

ACADEMIC HONESTY POLICY

POLICY

Academic integrity relies on the application of honesty as the foundation for scholarship and learning. Students and staff of Whitehouse Institute will conduct themselves in their academic studies honestly and ethically and are expected to carefully acknowledge the work of others in their academic activities and creative endeavours, in the production of knowledge through research, and in the reproduction of knowledge through scholarship and teaching.

This Policy should be considered in conjunction with the Code of Conduct, the Assessment Policy and Procedures, the Student Misconduct Policy and the Academic Grievance Policy.

PURPOSE

The purpose of this policy is to provide directions on matters of academic honesty and academic misconduct. Students and staff are expected to adhere to the provisions of relevant legislation, and to the rules, policies, regulations, procedures and guidelines at Whitehouse Institute, the accepted ethical practices of the higher education community in Australia, and the standards of relevant academic disciplines and professional practice.

DEFINITIONS

Academic misconduct is behaviour that contravenes the values of academic integrity, which breaches rules, policies, direction and guidelines at Whitehouse Institute in relation to assignments and assessment, and which normally includes action taken with the intention of gaining an unfair advantage for self or others. It includes, but is not limited to, plagiarism, collusion, cheating and fraud.

- **Plagiarism** is using the work of others without due acknowledgement, deliberately or inadvertently, and proclaiming it or allowing it to be considered as one's own for academic or other purposes.
- **Collusion** is a type of plagiarism that includes, but is not limited to, presenting the product of unauthorised collaboration to an examiner as independent work. Collusion also occurs when a person knowingly allows his or her work to be copied and passed off as the work of another person.
- **Cheating** is improper conduct in examinations or other assessment tasks. It includes, but is not limited to, taking unauthorised study material and aids into an examination room, copying from another student; sitting an examination for another student; re-submitting work that has been prepared for one subject by presenting it as original work for another subject or re-presenting work previously submitted for an incomplete or failed subject unless specific permission is given and/or the assignment is re-worked; and presenting a false reference list or bibliography.
- **Fraud** is a form of cheating that includes, but is not limited to, creating false data, and falsifying collected data from systematic enquiry and research investigations.
- **Confidentiality** is a vital element of all processes related to academic misconduct, as an accusation may result in disruption or failure of student studies, in that person being unable to practice their profession or with serious consequences for an individual's reputation and employment prospects. Therefore confidentiality is

essential in any matters relating to a suspicion of academic misconduct. Any person suspecting a student of a breach of this Policy should ensure that they have read the Policy thoroughly and must maintain confidentiality at all times.

All records of information, proceedings and outcomes will be maintained with care as to their security and will be provided only to those who have a bona fide reason to know about them.

GUIDANCE FOR STUDENTS

In the preparation of work submitted to meet course requirements, students must take great care to distinguish their own ideas and language from information which they have used from other sources. These include published primary and secondary materials, the Internet and information and opinions gained directly from other People. Whenever ideas or facts are derived from someone else's work as part of reading and research, that material must be acknowledged and cited properly. In general students should provide references in the following circumstances:

- Direct quotation: whenever another author is quoted verbatim (i.e. word for word) by a phrase, a sentence or a paragraph, the words should be placed in single quotation marks and their source should be identified.
- Paraphrasing: whenever another person's words are summed up in the student's own words, they should be identified through an appropriate reference (e.g. John Galliano stated)
- Multiple summation: similar to paraphrasing, it involves the summary of several authors' works into a single paragraph in the student's words (e.g. George Bush, Charlie Brown and John Howard jointly declared)
- Statistics: indicate the sources of any statistics used in an assignment or project, e.g. Bureau of Statistics (2004)
- Controversial facts: acknowledge the source since it is not a commonly accepted historical fact, e.g. expensive clothing leads to higher self-esteem (Paris Hilton, 2006).

Students who are unsure of the acceptable standards of scholarly writing should seek guidance from their lecturers before beginning assignments and projects.

Group work can be a useful form of learning, and directed or approved legitimate co-operation does not per se constitute plagiarism or collusion, but students working as a group must adhere to academic standards and any instructions provided in their subject outlines regarding collaboration in assessment items. It is not acceptable for members of a group to submit identical sections or answers to assignments or projects by simply copying the work done as a group.

With the above exceptions, all assignments and projects must be submitted individually and the examiner is entitled to consider identical layout, identical mistakes, identical argument and identical presentation as evidence of possible collusion.

Students may not copy another student's assignment or project, computer program or parts of a program, or any part of another student's examination paper. No communication is allowed between students during an examination and no student is permitted to keep books, papers, calculators, computers or notes during an examination except with the explicit permission of the subject coordinator.

It is expected that all work submitted for a subject will have been done specifically for that unit. A student may not submit the same or similar work to any other subject without obtaining the prior written permission of the relevant subject coordinator.

Rights of students

Students at Whitehouse Institute have the right:

- to have access to information and learning about academic integrity and the implications of academic misconduct
- if suspected of academic misconduct, to have the case investigated in a way that observes procedural fairness and confidentiality
- to bring a support person (but not a legal representative) to any hearing into alleged academic misconduct. A support person does not have a role in the proceedings or the right to speak without approval, but may assist a student to clarify the processes involved during any hearing.

MISCONDUCT INVESTIGATION AND OUTCOMES

The Academic Coordinator or Course Co-ordinator and a member of the Teaching and Learning Committee will conduct a formal hearing into any allegation of academic misconduct, and the Academic Co-ordinator shall normally act as Chair. Where the Academic Co-ordinator or Course Co-ordinator is directly involved in the matter to be investigated, then an alternative staff member shall be nominated by the Chair of the Academic Committee. The student shall be given at least seven days notice of the hearing and may attend or if unable to attend may otherwise participate (eg through telephone conferencing, at his or her own cost). If the student declines to attend or participate, then the hearing shall proceed in the absence of the student.

The student may make a written submission to the hearing and/or be accompanied at the hearing by a companion who may be either a relative or friend, or an Whitehouse Institute staff member or student, but not a member of the legal profession. The companion is present as a support to the accused student and is not permitted to act as an advocate or spokesperson for the student. In exceptional cases, for example a student with a disability which affects his or her communication, permission may be granted by the Chair for the companion to speak on behalf of the student. Neither the student nor any other person participating in the hearing is entitled to be legally represented.

At least 5 days prior to the hearing, the student shall be provided with a copy of (or given reasonable access to) relevant written materials and evidence available in the case, at the discretion of the Chair in order to protect the rights of other students. The Chair may call witnesses to give evidence at a hearing or may receive written statements of evidence.

If the Chair deems it appropriate, or if the student requests it, the Chair may require persons to attend the hearing and to answer questions. The accused student may ask questions of any witnesses in attendance at the hearing. The student may make verbal or written submissions to the panel after the evidence of all witnesses has been given, but the student shall not be present for the deliberations of the Chair or the panel following the student submission at the end of proceedings.

As an outcome of the hearing, the Chair or the panel may decide as follows:

- to dismiss the complaint of academic misconduct
- to seek further information
- to provide the student with a warning together with advice about what is acceptable academic conduct
- to decide that the student is guilty of academic misconduct and impose one of the listed penalties.

The student shall be informed in writing of the decision of the Chair or panel, together with reasons for the decision, within five working days of the hearing.

The penalties for academic misconduct in minor cases may include one or more of the following:

- Issue of a formal written warning
- A reduction in marks or grade for the relevant assignment
- A requirement for the student to resubmit the assignment by a specified date (the maximum mark possible being a Pass grade).

The penalties for academic misconduct in major cases may include one or more of the following, and the most serious penalties may be considered in the case of repeated misconduct:

- The student may be required to undertake additional or alternative assessment (the maximum mark possible being a Pass grade)
- A grade of Fail may be recorded for the assessment task
- A grade of Fail may be recorded for the unit
- The student may be withdrawn from the course for a period of specified time
- The student may be failed in the course overall and expelled from the Whitehouse Institute.

A student may appeal any decision in relation to this policy in writing to the Chair of the Academic Committee within ten days of being notified of that decision, setting out the grounds for appeal. The Chair of the Academic Committee shall consider carefully all aspects of the case and the procedures followed, and his or her decision shall be timely and final in all matters relating to this policy.

This policy was approved by the Academic Committee on 28 August 2007 and is set out in the Student Handbook, Staff Handbook, Policy and Procedures Policy Manual and published on the Whitehouse Institute website www.whitehouse-design.edu.au