

# **Student academic integrity**

## **A Short Reference Guide for Students and Teachers**

June 2024

## Table of Contents

1	About this reference guide.....	3
1.1	Introduction.....	3
1.3	Purpose of this guide.....	3
1.2	Types of academic integrity breaches .....	3
2	Addressing suspected cases of plagiarism .....	4
3	Explanatory notes re Plagiarism:.....	12
4	Explanatory notes re the other forms of academic misconduct: unauthorised use of GenAi; Cheating, Collusion and Fraud .....	12
5	References.....	12

## 1 About this reference guide.

### 1.1 Introduction

*“Whitehouse upholds that academic integrity is an essential component in the foundation of scholarship and learning and is committed to fostering and maintaining a culture of academic honesty and integrity”*

(Whitehouse A016\_Academic Integrity policy statement)

### 1.3 Purpose of this guide

The purpose of this short Guide is to provide Whitehouse students and staff with advice and a strategy on how the policy and procedure may be applied in actual instances of suspected / alleged academic misconduct related to **breaches of academic integrity** as defined by the policy.

Where students commit unintentional academic misconduct, the response is primarily educative, to develop in students an understanding and appreciation of the value of academic integrity and honesty by enhancing their academic skills and creative practice.

Where students commit deliberate academic misconduct, to apply measures (educative and punitive) commensurate with the offence to prevent future occurrences and safeguard the integrity of the qualification and reputation of Whitehouse.

A risk assessment and management approach are applied when staff investigate and resolve alleged student breaches of the policy.

Below are ‘hypothetical case’ examples of academic misconduct and corresponding treatments.

### 1.2 Types of academic integrity breaches

As defined by the Policy, breaches of academic integrity relate to suspected cases of:

- Plagiarism
- Cheating
- Collusion
- Fraud
- Self-Plagiarism, and
- Use of GenAI contrary to the Policy | Procedure.

Refer the Policy for the definitions.

## 2 Addressing suspected cases of plagiarism

Whitehouse academic staff know their students well and their learning progress **individually** and when students interact and collaborate with fellow students, and can detect instances of potential academic misconduct (breaches of academic integrity) in submitted work <sup>1</sup>

With the availability of the “Originality Check” feature in Google Classroom as a tool in detecting potential academic misconduct (e.g. plagiarism, collusion), Whitehouse teachers are using this feature as an additional means of ensuring academic honesty and integrity in student work.

The process described below, using ‘hypothetical scenarios’ as examples outlines how Whitehouse applies the policy and procedure to resolve alleged student cases of academic misconduct.

The procedure categorises academic misconduct as either “minor” or “major”, “unintentional or “intentional” (with some cases on the borderline) and how in each individual case it may be addressed (risk managed) by way of a “proportionate” response, depending on its “severity”.

That is to say, while students are expected to become conversant with the policy and what is permitted and what is not, and have a responsibility to abide by it and the Code of Conduct, early on in their first-year learning journey, where instances of breaches are more likely to be unintentional and of a minor kind, Whitehouse will apply an “educative”, non-punitive approach, while in their second year of course progress, it is understood that students are consciously and fully aware of the requirements and consequences of breaches of the policy which are most certainly intentional and deliberate, so can attract severe penalties.

Final decisions in resolving alleged cases of academic misconduct will be made in most cases by the teacher (mostly for first year students and unintentional cases). Decisions relating to more serious breaches (e.g. intentional breaches by second year students) will be made by senior staff members, in consultation with the relevant subject teacher. (Refer procedure for details)

---

<sup>1</sup> For example, in plagiarism cases related to academic writing, teachers detect changes of writing style/s in an essay; grammar (changes in tenses; mixing singulars/plurals), syntax; variability in narrative flow or logic or expression.

Example (Description)	Is it a breach of academic integrity?	Type of breach	Unintentional or Intentional?	Minor or Major?	Response	Application of P/P (Consequences)
<p>A <b>first-year</b> student submits their first assessment and is flagged by Originality Check on Google Classroom (GC) and/or detected by the teacher.</p> <p>It contains less the 10% of matched text; (excluding the Bibliography); with no citations, referencing or acknowledgement of sources.</p>	<p>Yes, sources not cited</p>	<p>Plagiarism</p>	<p>Unintentional</p>	<p>Minor</p>	<p>Educative. Counsel student on requirements and refer Policy / Procedure.  Refer LibGuide on Referencing system used by Whitehouse</p>	<p>Student can re-submit, no penalty.  If student does not re-submit, then is marked down vis the assessment rubric for not meeting specified grading criteria.</p>
<p>A <b>first-year</b> student submits an assessment and is flagged by Originality Check on GC and/or detected by the teacher.</p> <p>It contains 20% or more of matched text; with full citations, referencing and acknowledgement of sources.</p>	<p>No, as sources are cited/ referenced, <b>but</b> poor writing and not addressing the brief of the assessment</p>	<p>Has not addressed the assessment brief / scope</p>	<p>Unintentional</p>	<p>Minor</p>	<p>Educative.  There is too much cut and paste of other text and while cited, it shows little of the student's own work and what the student thinks.  Student must cite / reference sources, <b>and</b> keep</p>	<p>Will affect the mark/ grade as student will be marked down as per the assessment rubric.  Student can be given feedback and asked to re-submit, no penalty</p>

Example (Description)	Is it a breach of academic integrity?	Type of breach	Unintentional or Intentional?	Minor or Major?	Response	Application of P/P (Consequences)
					cited text to less than 10% and write in their own words (authorial voice)	
A student submits an assessment and is flagged by Originality Check on GC and/or detected by the teacher as “not their own”; having been sourced through a paid “third party”.	Yes	Cheating,  the student has sourced it externally (“contract cheating”)	Intentional	Major	Punitive	Assessment is marked to zero, and a Fail recorded.  Depending on the severity of the breach penalties may include:  Subject fail  Suspension  Course cancellation  Criminal charges.
The assessment work of two <b>first year</b> students is similar, with identical material (text, images, objects, sources), not cited or referenced.	Yes, both students have submitted “identical” work.	Plagiarism and Collusion	Borderline Intentional	Minor	Educative, with penalty.  Counsel students on requirements and refer Policy / Procedure	Assessments are marked to zero.  A penalty may include:  Re-submit, with penalty (pass only)

Example (Description)	Is it a breach of academic integrity?	Type of breach	Unintentional or Intentional?	Minor or Major?	Response	Application of P/P (Consequences)
The assessment work of three <b>second year</b> students is similar, with identical material (text, images, objects, sources) and don't distinguish between own original and other's work.	Yes.	Collusion (Plagiarism)	Intentional	Major	Punitive. Second-year students should be conversant with the policy and know better.  A proportional response depending on the severity.	Any number of penalties, including:  Re-submit, with penalty (pass only)  No-resubmit, Fail result for assessment  No-resubmit, Fail result for subject overall
A <b>first-year</b> student submits an assessment and is flagged by Originality Check on Google Classroom (GC) and/or detected by the teacher as being similar to an earlier submitted work.	Yes	Self-Plagiarism	Borderline Intentional	Major	Educative with counselling and a warning.  Students must not resubmit work for assessment that has already been submitted and graded before, <b>except</b> specific portions (e.g. an image) that have been approved for inclusion as part of continuous	Assessment is marked to zero.  A penalty may include:  Re-submit, with penalty (pass only)

Example (Description)	Is it a breach of academic integrity?	Type of breach	Unintentional or Intentional?	Minor or Major?	Response	Application of P/P (Consequences)
					assessment(s) over a span of subjects.	
A <b>second-year</b> student submits an assessment and is flagged by Originality Check on Google Classroom (GC) and/or detected by the teacher as being similar to earlier submitted work.	Yes, a second-year student should know better.	Self-Plagiarism.	Intentional	Major	Punitive. A proportional response depending on the severity.  Students must not resubmit work for assessment that has already been submitted and graded before, <b>except</b> specified portions that have been approved for inclusion as part of continuous assessment(s) over a span of subjects.	Any number of penalties, including:  Re-submit, with penalty (pass only)  No-resubmit, Fail result for assessment  No-resubmit, Fail result for subject overall.
A <b>second-year</b> student submits an assessment and is flagged by Originality Check on GC and/or detected by the	Yes, sources not cited and/or	Plagiarism	Intentional	Minor	Punitive, with a warning as the student should be	Student can re-submit, with a penalty e.g. reduction in the result



Example (Description)	Is it a breach of academic integrity?	Type of breach	Unintentional or Intentional?	Minor or Major?	Response	Application of P/P (Consequences)
teacher. It contains up to 10% or greater of matched text; with no citing / referencing/ acknowledgement of sources	exceeding % amount of matched text				conversant with the policy and know better	grade OR a Fail in the Assessment
<p>A <b>second-year</b> student submits an assessment and is flagged by Originality Check on GC and/or detected by the teacher. It contains up to 20% or greater of matched text; with no citing / referencing/ acknowledgement of sources.</p> <p>It is also a second offence after having received previous counselling and /or warning</p>	<p>Yes, sources not cited. Use of too much text from external sources</p> <p>Repeat offence</p>	Plagiarism	Intentional	Major	Punitive with academic counselling / warning / penalty.	<p>Any number of penalties, including:</p> <p>No-resubmit, Fail result for assessment, or</p> <p>No-resubmit, Fail result for subject overall</p>
A student submits an assessment, a combination of <b>approved</b> AI generated material, and original student work, with proper referencing and acknowledgement of GenAI material and sources.	No	n/a	n/a	n/a	The student has met the requirements of the assessment brief and complied with the appropriate use of GenAI	The student's work is marked in accordance with the subject's assessment brief and grading rubric.
A <b>first-year</b> student submits an assessment, a combination of <b>authorised</b> use of GenAI generated material, and original student work, but no referencing /	Yes	Plagiarism, (Use of GenAI not	Unintentional	Minor	Educative. Counsell student and refer them to the policy / procedure	<p>Student can re-submit, no penalty.</p> <p>If student does not re-submit, then is marked</p>

Example (Description)	Is it a breach of academic integrity?	Type of breach	Unintentional or Intentional?	Minor or Major?	Response	Application of P/P (Consequences)
acknowledgement of GenAI material and how it was used.		referenced / annotated)				down vis the assessment rubric for not meeting specified grading criteria.
A <b>first-year</b> student submits an assessment <b>wholly</b> generated by AI, contrary to the policy.	Yes	Plagiarism (Unauthorised use of GenAI in an assessment)	Intentional	Major	Punitive. Serious breach. Student should know that the submission of an assessment <b>wholly</b> produced by GenAI is strictly prohibited.	Assessment is marked to zero. A penalty may include: No re-submit: Assessment Fail result
A <b>second-year</b> student submits an assessment <b>wholly</b> generated by AI, contrary to the policy	Yes	Plagiarism	Intentional	Major	Punitive. Serious breach. Student should know that the submission of an assessment <b>wholly</b> produced by GenAI is strictly prohibited.	Assessment is marked to zero. A penalty may include: No re-submit. Assessment Fail, or Subject Fail result

Example (Description)	Is it a breach of academic integrity?	Type of breach	Unintentional or Intentional?	Minor or Major?	Response	Application of P/P (Consequences)
A <b>first-year</b> student submits an assessment with questionable research, data, text, materials, results, fabricated data,	Yes	Fraud	Intentional	Major	Educational and Punitive.  Serious breach in falsifying and /or fabricating data	Assessment is marked to zero.  A penalty may include: Re-submit, with penalty (pass only)
A <b>second-year</b> student submits an assessment with questionable research, data, text, materials, results, fabricated data.	Yes	Fraud	Intentional	Major	Punitive.  Serious breach in falsifying and /or fabricating data	Assessment is marked to zero.  A penalty may include: No re-submit. Assessment Fail, or Subject Fail.

### 3 Explanatory notes re Plagiarism:

Essay writing for academic purposes (as in the CONTEXT subject) is a skill and acquired over time. It involves much reading, and the application of a critical and discerning mind. It's no easy thing.

We expect students to have little of this “capability” when they start and well into their first year of study.

In the second year however, having engaged in higher education learning; having received critical feedback and advice on their assessments, and what is academic and integrity (the policy) and how we expect and require students to then avoid most of the obvious pitfalls of “academic misconduct”, (as described above), while still developing their academic writing skills at a higher standard.

The trap that students fall in most is not writing in their own *authorial voice*, that is, in their own style, using their own words, rather than a series of lines or text copied from other sources strung together in a sentence / paragraph, acknowledged or not or more recently generated by AI technologies.

As a rule, text of more than two or three lines in inverted commas “xxx xxx” should sit separate (and indented) from the body of the writer’s own text/words, and only serve as support for their argument / case. It should also be used very sparingly, and always acknowledged / cited.

### 4 Explanatory notes re the other forms of academic misconduct: unauthorised use of GenAi; Cheating, Collusion and Fraud

These forms of academic misconduct, by the very nature of the act, tend much more towards **deliberate intent** and are likely to have more severe impacts, with commensurate levels of consequence such as subject failure, course suspension or exclusion (termination of enrolment) and at their most severe a criminal charge that carries with it heavy financial penalties and / or imprisonment.

For a definition of these forms of academic misconduct and Whitehouse’s response, refer the Policy and Procedure, and TEQSA’s Guidance Note, and resources listed in the References section below.

### 5 References

Whitehouse [A016 Academic Integrity Policy](#)

Whitehouse [A016 Academic Integrity-Misconduct Procedure](#)

Whitehouse [A002 Assessment Procedure](#)

TEQSA Guidance Note – Academic Integrity

[Guidance Note: Academic Integrity | Tertiary Education Quality and Standards Agency \(teqsa.gov.au\)](#)

TEQSA: Higher Education good practice hub

<https://www.teqsa.gov.au/guides-resources/higher-education-good-practice-hub>

TEQSA Resource Hub related to academic integrity

[Understanding academic integrity | Tertiary Education Quality and Standards Agency \(teqsa.gov.au\)](#)

TEQSA Good Practice note: Addressing contract cheating to safeguard academic integrity

[Good Practice Note: Addressing contract cheating to safeguard academic integrity | Tertiary Education Quality and Standards Agency \(teqsa.gov.au\)](#)