

Procedure Name	ACADEMIC HONESTY / MISCONDUCT PROCEDURE
Procedure Number	A016_PR_HE (Academic)
Purpose	<p>The purpose of this policy is to outline the following regarding Academic Honesty at the Whitehouse Institute of Design, Australia (Whitehouse):</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • expectations for academic integrity on the part of students and staff in their academic practice and • expectations of staff responsibilities in promoting academic integrity and in investigating suspected cases of academic misconduct.
Scope	This policy applies to all academic Higher Education staff and students at Whitehouse.
Procedure	<p>This procedure has rights and responsibilities and requires actions by the following:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • academic Director • academic staff • whitehouse staff • students. <p>Rights of Staff and Students</p> <p>Staff and students at Whitehouse Institute have the right:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • 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 such as a student representative, a friend or relative, 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. <p>Responsibilities of Staff</p> <p>Staff are responsible for ensuring that students under their guidance are conducting their academic endeavors honestly and ethically and that any concerns regarding alleged academic misconduct are investigated according to the principles of natural justice.</p> <p>Misconduct Process</p> <p>For straightforward matters or where the matter is deemed not to be serious the matter will be handled by the course leader with a written report provided to the Academic Director and tabled at Learning Teaching and Assessment and Curriculum Committee (LTACC) and Executive Management Committee (EMC).</p> <p>Serious Misconduct Process</p> <p>To be used where the matter is deemed serious and or complex. To be used where the possible penalty, should the matter be proven, is suspension or exclusion.</p>

Appeals or External Review

A student may appeal on the grounds of procedural unfairness to either the Executive Director or chair of the Academic Board. Students may also refer the matter to an external body for review.

Stage 1: Notifying of an Alleged Incident of Academic Misconduct and Minor Academic Misconduct

1. If a teacher suspects that work submitted by a student has breached the Academic Honesty Policy and that misconduct may have occurred they are to immediately report the alleged misconduct to the Academic Director. If the issue is deemed to be minor by the Academic Director, the student is provided with a written warning which is filed in the student files (with Student Administration). Students may be asked to resubmit work or provide alternate assessments that do not show any evidence of academic misconduct. Students who have more than one misdemeanor of minor academic conduct will have any subsequent misconduct issues dealt with as major.
2. The course leader will provide a report on minor academic misconduct to LTACC and EMC for tabling. The report is to be in writing and is to contain details on the nature of the alleged misconduct, including details on the exact details of the situation and where appropriate details on the time and place. The report is to be accompanied by any evidence available.
3. 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 assessment task
 - a requirement for the student to resubmit the assignment by a specified date (the maximum mark possible being a 50% Pass grade)
 - educational corrective action and
 - academic counselling.
4. If misconduct is deemed to be of a major nature it will be escalated to further stages (below).

Stage 2: Misconduct Investigation and Outcomes

1. In the case of major academic misconduct the Academic Director, a Course Leader and a member of LTACC will conduct a formal hearing into any allegation of major academic misconduct and the Academic Director shall normally act as Chair. Where the Academic Director or course leader is directly involved in the matter to be investigated then an alternative staff member shall be nominated by the Chair of the Academic Board.
2. The student or staff member shall be given at least seven days notice of the hearing and may attend or, otherwise participate (for example: through Skype or telephone conferencing, at his or her own cost). If the staff member or student declines to attend or participate, then the hearing shall proceed in the absence of the student or staff member.

The student may make a written submission for the hearing and/or be accompanied at the hearing by a companion who may be either a relative or friend, or a Whitehouse Institute staff member or student, but not a legal representative. 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. Either the student or 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.

3. 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 and
 - to decide that the student is guilty of academic misconduct and impose one of the listed penalties.

Stage 3: Notification of the Outcome/s of the Investigation


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 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 50% Pass grade)
- a grade of Fail may be recorded for the assessment task - zero for assessment task or subject
- educational corrective action
- academic counselling
- suspension, where the student may be withdrawn from the course for a period of specified time and
- exclusion where the student may be failed in the course overall and be expelled from Whitehouse.

	<p>Stage 4: Appealing a Decision – Internally</p> <p>A student may appeal any decision in relation to this policy in writing to the Chair of the Academic Board within ten days of being notified of that decision, setting out the grounds for appeal.</p> <p>The Chair of the Academic Board shall consider carefully all aspects of the case and the procedures followed and his or her decision shall be timely and final with respect to internal procedures.</p> <p>Stage 5: Appealing a Decision - Externally</p> <p>A student may appeal the decision of the Chair of the Academic Board by seeking independent legal advice. This process is entirely at the students own cost and Whitehouse is not responsible for covering any associated costs incurred by the student in the process of an external review.</p> <p>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.</p>
<p>Relevant Legislation</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Higher Education Standards Framework (Threshold Standards) 2015 • TEQSA Guidance Note – Academic Integrity (Beta v 2.0 at 19 August 2016) • 2016 Higher Education Support Act (2003) • Australia Qualifications Framework (AQF) • Education Services for Overseas Students Act 2000 (ESOS) • Commonwealth Register of International Courses for Overseas Students (CRICOS) • Copyright Act 1968 (Cwlth) and the Copyright Amendment (Digital Agenda) ACT 2000 (Cwlth) • Telecommunications Act 1997 (Cwlth) and associated Acts • Crimes Act 1914 (Cwlth) • Broadcasting Services Act 1992 (Cwlth) and associated Acts • Privacy Act (Cwlth) 1988 • Privacy and Personal Information Protection Act 1998 (NSW) • Information Privacy Act 2000 (Victoria) • State Records Act 1998 (NSW) • The Equal Opportunity Act 2010, (Victoria)
<p>Key Related Documents</p>	<p>Academic Honesty Policy(HE)</p> <p>Access and Equity Policy (HE)</p> <p>Access and Equity Procedure (HE)</p> <p>Academic Grievance and Appeals Resolution Policy (HE)</p> <p>Academic Grievance and Appeals Resolution Procedure (HE)</p> <p>Privacy Policy (HE)</p> <p>Privacy Procedure (HE)</p> <p>Student Progression and Exclusion Policy (HE)</p> <p>Student Progression and Exclusion Procedure (HE)</p> <p>Quality Assurance and Continuous Improvement Policy</p> <p>Quality Assurance and Continuous Improvement Procedure</p>

	<p>Academic Grievance Policy</p> <p>Academic Grievance Procedure</p> <p>Academic Grievance Form</p> <p>AQF Handbook</p> <p>Code of Conduct</p> <p>Staff Handbook</p> <p>Student Handbook</p>
Definitions	<p>Academic misconduct: is behaviour that contravenes the values of academic integrity, which breaches rules, policies, direction and guidelines at Whitehouse in relation to project submissions and assessment and which normally includes action taken with the intention of gaining an unfair advantage. It includes, but is not limited to, plagiarism, collusion, cheating and fraud.</p> <p>Cheating: is improper conduct in assessment tasks. It includes, but is not limited to copying from another student; submitting own work 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.</p> <p>Collusion: is a type of plagiarism that includes, but is not limited to, presenting the product of unauthorised collaboration to an assessor 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.</p> <p>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.</p> <p>Plagiarism: is the action or practice of taking and submitting or presenting the thoughts, writings or other work of someone else as though it is your own work.</p>
Responsible Officer	Academic Director
Approval Authority/ Authorities	Executive Directors Academic Board
Date Approved	10/04/2017
Date of Commencement	11/04/2017
Date for Review	11/04/2020
Documents superseded by this Procedure	Academic Honesty Policy and Academic Misconduct Procedure November 2012

Amendment History	05/2018		
	Re-branding – Header & Footer only		
	11/2016		
	Policy and Procedures separated and HE and VET documentations separated. Updated formatting and minor amendments Updated Hyperlinks		
Signed and dated for Whitehouse Pty Ltd			
	Signature	Les Taylor	30/05/2018
	Signature	Name	Date

INFORMAITON FOR PUBLISHING ON POLICY REGISTER	
Category	Academic
Stakeholders	Academic Board Executive Management LTACC Academic Staff Administration Staff Students