ACADEMIC INTEGRITY AND HONESTY POLICY AND PROCEDURE

Sydney Institute of Traditional Chinese Medicine

1. Overview

Sydney Institute of Traditional Chinese Medicine ("SITCM") upholds the principle that academic integrity relies on the application of honesty in all scholarly endeavour. Students of SITCM will conduct themselves in their academic studies honestly and ethically and are expected to carefully acknowledge the work of others in all their academic activities.

This policy describes academic misconduct and outlines SITCM's response to instances of academic misconduct that are detected.

Use of the *Model Policy for the Prevention and Detection of Plagiarism* as a reference source is acknowledged.

2. Types of academic misconduct

Academic misconduct involves cheating, collusion, plagiarism or any other conduct that deliberately or inadvertently claims ownership of an idea or concept without acknowledging the source of the information. This includes any form of activity that negates the academic integrity of the student or another student and/or their work.

Plagiarism occurs when students fail to acknowledge that the ideas of others are being used. Specifically it occurs when:

- other people's work and/or ideas are paraphrased and presented without a reference;
- other students' work is copied or partly copied;
- other people's designs, codes or images are presented as the student's own work;
- phrases and passages are used verbatim without quotation marks and/or without a reference to the author or source;
- lecture notes are reproduced without due acknowledgement.

Cheating occurs when a student seeks to obtain an unfair advantage in an examination or in other written or practical work required to be submitted or completed for assessment.

Collusion (unauthorised collaboration) involves working with others without permission to produce work which is then presented as work completed independently by the student. Collusion is a form of plagiarism. Students should not knowingly allow their work to be copied.

3. Notification to students

All unit guides will explain the meaning of academic misconduct and will give students clear instructions as to whether they are permitted to work on an assignment jointly and provide clear guidelines relating to all aspects of group work.

The unit guides will also provide adequate information to students about referencing requirements and academic conventions for the use of others' work including advice on how to avoid plagiarism.

The unit guides will refer students to this policy.

4.   Prevention and detection of plagiarism

In order to assist in the prevention of plagiarism teaching staff have a responsibility to explain to students both good scholarly practice and the concept of plagiarism.

The unit guide will provide advice to students about referencing requirements and academic conventions for the use of others' work as well as advice on how to avoid plagiarism.

When marking papers teaching staff may detect possible plagiarism by observing changes in formatting within a paper, including a mixture of quotation marks; changes in writing style within a paper; suddenly improved writing style; a paper veering away from the topic; lack of recent reference sources or unusual or anachronistic references; and common phrases appearing in more than one paper.

SITCM also uses the automatic plagiarism detection software Turnitin. Turnitin is online web-based text-matching software that electronically compares submitted assessment papers to content located on the internet. This software provides a valuable addition to existing methods for supporting SITCM's approach to academic integrity and honesty.

Students are permitted to upload their assessments through Turnitin prior to the formal submission of an assessment in order to determine a similarity score. When a student is satisfied that the assessment falls below the approved similarity score, they may then formally upload the assessment for marking.

In instances where Turnitin returns a similarity score of 25% or more, the lecturer for that unit of study is required to report the matter to the Unit Coordinator and/or the Associate Dean. The matter may result in an allegation of plagiarism.

If a member of teaching staff believes that plagiarism has occurred they can search for a key phrase on a search engine such as Google (preferably enclosed in quotation marks).

If it is suspected that plagiarism of an internet site has occurred it would be advisable to print out the material in case the site is changed or removed.

Students will be required to submit all papers in electronic format so that they can be subject to electronic scanning to detect plagiarism.

5.   Allegation of academic misconduct

When academic misconduct is suspected by teaching staff, the Associate Dean should be notified. Allegations of academic misconduct must be based on firm evidence.

The Associate Dean will put the matter to the student(s) and give them an opportunity to respond to the allegation of academic misconduct. The student(s) should be called to a meeting where they are given particulars of the suspected academic misconduct and given a chance to defend the allegation. The student(s) should be informed of the penalties that may be applied if the allegation of academic misconduct is upheld. In cases where it is impracticable for a student to attend such a meeting, particulars of the academic misconduct should be put to the student in writing, and the student should be asked to respond within ten (10) working days from receipt of the written communication.

The Associate Dean is required to decide whether the allegation of academic misconduct is upheld or rejected and, if upheld, whether the academic misconduct was likely to have been intentional or unintentional.

There are a number of factors that might be taken into consideration when deciding whether academic misconduct was unintentional, such as:

- the student is in the first year of the course and has not received a prior warning;
- the student is from an educational background where different norms apply for the acknowledgement of sources;
- a negligible amount has been plagiarised;

- the student has made an inadequate attempt at referencing.

An indication that academic misconduct was intentional may be:

- that the students in the cohort were given information on how to acknowledge extracts and quotations and the student was present and received written information and knew that the use of material without acknowledgement was unacceptable;

- that the student had received a prior warning about academic misconduct.

6. Penalties

Once an allegation of academic misconduct has been investigated and found to be upheld a determination will be made within ten working days of the appropriate penalty. Each case of academic misconduct will be treated on its merits.

6.1 Unintentional academic misconduct

Where the Associate Dean decides that academic misconduct was not intentional they may take one of the following possible actions:

- warn the student and mark the assessment item without penalty (deduction of marks); or

- warn the student and mark the assessment item with penalty; or

- warn the student, request resubmission, and mark the assessment item with or without penalty.

Warnings and penalties must be communicated in writing to the student and will be kept on the student's file. The student shall also be advised of their right to appeal the finding of academic misconduct and the penalty imposed.

6.2 Intentional academic misconduct

Before the Associate Dean determines that the academic misconduct was intentional they must consider the student's response (if any) to the allegation. If the student fails to respond to an allegation of intentional academic misconduct or cannot convince the Associate Dean that the academic misconduct was unintentional, the Associate Dean will report the matter to the Dean.

In such cases the Dean, in concert with the Associate Dean, will determine the appropriate penalty for the intentional academic misconduct, which may be one or more of the following:

- the student may be required to undertake additional or alternative assessment (the maximum mark possible being 50/100 with the maximum grade possible being Pass grade);

- a grade of Fail with a mark of 0/100 may be recorded for the assessment item;

- a grade of Fail with a mark of 0/100 may be recorded for the unit of study;

- the student may be withdrawn from the course for a period of specified time;

- the student may be excluded from the course and expelled from SITCM.

The most serious penalties may be considered in the case of repeated academic misconduct.

The basis on which the academic misconduct has been determined to be intentional and the penalty that has been determined must be communicated in writing to the student and a copy kept on the student's file. The student shall also be advised of their right to appeal the finding of academic misconduct and the penalty imposed.

6.3 Recording incidences of academic misconduct

All proven cases of academic misconduct are entered onto a central register to allow for verification of repeated infringements. This register is maintained by the Associate Dean.

7.   Appeals

A student may appeal against a decision made under this policy. The grounds for appeal are that the decision is inconsistent with this policy. Appeals must be made in writing and lodged with the Dean within seven days of the student receiving written notification of the decision. The Dean will respond in writing to the appeal within twenty working days and may confirm or vary the decision. All decisions of the Dean in regards to appeals under this policy will be reviewed by the Teaching and Learning Committee.

If a student remains dissatisfied with the outcome of their appeal they may utilise SITCM's grievance handling procedures.

8.   Version control

Document: Academic Integrity and Honesty Policy and Procedure		
Policy Owner: Academic Board		
Policy Developer/Reviewer: Dean	Version #: 5.0	Date: 3 March 2016

Version History

Version	Authorised by	Approval Date	Details
1.0	Academic Board	24 March 2011	Document creation
2.0	Academic Board	26 November 2014	Various sections (reassigning responsibility of academic integrity and honesty from Associate Dean to Dean)
3.0	Academic Board	25 February 2015	Section 4 automatic plagiarism detection software Turnitin
4.0	Academic Board	25 November 2015	Various sections (reassigning responsibility of academic integrity and honesty from Dean to Associate Dean)
5.0	Academic Board	3 March 2016	Section 6.2: specified marks in penalties