

# PROCEDURE S1.5-P1.5

## MANAGING STUDENT ACADEMIC MISCONDUCT

### 1.0 INTRODUCTION

#### 1.1 Related Policy

Academic Integrity and Honesty Policy

#### 1.2 Purpose

This procedure outlines the responsibilities and processes required in managing academic misconduct by students. Refer to the relevant Code of Conduct for managing academic misconduct by staff.

#### 1.3 Scope

This procedure applies to all students of the Australasian College of Health & Wellness (ACHW), irrespective of their location, mode of study, or if they are taught by third party partners. It also applies to all ACHW or third-party staff, outlining their responsibility to report academic misconduct, and to staff involved in actioning the procedure.

#### 1.4 Scope Exceptions

None.

### 2.0 RESPONSIBILITIES

1. The Head of School, ACHW or a third party partner, is responsible for ensuring induction of new staff and ongoing staff development includes training and access to resources on academic integrity, including resources issued by TEQSA.
2. The Academic Coach or a third-party partner is responsible for ensuring that orientation of new students and ongoing student training and information includes access to resources on academic integrity.
3. All students are responsible for ensuring they understand what Academic Misconduct is, and attending training provided on academic integrity.
4. All students are responsible for using generative AI appropriately as defined by guidelines published by ACHW.
5. All students are responsible for conducting their scholarly activities with integrity, ethics and honesty.

6. All students and staff are responsible for reporting to the Head of School, ACHW any instances where they suspect academic misconduct.
7. The Head of School, ACHW is responsible for investigating all instances of suspected academic misconduct and for initiating disciplinary procedures if required and as appropriate.
8. Students whose behaviour has been reported as suspected academic misconduct are responsible for complying with this procedure.
9. Staff are responsible for enacting this procedure as outlined.

### 3.0 PROCEDURE

#### 3.1 Information and Training

- a. Facilitators will ensure that all Unit Guides contain standard information and relevant content available at the learning management system contain standard information about good scholarly practice, what constitutes academic misconduct, referencing and the concept of plagiarism. Information on academic misconduct must include that it involves the following:
  - other people's work and/or ideas paraphrased and presented by the student without a reference.
  - other students' work copied or partly copied and presented as the student's work.
  - other people's/GenAI designs, codes or images presented as the student's own work.
  - phrases and passages used verbatim by the student without quotation marks and/or without a reference to the author or source.
  - allowing someone or an organisation to draft or complete an assessment task on the student's behalf.
  - sharing assessments with other students or uploading in publicly available websites.
  - writing or editing work for other students.
  - not declaring the use of gen AI tools and presented as the student's own work.
  - lecture notes reproduced without due acknowledgement.

- b. Facilitators will ensure that Unit Guides contain advice about how to avoid plagiarism, and clear instructions to reduce the likelihood of unintentional academic misconduct. For example, instructions as to whether students are permitted to jointly work on an assignment and guidelines relating to all aspects of group work.
- c. The Academic Coach will ensure that orientation of new students includes:
  - training on academic integrity, including referencing.
  - training on what constitutes academic misconduct including plagiarism, collusion, contract cheating and the appropriate, responsible and ethical use of artificial intelligence platforms and paraphrasing tools to generate writing.
  - training on protection of the student's own work when using computers, including when using computer suites/labs; and
  - the importance of not sharing log-in details.
- d. The Academic Coach will ensure regular tutorials are provided on referencing techniques.

### 3.2 Prevention and Detection of Academic Misconduct

- a. Students studying via a blended delivery mode are required to submit assessments via the Moodle online learning system. Upon submission the students must give their permission for electronic scanning of their assessment to check for plagiarism. Assessments will not be accepted if they are not submitted via the online system.
- b. Students studying via a face-to-face delivery mode are required to submit assessments directly to their Facilitator with a cover sheet in which students confirm the assessment piece is their own work and give their permission for electronic scanning of the assessment. Assessments will not be accepted if they are not accompanied by the cover sheet, or if the cover sheet is without the required confirmation and approval as previously outlined.
- c. Electronic scanning will be conducted on submission of each assessment to look for any instance of plagiarism.
- d. Random sampling of an assessment piece may be conducted by academic staff to look for strong similarities which could indicate academic misconduct.
- e. When marking papers academic staff may detect possible academic misconduct 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, unusual, hallucinated anachronistic references; subject matter does not respond to the question posed; reflections don't relate to learning material, and common phrases appearing in more than one paper.
- f. Academic staff will utilise generative AI detection tools as well as manual checks to detect unacceptable use of AI-generated text.

- g. If a member of the academic staff believes that academic misconduct has occurred, searching for a key phrase on a search engine (preferably enclosed in quotation marks) may confirm this.
- h. If it is suspected that academic misconduct has occurred, the academic staff member will print out the material in case the site is changed or removed or the detection tool is updated, to use as reference in discussions with the student, or as evidence in an investigation.

### **3.3 Prevention and Detection of Academic Misconduct in Exams**

- a. The Head of School, ACHW ensures that Facilitators and where applicable third party partners have the required information to support them in making decisions and reports should they suspect academic misconduct during an exam. This includes information about students sitting the exam who have a disability or other special needs and have received permission for a reasonable adjustment.
- b. All students sitting an examination are expected to comply with the Student Code of Conduct and the rules of the examination, irrespective of whether the examination is held on-campus, off-campus, or online.
- c. Exam information is provided to all students at orientation and remains available on the online learning system. Facilitators ensure that students have accessed and understood this information prior to an exam. The information provided includes:
  - date, time, venue/mode of the examination.
  - detailed information about the rules governing the examination, including information on what constitutes academic misconduct in an examination and the consequences of this conduct; and
  - if the exam is online, information on how to download the software and notification that the software uses webcam and records the student while they take the exam.
- d. Online exams are conducted via the Respondus Monitor and Lockdown Browser. Students are required to download the software prior to being able to complete the exam.
- e. The software checks the student ID and IT environment and records the student doing the exam. The software provides a summary of results for the exam and lists them in priority order for checking if there are red flag moments during the exam.
- f. The Facilitator reviews the software recordings to see if anything is of concern, follows up any concerns with the student, and then reports any alleged academic misconduct to the Head of School, ACHW.

### 3.4 Reporting Alleged Academic Misconduct

- a. Staff and students reporting alleged academic misconduct by a student(s) must:
  - maintain the confidentiality of the student(s) concerned. Talking about the alleged misconduct with anyone other than the Head of School, ACHW or delegate or, if requested, other staff involved in the investigation will be viewed as misconduct; and
  - make an appointment to discuss the issue with the Head of School, ACHW, or delegate, who will investigate the allegation as outlined in clause 3.5.
- b. Facilitators should report suspected academic misconduct to the Academic Coach for investigation.
- c. Allegations of academic misconduct must be based on clear evidence provided to the Head of School, ACHW or delegate. Proven malicious allegations will be viewed as harassment and a breach of the relevant Code of Conduct and will result in consequences.

### 3.5 Levels of Academic Misconduct

- a. ***Level 1/minor academic misconduct*** is judged to be unintentional misconduct due to careless practice or misinterpretation of the academic misconduct rules and guidelines by a student, which results in only minor impact on the purpose of the assessment. For example:
  - inadequate or inconsistent referencing.
  - copying one or two sentences verbatim without adequate referencing.
  - Inappropriate collaboration.
  - Poor paraphrasing.
  - Use of editing and formatting -GenAI software that changes sentence structures.
- b. ***Level 2/moderate academic misconduct*** is where the misconduct clearly breaches the Student Code of Conduct and is deliberate. For example, copying more than one or two sentences without referencing, collusion, contract cheating, unauthorised use of -GenAI tools.
- c. ***Level 3/serious academic misconduct*** is where the misconduct is a serious, substantial breach of the Student Code of Conduct, and is deliberate. For example, serious plagiarism, cheating in an examination, contract collusion, or providing fraudulent documents.

### 3.6 Investigating Alleged Academic Misconduct

- a. In all investigations, communication to students must be in writing and the communication and the result of the investigation, recorded on the student's file. In the communication, the student(s) must also be advised of their right to

appeal any finding of academic misconduct through the Complaints and Appeals Policy and Procedure.

- b. Investigating alleged academic misconduct takes into account:

  - the level of the academic misconduct (see 3.5).
  - the experience of the student(s) (for example, the student is in first year of the course-.
  - whether there have been prior instances of academic misconduct by the student(s); and
  - the circumstances, such as a medical issue or other significant personal issue that has impacted on the student(s), language issues, or cultural background.
- c. On receipt of the allegation of academic misconduct, the Head of School, ACHW, or delegate, will, within five (5) working days of the allegation being made, write to the student, and include in the letter:

  - the full particulars of the allegation and the possible penalty should the allegation be proven-.
  - the date, time, venue/mode for a meeting of the student(s) with the Head of School, ACHW, or delegate-.
  - that the student should come to the meeting prepared to discuss and defend their position if they believe that they did not commit academic misconduct and bring any evidence they have to support that.
  - a requirement for the student(s) to reply in writing to the letter within ten (10) working days of receiving it, with the reply to include a response to the allegation and noting whether or not the student will attend the meeting with the Head of School, ACHW.
  - that, if it is impracticable for a student to attend the meeting, the student may send in their evidence with their letter; and
  - that the investigation will continue irrespective of whether the student responds to the letter, or if they withdraw from the course.
- d. The Head of School, ACHW will consider the factors listed in clause 3.6.b. and the defence provided by the student(s) and make a decision on 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.

  - The factors that can be taken into consideration when deciding whether the alleged academic misconduct was unintentional, are:
    - the offence gave limited or no advantage to the student.
    - the student's evident intent-

- 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; and
- the student has made an attempt, albeit inadequate, at referencing.

- Indications that the academic misconduct was intentional include:
  - The offence gives advantage to the student.
  - Breaches student code of conduct and academic integrity.
  - the student's evident intent.
  - the student was present at the time the information on academic integrity practices was given out and received it, or, if external, received it through other means such as Orientation materials/ Online resources on the online learning system and knew that academic misconduct was unacceptable; and
  - the student had received a prior warning about academic misconduct or had previous been penalised for academic misconduct.

### **3.7 Imposing Penalties for Academic Misconduct**

- a. In all cases, warnings and penalties must be communicated in writing to the student(s) within ten (10) working days of the decision and will be recorded on the student's file. The student(s) must also be advised of their right to appeal the finding of academic misconduct through the Complaints and Appeals Policy and Procedure.
- b. If the Head of School, ACHW, or delegate, believes that the student's actions were not academic misconduct, the student(s) will be notified in writing and any notes about the alleged incident will be removed from the student file. The person making the report of alleged academic misconduct will also be notified in writing.
- c. If the Head of School, ACHW, or delegate, believes level 1/minor academic misconduct has occurred, but that it was unintentional, the following may be actioned:
  - warn the student in writing and mark the assessment item without penalty (deduction of marks); or
  - warn the student in writing and mark the assessment item with a penalty.

- d. If the Head of School, ACHW or delegate believes that level 2/moderate academic misconduct has occurred, but it was unintentional, and the first warning for this student, the following may be actioned:
  - warn the student in writing, request resubmission of the assessment item, and mark the re-submitted assessment item with or without penalty.
- e. If the Head of School, ACHW or delegate believes the level 2/moderate misconduct was intentional, the following may be actioned:
  - warn the student in writing, request resubmission of the assessment item, and mark the re-submitted assessment item with a penalty; or
  - the student may be required to undertake additional or alternative assessment (the maximum mark possible being a Pass grade); or
  - a grade of Fail may be recorded for the assessment item.
- f. If the Head of School, ACHW or delegate, believes the academic misconduct is level 3/serious, or is a repeat of previous serious academic misconduct, they will initiate a formal inquiry to consider:
  - withdrawing the student from the course for a specified period; or
  - excluding the student from the course and expelling them from ACHW.

### 3.8 Formal Inquiry

- a. The formal inquiry panel consists of the Chief Education Officer, the Registrar, and the Academic Services Manager-.
- b. The student will be invited in writing to attend a meeting of the panel and advised they can bring a support person from Student Support and any further evidence they have to support their defence. The meeting will proceed irrespective of the student's attendance.
- c. The panel will consider the alleged level 3/serious academic misconduct, to confirm whether that level of misconduct has occurred, or the conduct is actually at a lower level. The decision will be finalised after the student has left the meeting, and can be:
  - exclusion of the student from the course and subsequently expel the student; or
  - impose a lower-level punishment such as withdrawing the student from the course for a specified period.
- d. Academic Misconduct which includes fraud or an attempt at bribery will always result in exclusion from the course and the student will be expelled from ACHW.
- e. Within five (5) working days of the panel's decision, the Head of School, ACHW will notify the student in writing of the decision and penalty, with information on their right to appeal and the process to do so.

### 3.9 Appeals

- a. Students have the right to appeal any decision and penalty made under the Academic Integrity and Honesty Policy and this procedure.
- b. The process for appeals and complaints is provided in the Complaints and Appeals Policy and Procedure.

### 3.10 Governance Requirements

- a. Proven incidents of academic misconduct, and the resultant disciplinary action are recorded on the Academic Misconduct Central Register by the Head of School, ACHW, and included in the Chief Education Officer's report to the ACHW Academic Board.
- b. The ACHW Academic Board includes proven incidents of academic misconduct and the disciplinary action in its reports to the ACHW Corporate Board.

## 4.0 DEFINITIONS

- Refer to the Academic Integrity and Honesty Policy for definitions.

## 5.0 REFERENCES AND ASSOCIATED INFORMATION

- Academic Integrity and Honesty Policy
- Managing Student Academic Misconduct Procedure
- Student Complaints and Appeals Policy and Procedure
- Student Code of Conduct
- ACHW Guidelines on the use of generative AI
- [TEQSA Guidance Note: Academic Integrity](#)

## 6.0 POLICY/PROCEDURE OWNERSHIP

Policy Owner	Chief Education Officer Higher Education,
Status	Reviewed on September 2025
Approval Authority	ACHW Academic Board
Date of Approval	11/09/2025
Effective Date	15/09/2025
Implementation Owner	Head of School, ACHW
Maintenance Owner	Senior Compliance Manager Higher Education
Review Due	December 2027

## 7.0 AMENDMENTS

Version	Amendment Approval (Date)	Amendment Made By (Position)	Amendment Details
S1.0-P1.0	10 July 2017	Director ACHW	Initial document review after purchase of MHMHE
S1.1-P1.0	15 January 2021	Director ACHW	General review
S1.2-P1.2	1 June 2021	Academic Board	<p>Procedure separated from policy.</p> <p>Formal Inquiry Panel added.</p> <p>Stepped classification of academic misconduct added.</p> <p>Staff responsibilities clarified.</p> <p>Further information on prevention of academic misconduct in exams added.</p> <p>Details of appeals removed and replaced with reference to the Appeals and Grievances Policy.</p>
S1.3-P1.3	25 June 2024	Executive Director	Reference to generative AI.
S1.4-P1.4	13 January 2025	Executive Director	Changes to staffing
S1.5-P1.5	11 September 2025	Senior Compliance Manager Higher Education	<p>Minor administrative changes</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Update to staff titles</li> <li>• Template slightly revised following benchmarking</li> </ul>