbooks

### Definitions:

#### **Academic Misconduct**

Involvement in cheating, plagiarism or any other conduct that deliberately or inadvertently claims ownership of an idea or concept without acknowledging the source of the information.

#### **Allegation**

A reported suspicion of academic misconduct with supporting evidence that requires investigation.

#### **Appeal**

A process whereby a student can formally request further investigation into a decision to possibly change an outcome.

#### **Breach**

Where a student has knowingly or unintentionally failed to abide by the guidelines set down by the Institute.

**Cheating**

Includes, but is not limited to, copying the work of another under any assessment condition without the other person's knowledge; copying the work of another under any assessment condition with the other person's knowledge; unauthorised collaboration of assessment tasks; speaking under exam conditions; leaving exam papers exposed under exam conditions that enables others to view the contents; bringing in concealed notes under exam conditions that have been expressly prohibited; receiving answers from another person under exam conditions that have been expressly prohibited.

**Collusion**

Where two or more students incite, facilitate and conceal involvement in cheating and/or plagiarism.

**Course Implications**

Implications as a result of the process or proven evidence of academic misconduct such as suspension, expulsion, loss of student visa, workplace involvement, etc.

**Expulsion**

Where a student has been found guilty of a serious breach and has had their studies cancelled at the Institute.

**Major Breach**

A major breach would constitute an intentional act to deceive or willingly participating in an intentional act to deceive and has serious consequences.

**Minor Breach**

A minor breach would constitute an unintentional act to deceive which has minor impact and can be rectified with appropriate consequences.

**Plagiarism (intentional)**

Involves intentionally submitting/presenting work that is done by another person without referencing the source of the information with the intention to take undue credit. This could involve complete or partial information.

**Plagiarism (unintentional)**

Involves unintentionally submitting/presenting work that is done by another person without adequately referencing the source of the information without the intention to take undue credit or deceive trainers.

**Representative**

A person (not legal) who provides support for the student during an investigation and interview process.

**Representative Institute Staff**

In cases of a serious breach of academic misconduct, senior academic staff, such as the Head of Studies, will also be involved in the investigation. Other cases may require a second academic staff member to be in attendance at the direction of the Head of Studies.

## **Suspension**

Where a student has been found guilty of a breach and has been denied access to classes and campus facilities for a period of time.

## **Tampering**

Involves attempts to alter examination scripts, class work, grades or any other academic records.

### **Responsible Persons:**

- Trainer(s)
- Student(s)
- Head of Studies
- National RTO Manager
- Executive Management (where requested)
- Representatives (where requested)

### **Documents Involved:**

- Evidence of submitted work that involves cheating, intentional plagiarism or unintentional plagiarism
- Supporting evidence of cheating, intentional plagiarism or unintentional plagiarism
- Letter to start investigation process
- Interview notes (signed by students and staff)
- Letter informing student of final outcome

### **Procedures:**

#### **Plagiarism:**

- a) The trainer receives a student assignment, test etc with evidence of plagiarism including, but not limited to, the following:
  - i. Work submitted was either entirely or partially done by a person other than the person submitting the assignment
  - ii. Does not reference the original author leading to misrepresentation of ideas/concepts
  - iii. Whole work has been copied from another student assignment, article, website, etc.
  - iv. Writing style lacks consistency indicating multiple authors with no reference to the original author.
- b) The trainer must collect all evidence of the breach. Evidence includes:
  - i. student submitted work
  - ii. evidence of plagiarism.
- c) In cases of a serious breach with verifiable evidence, the trainer must first consult the Head of Studies to decide upon a possible course of action.
- d) The Head of Studies formally writes to the student to attend an interview. The letter to the student must include:
  - i. details of the alleged academic misconduct under investigation

- ii. summary of evidence of plagiarism
  - iii. provide the student with the opportunity to have a representative attend the interview
  - iv. day, date, time, location and representative Institute staff involved in the interview.
- e) In cases where more than one student is involved and evidence indicates possible collusion with other students, they will also receive a formal letter to attend an interview conducted on the same day. The interview will not be held at the same time as other students involved in the allegation.
- f) During the interview, the following process will occur:
- i. Trainer will provide student with details and evidence of alleged plagiarism
  - ii. Student will have an opportunity to present their case with evidence
  - iii. Interview notes must include the issue, discussion and actions required with timeframes
  - iv. Head of Studies, trainer and student all sign the interview form
  - v. Signed copies for both the student and EHI.
- g) In cases of collusion, all students suspected of involvement will be interviewed separately by the same representative Institute staff following the stated formal interview procedures.
- h) Representative EHI staff must then follow the process for confirming allegations or finding that a penalty is not warranted. Refer to sections Confirming Allegations and Allegations not Warranted.
- i) In cases where expulsion of a student(s) has been recommended, final approval must be gained from EHI National RTO Manager and Managing Director.
- j) The outcome of the investigation and resulting actions will be formally communicated to the student in writing within 10 working days.
- k) Students may appeal any decision in writing and activate the appeals process
- l) Where a student has requested an appeal, the same interview process will be implemented. The Head of Studies will refer the matter to the National RTO Manager and/or Managing Director to ensure that students have an opportunity for independent appeal.
- m) All letters, interview notes and evidence of plagiarism must be placed on the student file with notes included on the student database.

### **Cheating during examinations:**

- a) Cheating includes but is not limited to evidence of:

- i. Communicating during an examination, including verbal or written
  - ii. Surreptitiously bringing in unauthorised information into an examination room including written and electronic sources of information.
  - iii. Leaving examination papers exposed for others to view.
  - iv. Persistent attempts to view other students' examination papers
  - v. Receiving unauthorised notes, papers etc that relate to the examination
  - vi. Providing unauthorised notes, papers etc that relate to the examination.
- b) The invigilator/trainer must collect all evidence of cheating. Evidence includes but is not limited to:
  - i. Unauthorised written communication
  - ii. Unauthorised electronic communication.
- c) In cases where students have verbally communicated or provided/received unauthorised notes, papers etc that relate to the examination, both students will immediately have their papers and communication retrieved and quietly removed from the examination room to ensure stability for the other students still doing the exam.
- d) The trainer/invigilator provides the evidence to the Head of Studies as soon as the examination period has finished.
- e) The Head of Studies formally writes to the student to attend an interview. The letter to the student must include:
  - i. details of the alleged cheating during the examination
  - ii. provide the student with the opportunity to have a representative attend the interview
  - iii. day, date, time, location and representative Institute staff involved in the interview.
- f) In cases where more than one student is involved and evidence indicates possible collusion with other students, they will also receive a formal letter to attend an interview conducted on the same day. The interview will not be held at the same time as other students involved in the allegation.
- g) During the interview, the following process will occur:
  - i. Representative Institute staff will provide student with details & evidence of alleged cheating
  - ii. Student will have an opportunity to present their case with evidence
  - iii. Interview notes must include the issue, discussion and actions required with timeframes
  - iv. Representative Institute staff and student both sign the interview form

- v. Signed copies for both the student and Institute.
- h) In cases of collusion, all students suspected of involvement in cheating during the examination will be interviewed separately by the same representative Institute staff following the same interview procedures.
- i) Representative Institute staff must then follow the process for confirming allegations or finding that a penalty is not warranted. Refer to sections Confirming Allegations and Allegations not Warranted.
- j) In cases where expulsion of a student(s) has been recommended, final approval must be gained from the Academic Director and Managing Director.
- k) The outcome of the investigation and resulting actions will be formally communicated to the student in writing within 10 working days.
- l) Students may appeal any decision in writing to the Head of Studies within 10 working days.
- m) Where a student has requested an appeal, the same interview process will be implemented. The Head of Studies will appoint representative Institute staff that have not been involved in the process to ensure that students have an opportunity for independent appeal.
- n) All letters, interview notes and evidence of cheating must be placed on the student file with notes included on the student database.

**Tampering:**

- a) Tampering includes but is not limited to evidence of unauthorised tampering of:
  - i. Examination scripts
  - ii. Class work
  - iii. grades
  - iv. class records
- b) The trainer must collect all evidence of tampering.
- c) In cases of a serious breach with verifiable evidence, the trainer must first consult the Head of Studies to decide upon possible course of action and representative Institute staff.
- d) The Head of Studies formally writes to the student to attend an interview. The letter to the student must include:
  - i. details of the alleged tampering under investigation
  - ii. summary of evidence of tampering
  - iii. provide the student with the opportunity to have a representative attend the interview
  - iv. day, date, time, location and representative Institute staff involved in the interview.

- e) In cases where more than one student is involved and evidence indicates possible collusion with other students, they will also receive a formal letter to attend an interview conducted on the same day. The interview will not be at the same time as other students involved in the allegation.
- f) During the interview, the following process will occur:
  - i. Trainer will provide student with details & evidence of alleged plagiarism
  - ii. Student will have an opportunity to present their case with evidence
  - iii. Interview notes must include the issue, discussion and actions required with timeframes
  - iv. Head of Studies, trainer and student all sign the interview form
  - v. Signed copies for both the student and Institute.
- g) Representative Institute staff must then follow the process for confirming allegations or finding that a penalty is not warranted. Refer to sections Confirming Allegations and Allegations not Warranted.
- h) In cases where representative Institute staff is comprised of trainers, they will meet with the Head of Studies to present the degree of the breach and recommended course of action based on confirmation of allegation prior to gaining the Head of Studies approval for implementation.
- i) In cases where expulsion of a student(s) has been recommended, final approval must be gained from the National RTO Manager and Managing Director.
- j) The outcome of the investigation and resulting actions will be formally communicated to the student in writing within 10 working days.
- k) Students may appeal any decision in writing to the Head of Studies within 10 working days.
- l) Where a student has requested an appeal, the same interview process will be implemented. The Head of Studies will appoint representative Institute staff that has not been involved in the process to ensure that students have an opportunity for independent appeal.
- m) All letters, interview notes and evidence of tampering must be placed on the student file with notes included on the student database.

### **Confirmation of Allegations:**

- a) Where there is confirmation of academic misconduct, the following may be applied
  - i. written warning
  - ii. reprimand
  - iii. formal apology if more than one student is involved and coercion is a key factor
  - iv. resubmit work so that it meets required academic standards
  - v. new assessment item

- vi. resit a different version of the exam
  - vii. adjustment of grade
  - viii. fail grade and the student is required to repeat the unit of study.
- b) If it is a student's second major breach, the following may be applied:
- i. suspension
  - ii. expulsion
- c) In all cases, details of the academic misconduct will be kept on the student's record/file.

**Allegations not warranted:**

- a) In cases where there is insufficient evidence, no penalty may be imposed but suspicions of academic misconduct can be kept on the student's record/file.
- b) If the student is involved in academic misconduct again at a later date, then the first allegations will form a valid part of the investigation and can be regarded with the seriousness of a second breach.

**Factors to Consider:**

The following factors need to be considered when deciding the degree of seriousness of academic misconduct and the level of consequence to be implemented:

- a) Degree of the breach and if it was a major or minor breach
- b) Whether the breach was intentional or unintentional
- c) Academic level of the student and what stage of their studies they are at the time of the offence. (ie: first or second year)
- d) Consider the course implications such as loss of student visa
- e) Where there is evidence of collusion, ascertain degree of coercion (if any), leaders, followers, etc.
- f) Extent of remorse shown by the student
- g) History of serious or unsatisfactory study patterns
- h) Take into account the cultural background of students, where appropriate
- i) Consequence must be dealt with in relation to the breach to ensure fairness and equity.
- j) Consistent handling to ensure that roles carried out by representative Institute staff is consistent across all cases of academic misconduct.

**Reporting Lines:**

When reporting incidents of academic misconduct, the following lines for reporting are to be implemented:



- a) Plagiarism (minor breach):
  - i. Trainer to Head of Studies
  - ii. Head of Studies interviews student
  - iii. Head of Studies back to trainer/invigilator
  - iv. Trainer back to student
  
- b) Plagiarism (major breach):
  - i. Trainer to Head of Studies
  - ii. Head of Studies and lecturer interviews student
  - iii. Head of Studies to National RTO Manager and Managing Director
  - iv. National RTO Manager and Managing Director back to Head of Studies
  - v. Head of Studies back to trainer/student
  
- c) Cheating in Examinations
  - i. Trainer to Head of Studies
  - ii. Head of Studies interviews student
  - iii. Head of Studies back to trainer/invigilator
  - iv. Trainer back to student

**Appeals:**

An applicant may appeal against a decision made under this policy. Appeals must be made as prescribed in the appeals process outlined in the *EHI Grievance Procedure*.

**Version Control:**

<b>Version / Dates:</b>	V1 – July 2012