

TITLE	POLICY: CODE OF PRACTICE FOR STUDENT ACADEMIC INTEGRITY
FILE NUMBER	200911287
PURPOSE	The Code makes explicit the ANU's expectations for academic integrity on the part of students in their academic practice, and staff responsibilities in developing and promoting academic integrity and penalising academic misconduct.
RELEVANT TO	Staff-Academic, Students-Graduate-Coursework, Students-Undergraduate
RESPONSIBLE OFFICER	Pro Vice-Chancellor (Education)
INTRODUCED	Second Semester 2009
MODIFICATION HISTORY	Introduced 12 December 2003 (367g/2003); revised November 2005 (paper 34a/2006); revised and renamed June 2009 (521b/2009)
RELATED POLICIES	Assessment Review and Appeals Policy Code of Practice for Teaching and Learning ANU's Records and Archives Management Policy
RELEVANT LEGISLATION (IF ANY)	<i>Privacy Act 1988</i> <i>Archives Act 1983</i> <i>Discipline Rules</i> <i>Undergraduate Awards Rules</i> <i>Examinations Rules</i>
PRINCIPLES	
521b/2009	
Principles	
<p>The presentation of genuine, original work is an indispensable cornerstone of appropriate scholarly practice. This <i>Code</i> explains the ANU's expectations for academic integrity on the part of students in their academic practice. It sets out the responsibilities of University academic staff in developing and promoting academic integrity, and penalising academic misconduct.</p>	
1. The principle of appropriate scholarly practice	
Any work by a student of the Australian National University must be work:	
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • that is original • that is produced for the purposes of a particular assessment task 	

- that gives appropriate acknowledgement of the ideas, scholarship and intellectual property of others insofar as these have been used

General understandings and specific techniques of “appropriate acknowledgement” vary across cultures and disciplines. Therefore:

- it is the responsibility of everyone at the ANU to uphold and promote fundamental principles of quality and integrity in scholarly work
- it is the responsibility of academic staff to promulgate, explicitly and unambiguously, techniques of and expectations about appropriate acknowledgement within their area
- it is the responsibility of students to ensure that they understand the acknowledgement practices relevant to every piece of work they submit for assessment

2. Definitions

For the purpose of the *Code*:

Academic Integrity

embodies the principle that students’ work is genuine and original, completed only with the assistance allowed according to the rules, policies and guidelines of the University. In particular, the words, ideas, scholarship and intellectual property of others used in the work must be appropriately acknowledged.

Note that "work" above includes not only written material, but in addition any oral, numerical, audio, visual or other material submitted for assessment.

Breaches of academic integrity include plagiarism, collusion, the fabrication or deliberate misrepresentation of data, and failure to adhere to the rules regarding examinations in such a way as to gain unfair academic advantage.

Cheating

means the breach of rules regarding formal examinations, or dishonest practice in informal examinations, tests or other assessments. Examples include the use of prohibited material or equipment for unfair advantage, and consultation with other persons during the course of the assessment where this is prohibited.

Collusion

is the involvement of more than one individual in an instance of academic dishonesty. All parties involved in such collusion are in breach of the principle of academic integrity (unless there is good evidence of innocent involvement). "Collusion" needs to be distinguished from "collaboration", defined for the purposes of this document as work jointly undertaken and produced.

Fabrication

is the representation of data, observation or other research activity as genuine, comprehensive and/or original when it is not. This includes inventing the data, using data gathered by other researchers without acknowledgment, or willfully omitting data to obtain desired results.

Originality

For the purposes of this *Code*, "original" work is work that is genuinely produced by the student specifically for the particular assessment task.

Plagiarism

is copying, paraphrasing or summarising, without appropriate acknowledgement, the words, ideas, scholarship and intellectual property of another person. This remains plagiarism whether or not it is with the knowledge or consent of that other person. Plagiarism has also taken place when direct use of others' words is not indicated, for example by inverted commas or indentation, in addition to appropriate citation of the source.

Each individual student is responsible for ensuring that they are fully informed about methods of acknowledgement appropriate to any piece of assessable work that they submit.

Recycling

is the submission for assessment of work which, wholly or in large part, has been previously presented by the same student for another assessment, either at the Australian National University or elsewhere. In some cases, lecturers will specifically allow this practice. If no specific provision to the contrary is made, submission of work for assessment a second or subsequent time constitutes a breach of this *Code*.

Poor academic practice

covers behaviour that is unintended, careless, inadvertent, uninformed or that is excusable because of mitigating circumstances (including personal, emotional, or health-related circumstances).

Academic misconduct

covers behaviour that is knowing, intentional, reckless, wilful, premeditated, repeated or that is otherwise inexcusable.

Course Authority

means the person in charge of a course (and the Student Year Coordinator for the MBBS).

Delegated Authority

means the staff member in the ANU College appointed for the purposes of this *Code*.

Note: The Delegated Authority is normally the Associate Dean (Education) or Head of School in which the course is offered; and the Deputy Dean in the ANU Medical School. If in doubt, students should contact the student adviser or other student support staff for assistance in identifying the appropriate responsible officer.

Student

means any person who is or was enrolled in, or seeking enrolment in, a program in, or a course offered by, the University or who is or was given permission by the University to audit such a course.

3. Responsibilities of Students

It is the responsibility of each individual student to ensure that:

- they are familiar with the expectations for academic integrity both in general, and in the specific context of particular disciplines or courses
- work submitted for assessment is genuine and original
- appropriate acknowledgement and citation is given to the work of others
- they declare their understanding of and compliance with the principle of academic integrity on appropriate *pro formas* and cover sheets as required by the academic area, or by a statement prefacing or attached to a thesis
- they do not knowingly assist other students in academically dishonest practice



4. Responsibilities of Academics

It is the responsibility of individual academic staff teaching, assessing or coordinating a course, to:

- provide information that enables all students taking the course to become aware of this *Code*
- provide information that enables all students taking the course to become aware of the expectations for academic integrity within the particular College, discipline and course, and of the potential consequences of breaches of this *Code*
- take account of the disparate educational backgrounds of students, including some who will be quite unfamiliar with the normal expectations for academic integrity. For example, students should be directed to appropriate sources of support and guidance to amplify the academic's explanations about academic integrity
- make regular attempts to detect academic dishonesty in the work submitted by students
- apply penalties in accordance with this *Code* where breaches occur

In addition, senior staff (such as College Deans) and the Pro Vice-Chancellor (Education) are responsible for the general implementation, oversight, and promulgation of this *Code of Practice*.

PROCEDURES: CODE OF PRACTICE FOR STUDENT ACADEMIC INTEGRITY

	General Information	 Relevant Dates
Purpose	To set out the ANU's procedures for reviewing breaches of academic integrity and penalising academic misconduct.	Effective Date Semester II, 2009
Relevant To	Staff-Academic, Students-Graduate-Coursework, Students-Undergraduate	Date Approved Next Review
Related Topics	Teaching & Learning , Assessment, Academic Progress & Appeals (Students), Students , Staff	 Related Documents Related Policies Assessment Review and Appeals Policy

**Authorisations**

Responsible Officer Pro Vice-Chancellor (E)

Contact Area Registrar

Code of Practice for
Teaching and Learning
ANU's Records and
Archives Management
Policy

Privacy Act 1988

(Commonwealth)

Archives Act 1983

(Commonwealth)

[Discipline Rules](#)[Undergraduate Awards
Rules](#)[Examinations Rules](#)

521b/2009

These procedures are to be read in conjunction with the *Code of Practice for Student Academic Integrity*

**PROCESS FOR DETERMINING AND THEN RESPONDING TO APPARENT
POOR ACADEMIC PRACTICE OR ACADEMIC MISCONDUCT**

STAGE 1. Where a Course Authority thinks that a student's academic behaviour may raise concerns under the *Code of Practice* they must meet with the student to discuss the matter. The purpose of the meeting is for the Course Authority to decide:

- First, whether there are in fact any concerns under the *Code of Practice* and,
- If there are concerns, whether it is an instance of poor academic practice or of academic misconduct.

This meeting must occur as soon as possible after the matter has been identified. The student must be informed, at the time the meeting is arranged, about the purpose of the meeting and the nature of the Course Authority's concerns. The student should be offered the option of being accompanied at the meeting by another person (other than a legal representative).

If the student requests it, a copy of the assessment item that has been marked up to indicate the points of possible concern should be made available to the student prior to the meeting.

STAGE 2. After speaking with the student, and having considered the assessment item in question, the Course Authority will decide whether there are any concerns under the *Code of Practice*.

- If no concerns under the *Code* are raised, the student will be informed of this in writing and told that the matter is concluded.
- If concerns under the *Code* are raised, the Course Authority must assess (then decide) whether it is an instance of:
 - (i) poor academic practice, or
 - (ii) academic misconduct.

In making this assessment, the Course Authority should take into account the

following factors:

- the student's explanation of what has occurred, and the student's response to concerns raised by the Course Authority, including redemptive behaviour (such as contrition, remorse, apologies);
- the extent of problematic material relative to the total amount of material in the submitted work;
- whether the conduct is inadvertent or accidental;
- the circumstances in which the academic misconduct is alleged to have occurred, including the student's personal circumstances at the time;
- whether the student has received general instruction, in this or other courses, about appropriate standards of academic research and writing practice;
- whether the student has previously been specifically counselled about the need to adhere to the principle of appropriate scholarly practice or has been found to be in breach of the *Code*;
- the stage of studies that the student has reached (it can be expected that later year students should have a greater awareness of the principles and expectations embodied in the *Code* than students at the early stages of their academic studies).

NOTE: The following processes are described in the attached flowchart.

STAGE 3. Conduct which constitutes poor academic practice under Stage 2.(i)

If the student's conduct is determined by the Course Authority to constitute poor academic practice, the Course Authority:

- Will consider it as a pedagogical issue (thereby recognising that student needs explicit teaching in scholarly practice).
- Will counsel the student about appropriate academic practices to ensure future compliance with the *Code*.
- May reduce the mark for the item of assessment, or require the student to undertake a further or alternative form of assessment.
- Will advise the student that any future conduct that constitutes plagiarism or other behaviour covered by the *Code* may result in the application of academic penalties or disciplinary consequences.

STAGE 4. Notification of poor academic practice

Stages 1. and 2.(i) to 4 do not constitute a finding of academic misconduct. The processes for notification of poor academic practice are:

- The Course Authority will give to the Delegated Authority (normally the Associate Dean (Education) or Head of School) a note that the student has been counselled about appropriate scholarly practice and has been made aware of the consequences of any future deviations from those standards.
- The Delegated Authority will cause to have the note from the Course Authority entered on the student's University file.
- The student will be informed in writing that the note from the Course Authority has been entered on the student's University file.

The notation on the student's file does not constitute a record of academic misconduct. It is intended only as a means of recording when a student has been the subject of the educative and non-disciplinary process described in Stages 1. and 2.(i) to 4.

STAGE 5. Conduct which may constitute academic misconduct under Stage 2.(ii)

If, under Stage 2., the Course Authority is of the opinion that the student may have engaged in academic misconduct the Course Authority will:

- Inform the student in writing of this opinion, and
- Speak to the Delegated Authority about the matter and provide copies of any material that was considered at Stage 2.

The Delegated Authority will examine the material, taking into account the factors listed at Stage 2., to determine:

- (i) Whether the matter may constitute an instance of academic misconduct (in which case the process described in Stages 6., 7. and 8. will apply), or
- (ii) Whether the matter is more appropriately classified as poor academic practice (in which case the process described in Stages 3. and 4. above will apply).

STAGE 6. Process for dealing with a determination under Stage 5.(i)

If the Delegated Authority determines that the matter may constitute an instance of academic misconduct:

- The student will be advised in writing of this determination and asked to meet with the Delegated Authority and the Course Authority to discuss the matter.
- The student should be offered the option of being accompanied at the meeting by another person (other than a legal representative).
- If the student chooses not to meet to discuss the matter, the student will be given the opportunity to make written representations.

STAGE 7. Decisions available to the Delegated Authority

The Delegated Authority, in consultation with the Course Authority, taking all factors into account including the meeting with the student or any written representations will decide either:

- (i) That the student has engaged in academic misconduct. In particular, a finding of academic misconduct will be appropriate where:
 - there is evidence that the student's conduct was knowing, intentional, reckless, wilful, premeditated, repeated or is otherwise inexcusable;
 - there are no compelling or adequate mitigating circumstances to explain the conduct;
 - the student's explanation is inconsistent with other compelling evidence (eg the student denies copying even though the assessment item contains material that is clearly copied from another identified source); or
- (ii) That the student's conduct constitutes poor academic practice (in which case the process described in Stages 3. and 4. above will apply); or
- (iii) That the student's conduct has been found not to be in breach of academic integrity under the *Code*. The student will be informed in writing of this and told that the matter is concluded.

STAGE 8. Consequences of a finding of academic misconduct under Stage 7.(i)

The consequences of a finding of academic misconduct are:

- A punitive penalty will be applied (eg the assessment item will receive a mark of 0%).
- The Delegated Authority will report the misconduct to the Prescribed Authority (i.e. normally the ANU College Dean or the Registrar) for the application of the

University's *Discipline Rules*.

- A record that the student has committed a breach of the *Code*, including details of the breach, will be entered on the student's University file.

The student will be informed in writing of the finding of academic misconduct and of these consequences.

STAGE 9. APPEALS

Where an academic penalty applied at Stage 3. or Stage 8. results in a final grade of fail for the course, the review and appeal processes set out in the *Assessment Review and Appeals Policy* and the *Examinations Rules* must be followed.

Where an academic penalty is applied at Stage 3. or at Stage 8., i.e. the mark for the item of assessment is reduced, and the student believes they have grounds for an appeal, the student may appeal in writing to the ANU College Dean against the mark reduction. The grounds on which a student may appeal are:

1. severe illness or medical condition (documentary evidence of which must be lodged with the appeal);
2. harshness of the penalty;
3. special circumstances set out in the appeal;
4. proper processes have not been followed.

The College Dean will determine the processes for the consideration of the appeal and notifying the student of the outcome. The decision of the Dean is final.

FLOWCHART OF PROCESSES FOR DETERMINING AND THEN RESPONDING TO APPARENT POOR ACADEMIC PRACTICE OR ACADEMIC MISCONDUCT

521b/2009

