



ACADEMIC INTEGRITY POLICY AND PROCEDURES

Policy Statement	This policy and procedures support: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • TEQSA Higher Education Standards Framework (Threshold Standards) 2021, Domains 5, 6, and 7; Sections 5.2, 6.2 & 6.3; Standard 2, 7.2 and 7.3 Standard 3. • Standards of Registered Training Organisations 2015 (Standard 1 Clause 1.8)
Responsibility for Implementation	Executive Deans, Associate Deans, Course Co-ordinators, Senior Lecturers, Lecturers, Head of Vocational Education, VET Course Co-ordinators, Trainers and Assessors.
Compliance and Monitoring	Executive Deans, Head of Vocational Education, Academic Board, Audit and Risk Management Committee, Governing Board.

Purpose

The purpose of the policy is to promote and reinforce student understanding of and respect for academic integrity and ethical practices in the pursuit of knowledge. Dishonest practices contravene academic values, compromise the integrity of research and devalue the quality of learning. Kent Institute Australia (Kent) protects the academic integrity of its courses and students and staff members through prevention, detection and action addressing academic misconduct.

Scope

This policy applies to:

1. All enrolled students who are undertaking a Higher Education or VET course at Kent irrespective of whether the course leads to an AQF qualification or is a short unaccredited course or other program, **and**
2. All Kent Higher Education Staff and VET Trainers and Assessors with reference to their scholarly and research output and activities, **and**
3. All Kent staff with particular reference to the promotion of academic integrity, mitigation and management of academic misconduct breaches.

Aim

To ensure all Kent Students and Staff clearly understand the importance of academic integrity and what constitutes a breach of academic integrity, and to provide clear processes for the address of such breaches.

Definitions

In this Policy:

Academic Integrity: Upholding principles of honesty, responsibility and fairness and enacting of educational values in academic undertakings and endeavours including scholarship and scholarly activities in learning, teaching, and research though the avoidance of academic misconduct including behaviours such as cheating, plagiarism, and contract cheating.

Research Integrity: Upholding principles of Academic Integrity in the pursuit of scholarly and research activities and carrying out research in such a way that ensures output can be trusted and methods and findings are sound, honest and accurate. It also means taking accountability and working fairly in collaboration with others.

A **Student** includes a person who was an enrolled in a Kent course, unaccredited short course or other program offered by Kent the time when he or she is alleged to have engaged in academic misconduct.

Academic offender: A student who is found to have breached Kent’s academic Integrity Policy by engaging in a type of academic misconduct; for example, plagiarism, contract cheating, exam cheating. Where a student has a record of a single or multiple other breaches, they are considered to be a **Repeat Academic Offender**.

Alleged breach of Academic Integrity: Allegations of academic misconduct, that is, a breach of academic integrity principles which have not been proven and cases under investigation are referred to as alleged breaches until a final outcome is reached in which the student is deemed to have committed a breach of academic integrity or the allegations are dropped.

Alleged breach of Research Integrity: Allegations of Research Misconduct, that is, a breach of academic integrity principles in scholarly and research undertakings by an Academic Staff member, which have not been proven and cases under investigation are referred to as alleged breaches until a final outcome is reached in which the Academic Staff Member is deemed to have committed a breach of research integrity or the allegations are dropped.

Artificial Intelligence (AI) Tool: Any machine which has the capacity to solve problems, complete tasks or generate texts images or other material based on prompts provided by the user.

Assessment has the same meaning as in the Assessment Policy and Procedures (Kent Website [MyKent Student Link](#)> Student Policies and Forms > POLICY - Assessment Policy and Procedures – Student Login Required).

Examination has the same meaning as in the Assessment Policy and Procedures (*refer above*).

Academic Misconduct is a breach of Academic Integrity principles as defined in this Academic Integrity Policy and Procedures. Academic Misconduct includes acts, omissions by which a student gains or attempts to gain in unfair or unjustified academic advantage. There are many types of Academic Misconduct including research misconduct, cheating, contract cheating, plagiarism, self-plagiarism and recycling of work, collusion, deception, impersonation, fabrication, obstruction or sabotage.

Research Misconduct is a breach of Research Integrity Principles as defined in this Academic Integrity Policy and Procedures. Research Misconduct includes acts, omissions by which an Academic Staff Member gains or attempts to gain in unfair or unjustified academic advantage in their scholarly and research pursuits. There are many types of Research Misconduct including plagiarism, fabrication, obstruction or sabotage, failing to present research methodology, findings data accurately or transparently.

Cheating is a broad term which encompasses a range of actions which constitute academic misconduct including fraud, dishonesty or deceit of any kind in relation to an assessment item in order to gain an academic advantage. Examples include, but are not limited to, making a false claim of contribution to a group assignment, completing an assessment for another person without their knowledge or consent, engaging another person to assist in the completion of an assessment or to complete an assessment on one’s behalf, bringing material or device into an examination or other forms of assessment other than the approved items specified for that assessment task. Using artificial intelligence writing tools such as content generators, assistant writers, re-writers and authoring tools or software to auto generate or paraphrase work or proofreading services which rewrite a student’s work to an extent that it is not their own and without

acknowledgement is also a form of cheating. Uploading one's own work or Kent assessment materials and downloading other students work or assessment materials through a third-party platform is also a form of cheating.

Contract Cheating is a type of cheating where a student arranges, attempts to arrange, acquires or allows any form of paid or unpaid assessment to be undertaken fully or partially by another party and the student represents or represented the work as if it were their own. This is sometimes referred to as "Ghost Writing".

Use of commercial academic cheating services which offer to produce work on a student's behalf are not only unethical and contradictory to Kent's Academic Integrity Policy but also illegal.

Use of artificial intelligence writing tools such as content generators, assistant writers, re-writers and authoring tools or software to auto generate work as well as proofreading services which rewrite a student's work to the extent that it is not their own but is presented as their own work (i.e. not acknowledged) or not permitted in the context of an assessment is also a form of contract cheating. Purchasing or downloading other students' work or assessment materials through a third-party platform and presenting it as one's own is also a form of contract cheating.

Collusion: Collusion is unauthorised collaboration with other students to complete an assessment task or examination. It may involve sharing ones work with others to help them with an assessment task, communicating during an examination, leaving an examination or test answers to the view of other students so they can copy answers, arranging to copy answers in an examination from another student with their consent, or sharing exam questions or papers when not authorised to do so, passing notes in examination or using technology to engage with others to gain an unfair advantage through file sharing; for example, file sharing where exam questions and assignments are exchanged internally. Uploading one's own work or Kent assessment materials and downloading other students work or assessment materials through a platform in collaboration with other students is also a form of collusion.

Falsification: Providing forged or falsified medical or other documents to gain an academic advantage.

Fabrication: The creation or making of false data, information, research or citations as part of an assessment.

Impersonation: Assuming another person's identity and taking an examination or test or other form of assessment which requires attendance in person or electronically on their behalf or arranging for another person to assume ones identity and complete an assessment on one's behalf.

Obstruction and Sabotage: The act of preventing, impeding or interfering with other student's learning opportunities in order to gain an academic advantage or attempting to do so. This may include for example, tampering with practical examination apparatus to ensure other students attain incorrect answers, intentionally providing incorrect information to a student, destroying another student's work or limiting access to materials to prevent them from completing an assessment or examination.

Plagiarism: The presentation of work or ideas of others as one's own without due acknowledgement and referencing. Examples include, but are not limited to, the inclusion of one or more sentences from another person's work, or tables, graphs, images, designs, computer programs, computer code or formulae and any other data, ideas or work without the use of quotation marks and acknowledgement of the source; the use of one or more sentences from the work of another person where a few words have been changed or where the order of copied phrases or sentences has been changed; the use of one or more lines of computer program from the work of another person where the name of variables or functions or methods have been changed or where the order of the functions or methods has been changed.

Self-plagiarism: A type of plagiarism where a person re-uses their own work in whole or part, that has previously been submitted, marked and counted towards to the fulfilment of the requirement of another unit, or the present unit, or a previous offering of the present unit without the permission to do so from an Academic Staff member and without due acknowledgement and reference.

1.0 Staff and Student Codes of Conduct and Academic and Research Integrity Responsibilities

Kent students are expected to abide by the Student Charter and Code of Conduct as contained in the Student Handbook. Notably, Kent is committed to the principles of intellectual freedom, including critical and open inquiry, and the free expression of ideas and opinion without fear or favour. As members of a community of scholars, Kent students are encouraged to develop a capacity for critical judgment and sustained and independent search for truth and with this come responsibilities of maintaining values of honesty, responsibility and fairness and enacting of educational values in academic undertakings which underpin academic integrity.

Kent staff are expected to abide by the Staff Code of Conduct as contained in the Staff Handbook, and, notably, academic staff are required to abide by the Code of Ethical Academic Conduct which included adhering to principles of academic honesty and integrity. Academic Freedom and Intellectual Inquiry are also provisioned in the Staff Handbook but with it comes the responsibility to be bound by high academic standards, including a commitment to intellectual honesty and upholding of academic integrity principles in any scholarly and research undertakings.

Responsibility for the upholding of Academic Integrity hence lies with all Kent stakeholders and Kent encourages Academic and Professional staff and students to collaborate and openly communicate and collaborate on aspects of Academic Principles to fulfil this responsibility.

2.0 Procedures

2.1 Education and Awareness

Kent's primary focus is on raising awareness of Academic Integrity, and educating and guiding both staff and students on the principles and values Academic Integrity entails.

2.1.1 Student Education

Kent provides education and guidance to students on Academic Integrity, writing and referencing conventions of academic work.

Students will be made aware of academic integrity principles, acceptable academic practices and unacceptable practices which constitute academic misconduct. This information will be available to them via:

- Orientation Program presentations
- Academic Learning Support Workshops
- Unit Outlines
- Kent website
- Academic staff communications and directives at the beginning of each trimester or block of study.
- Mid trimester academic integrity quiz

2.2.1.1 Acceptable Academic Practices

Acceptable academic practices that are encouraged by Kent include:

- i. **Self and Peer-assisted Proofreading and Editing** of work to correct grammar, punctuation and make corrections, where the corrections are made by the student based on feedback provided and not by the proof-reader or other service.
- ii. **Recognition and Acknowledgement of External Sources** and authorship, the ideas and contributions of other parties using an appropriate **referencing** style, including referencing of the use of any Artificial Intelligence Tools.
- iii. **Collaboration** with others where this is explicitly permitted in an assessment task, and following assessment guidelines and with due acknowledgement of the contribution of other parties or the extent of one's own contribution to the task. This may be acceptable for example in a group work assessment task, where an assignment requires or permits students to work with others; but would not be acceptable if the assessment task is an individual task which explicitly requires students to work on their own.

2.1.2 Staff Education

Kent's **Scholarly Activity and Professional Practice Framework** supports Academic Staff Members undertake scholarly and research activities and the Executive Dean oversees, supports and guides scholarly activities Teaching through its Scholarly and Research undertakings.

Education about Research Integrity is a critical component of the guidance in their scholarly pursuits and Academic Staff Professional Development Activities scheduled by Kent, Scholarly Activity Colloquiums, Professional Development and Review Processes and other Academic Forums will seek to ensure that all academic staff, notably those in their early careers as academics, are aware of the Principles of Research Integrity, as well as broader principles of Academic Integrity in their applications to both staff and students.

Kent's ultimate goal in educating staff is to ensure that honesty, trust, responsibility, and fairness form the foundations of academic scholarship and scholarly activities at Kent and that Academic staff can effectively fulfil their stewardship responsibilities in guiding students in their academic journey. Notably staff will be made aware of their responsibilities to:

- Undertake education and training in research integrity;
- Record and present methodology, data and research findings accurately;
- Declare any conflict of interests;
- Publish findings and research output honestly and accurately;
- Treat other researchers fairly and provide acknowledgement of the contributions of others accurately and according to established conventions;
- Ensure that research complies with relevant legislation, policies and guidelines;
- Provide fair and accurate feedback as part of any peer reviews they partake in;
- Seek advice from the Executive Dean on academic and research integrity as required; and
- Report suspected breaches of Academic and Research Integrity at Kent in accordance with this Policy.

All Kent Higher Education Academic Staff, and notably those with responsibilities for assessment, investigation or decision making regarding alleged academic misconduct or the

design or administration of student misconduct policies will receive training in contract cheating detection and deterrence as part of their Orientation at Kent via [TEQSA's self-directed online course, Masterclass: contract cheating detection and deterrence](#).

Kent staff engaging in research activities will also be made aware that they are bound by and must adhere to the [Australian Code for the Responsible Conduct of Research](#) 2018 ("the 2018 Code" or "ACRCR"), which is applicable to all research disciplines, and which guides institutions and researchers in responsible research practices.

In addition, staff working with human data will be made aware of applicable ethics principles as specified in the [National Statement on Ethical Conduct in Human Research](#) (2018) as defined in Kent's ***Ethics Approval for Negligible or Low Risk Research Guidelines***.

2.2 Mitigation Strategies

2.2.1 Prevention of Student Breaches of Academic Integrity

Upholding of Academic Integrity Principles and therefore prevention of Academic Misconduct through the mitigation of risk associated to Academic and Research Integrity is the primary focus for Kent.

Kent teaching staff are required to:

- a. inform students of the requirement for academic integrity during their studies at Kent and of the consequences of academic misconduct, and
- b. communicate risks associated with using commercial academic cheating services clearly and regularly to students as part of ongoing discussions about academic integrity and the potential for class groups on messaging and social media platforms to be infiltrated by contract cheating services.
- c. make students aware how to report an instance where they are approached or blackmailed by contract cheating services
- d. make students aware of how to access genuine study support services
- e. implement mitigation strategies in assessment tasks and approaches.

Kent teaching staff are instructed to undertake the following activities to inform students:

- Discuss academic integrity in class, make students aware of the definitions, levels and penalties;
- Make sure students know that they are aware, in particular, of contract cheating. Many students assume that their lecturers/tutors/trainers are not aware of such issues;
- Provide clear instruction regarding the parameters for use of generative and other Artificial Intelligence Tools within the unit and assessment tasks.
- Ensure students are aware of and have access to referencing guidelines, including for use of AI Tools.
- Refer students to the Academic Learning Support (ALS) staff as required;
- Read the Unit Outline and assessment guidelines from the perspective of the student and check with students if they require clarification about ambiguities in these documents or lack sufficient instructions;
- Be sensitive to the pressure and stresses students are under and to reassure them by providing the information they need to succeed.

- To provide assessment information and feedback on evaluated works in a timely fashion;
- Inform students that they should contact their lecturers/tutors/trainers with any concerns about breaches of academic integrity; and
- Create opportunities for dialogue about plagiarism and for students to raise questions about their understanding and application of academic writing.

Kent teaching staff implement mitigation strategies in assessment tasks and approaches to minimise the likelihood of academic misconduct occurring through the following:

- i. If a quiz or online assessment contributes significantly to the assessment mark for the unit of study, the Unit Co-ordinator (HEd) must take appropriate steps to assure its academic integrity and it is consistent with the Kent policies and procedures.
- ii. If a quiz or online assessment contributes a small percentage of the overall unit mark, academic integrity should still be considered as part of its design but assurance of the overall academic integrity of assessment for the unit of study may be through consideration of the complete assessment approach for the unit.
- iii. If class tests or final examinations contribute to the assessment mark, the Exam Invigilator (Lecturer/Trainer) must take active measures to provide seating arrangements which prevent copying. Where it is not possible to ensure students cannot see another student's paper one of the following techniques should be used:
 - sorted seating where students are sitting with adjacent students taking different examinations;
 - scrambling multiple choice questions between candidates; or
 - other appropriate methods
- iv. Where there is a possibility that ghost-writing or contract cheating might occur, the lecturer/trainer must take reasonable steps to eliminate or minimise the opportunity to do so, so that assessors can be reasonably satisfied that the submitted work was written by the student without assistance except for legitimate co-operation. Such measures may include, but are not limited to:
 - requiring an oral presentation of the work as part of the assessment;
 - assessing outlines, drafts, and other iterations of the written work as it is developed;
 - requiring that students demonstrate learning outcomes in a supervised examination, where the student is required to pass, or reach a reasonable threshold in, the examination in order to pass the unit of study;
 - conducting an oral examination.
- v. Provision of clear assessment instructions and guidelines which indicate whether and how tools such as Artificial Intelligence may be used or are expected to be used by students.
- vi. Where there is a possibility that students use Artificial Intelligence Tools or Generative AI Technologies in particular to complete an assessment, the lecturer/trainer must take reasonable steps to ensure that assessment design is robust enough to produce evidence that is valid, reliable, sufficient, current and authentic to enable the assessor to make a judgement as to whether relevant learning outcomes have been achieved by the student. Where this is not the case, the lecturer/trainer will refer the matter to the Course Co-ordinator and the relevant Associate Dean(s).

In addition, Kent IT and Facilities Unit ensure that:

- i. Students and staff are regularly reminded of their obligation to not disclose university system passwords to anyone, and that genuine, ethical businesses will not request this information.
- ii. IT systems are monitored for suspicious activity, and spam filters and other tools are updated to quarantine emails to students that advertise illegal cheating services
- iii. Material posted or left on campus promoting commercial academic cheating services are promptly removed

Any information or evidence relating to a commercial academic cheating service targeting Kent or used by Kent students will be shared with regulators by the Chief Risk and Compliance Officer.

2.2.2 Prevention of Academic Staff Breaches of Research Integrity

Kent academic staff are guided in their scholarly and research practices by the Executive Dean as part of ***Kent's Professional Development Policies and Procedures*** and ***Scholarly Activity and Professional Practice Framework*** activities.

Collaboration, collegiality, transparency and Peer Reviews will be encouraged and promotes within Kent's Academic Community and through these processes, Kent will ensure that collective ownership of responsibility for Research Integrity is exercised and Research Misconduct avoided.

Furthermore, to mitigate breaches, Kent Academic Staff engaged in research will be encouraged to:

- a. Submit ethical clearance applications to the Executive Dean and Academic Board where they seek to work with human data.
- b. Discuss their research and other scholarly undertakings with the Executive Dean prior to commencing such activities to ensure that methodologies suitable to the research goals are implemented and research results justified.
- c. Make their research engagements and collaborations known to Kent so that oversight can be maintained over undertakings of Academic Staff and the relevant of scholarly and research undertakings assessed against the staff member's role at Kent and discipline of expertise as well as to recognise and appropriately support collaborative research undertakings among Kent Academic Staff Members and Kent affiliated research.
- d. Ensure staff are recognised as authors only where they have made a significant contribution to the research output in question and all contributors are appropriately acknowledged.
- e. Publish their work in high-ranking journals in the Scopus Database and in indexed, peer-review conferences to ensure their work is published in well-known platforms.

2.3 Identifying and Reporting Alleged Breaches of Academic Integrity

2.3.1 Higher Education Students

- i. Depending on the type of assessment, the marker, examination invigilator or other member of staff who reasonably suspects a possible case of academic misconduct will bring it to the attention of relevant Course Co-ordinator with appropriate supporting evidence. The supporting evidence to be provided will include, but not limited to, student's original submission documents, Turnitin Report, original source of content

- that is plagiarised, individual contribution statement forms, and markers report outlining the misconduct.
- ii. All modes of assessments and/or final assessment tasks (including examinations) which may result in a request for the student to attend a formal interview with relevant Academic Unit staff (HEd) to address matters arising during the undertaking of these assessments tasks will require a record of interview by Academic Unit staff. The record of interview outcomes will be completed on the *Assessment Interview Record* ([Kent Website MyKent Staff Link](#)> *Staff Policies and Forms > FORM – Assessment Interview Record – Staff Login Required*).
 - iii. If the Course Co-ordinator believes, on reasonable ground, an academic misconduct incident has occurred, they shall request the academic staff member to complete and submit a *Student Academic Misconduct Form* ([Kent Website MyKent Staff Link](#)> *Staff Policies and Forms > FORM – Student Academic Misconduct Form – Staff Login Required*) detailing the nature of the alleged case.
 - iv. The Course Co-ordinator shall investigate based on evidence provided by academic staff member and provide their recommendations to Associate Dean for adjudication. All appropriate details, including relevant original submissions, Turnitin reports, *Invigilator Report Examination Incidents* and other supporting evidence, must be attached to the *Student Academic Misconduct Form* for adjudication and sent to the Associate Dean immediately but no later than five (5) working days of detection.
 - v. Notwithstanding other provisions in this Clause 2, all Higher Education *Invigilator Report Examination Incidents* are sent to the Associate Dean for the relevant course. The Associate Dean shall then complete a *Student Academic Misconduct Form* detailing the nature of the case.
 - vi. In situations where academic misconduct cases are pending at the time of grade finalisation, the Course Co-ordinator is responsible for setting the student's mark for assessment items in question to zero marks and adding a comment in the Kent Learning Management System (Moodle) and Kent Student Information System (SIS or RTO Manager) that the result is withheld due to pending academic misconduct investigation.

2.3.2 Vocational Education Students

- i. If the Trainer believes, on reasonable ground, an academic misconduct incident has occurred, they shall complete a *Student Academic Misconduct Form* ([Kent Website MyKent Staff Link](#)> *Staff Policies and Forms > FORM – Student Academic Misconduct Form – Staff Login Required*) detailing the nature of the alleged case and submit to the Head of Vocational Education for review.
- ii. All appropriate details, including relevant original submissions, , and other supporting evidence, must be attached to the *Student Academic Misconduct Form* for adjudication and sent to the Head of Vocational Education immediately, but no later than five (5) working days of detection.

2.3.3 Academic Staff

Allegations of Breaches of Research Integrity will be reported to the Executive Dean and processed under the procedures outlined in the ***Staff Misconduct Policy and Procedures***.

Where an investigation under the ***Staff Misconduct Policy and Procedures*** requires a Staff Misconduct Interview, the CEO / Managing Director will appoint the Executive Dean to the interview panel to conduct the staff misconduct interview to provide expertise on

Academic and Research Integrity. In an appropriate case, the CEO may appoint a senior academic staff member to the Interview Panel.

The **Staff Misconduct Policy and Procedures** allow for the staff member to respond to the Allegation and any such response will be considered in determining the appropriate outcome and any associated penalties for the case.

2.4 Case Review by Associate Dean or the Head of Vocational Education

- i. The Associate Dean or the Head of Vocational Education will review the Alleged Breaches including the *Student Academic Misconduct Form* and any supporting documents or evidence.
- ii. Where additional investigation is required the Associate Dean or the Head of Vocational Education will refer the case to the appropriate stakeholder for further investigation or supporting documents.

2.5 Notification to the Student and Opportunity to Respond in Writing

- i. The student will be sent correspondence by Higher Education Administrator or VET Administrator outlining the details of the alleged breach, the process to be followed and providing the student an invitation to respond in writing to the allegation of academic misconduct.
- ii. The student is required to respond within five (5) working days of the date of the invitation.
- iii. Alternatively, the Associate Dean may schedule a meeting with student to allow the student to respond to the allegation in person.

2.6 Consideration of Student Response & Case Progression

- i. After the five (5) working days have lapsed, any response from the student will be taken into account by the Associate Dean or the Head of Vocational Education in reaching a decision on how to progress the case.
- ii. The Associate Dean or the Head of Vocational Education may decide to:
 - Dismiss the allegations.
 - Uphold the allegations and progress the case to the Academic Misconduct Tribunal or adjudication by the Associate Dean or the Head of Vocational Education
- iii. If allegations are dismissed, the student will receive correspondence from the Associate Dean or the Head of Vocational Education outlining the reasons and referring the student to any support mechanisms and Academic Integrity resources as appropriate.

2.7 Cases Referred to the Academic Misconduct Tribunal

- i. the Associate Dean or the Head of Vocational Education will refer the following cases directly to the Academic Misconduct Tribunal for adjudication and award of relevant penalties where the allegation is upheld:
 - Repeat Academic Offences where the student has a previous record of an upheld allegation of academic misconduct
 - Allegations of Contract Cheating involving commercial academic services, (excludes unauthorised use of AI tools and ghost-writing).
 - Allegations of Collusion
 - Allegations of Impersonation
 - Allegations of Obstruction and Sabotage

- ii. Where a case is referred to the Academic Misconduct Tribunal, the student will be sent correspondence by the Higher Education Administrator or VET Administrator with an invitation to attend a hearing to respond to the allegation in person. The student may be accompanied by a support person. .

2.8 Adjudication by Associate Dean or the Head of Vocational Education

- i. Any allegations which are not dismissed or referred to the Academic Misconduct Tribunal will be adjudicated and any relevant penalties awarded by the Associate Dean or the Head of Vocational Education.
- ii. The student will be sent correspondence as per Clause 2.11 notifying them of the outcome of their case.

2.9 Adjudication by Academic Misconduct Tribunal

2.9.1 Higher Education:

An *Academic Misconduct Tribunal* for Higher Education, consisting of the Executive Dean an Associate Dean for the relevant Course the student is enrolled in, the relevant Course Co-ordinator and a Student Representative shall be convened to hear cases referred to it by the Associate Deans.

a) Student Representative on the Academic Misconduct Tribunal

The Student Representative will be nominated from the membership of the Student Representative Group (SRG) by the Executive Manager Student Services. Depending on availability at the time of the Tribunal meeting, either the SRG President or a Vice-President will be contacted to participate.

The SRG has one President, who is elected from the student body and is located at either Melbourne or Sydney Campus, and two Vice-Presidents with one located at each Kent campus.

The Student Representative will be nominated and contacted in writing by the Executive Dean This communication will include details to duly inform the student representative of the meeting date schedule and request a returned signed copy accepting the responsibilities assigned to the tasks of the Academic Misconduct Tribunal.

The written communication to the Student Representative will also advise that all discussions pertaining to any Academic Misconduct Tribunal, either pre-meeting or during the meeting, shall remain confidential according to the Kent *Privacy Policy* and also details in compliance with the *Academic Integrity Policy & Procedures* (Website Links to these documents will be stated in the communication to ensure the student representative is referred to them to be fully informed (Kent Website [MyKent Student Link](#)>POLICY – *Privacy Policy* and *Academic Integrity Policy and Procedures* – *Student Login Required*)).

The importance of maintaining the confidentiality of all information related to the misconduct cases will be re-emphasised by the Executive Dean at the meeting so that the student being the subject of the Tribunal meeting is also aware of the confidentiality pertaining to the Student Representative being present at the meeting.

2.9.2 Vocational Education:

An Academic Misconduct Tribunal for VET, consisting of the Head of Vocational Education, VET Course Co-ordinator, an independent person to be nominated by the Head of Vocational Education, such as a senior academic staff member and a student representative, shall be convened to hear cases referred to it by the Head of Vocational Education. The Head of Vocational Education will refer to Clause 2.6 ia) above and enact the same procedures for the nomination of the student representative to be a member of the Academic Misconduct Tribunal.

Both Higher Education and VET Students will be sent correspondence as per Clause 2.11 notifying them of the outcome of their case.

2.10 Determination of Penalties

2.10.1 Academic Integrity Penalties for Students

- i. Where allegations of a breach of Academic Integrity are upheld by the Associate Dean or the Head of Vocational Education, they will determine the penalty by imposing one or more of the following options:
 - a) mandatory successful completion of an ALS session on the foundations of academic integrity or other relevant learning program decided by the Associate Dean or the Head of Vocational Education;
 - b) Downgrading the marks for the assessment in which academic misconduct has been detected and any mark awarded is to be based only on the non-plagiarised content of the submitted work;
 - c) failing grade for the assessment item (zero marks);
 - d) downgrading the final grade letter in a unit;
 - e) imposing a Fail grade for the unit.
- ii. Where allegations of a breach of Academic Integrity are upheld by the Academic Misconduct Tribunal, the Tribunal will determine the penalty by imposing one or more of the following options:
 - a) mandatory successful completion of an ALS session on the foundations of academic integrity or other relevant learning program decided by the Associate Dean or the Head of Vocational Education;
 - b) downgrade the marks for the assessment in which academic misconduct has been detected and any mark awarded is to be based only on the non-plagiarised content of the submitted work;
 - c) failing grade for the assessment item (zero marks);
 - a) downgrading the final grade letter in a unit;
 - b) imposing a Fail grade for the unit;
 - c) academic probation (i.e. escalate to the next stage in Academic Monitoring and Intervention program);
 - d) suspension from Kent for such a period of time as the Academic Misconduct Tribunal shall deem necessary;
 - e) cancellation of enrolment and exclusion for such a period of time as the Academic Misconduct Tribunal may deem necessary;
 - f) such other outcome or penalty as authorised by Academic Board.
- iii. The penalty imposed shall be of a severity appropriate in all the circumstance of the offence, taking into consideration the following factors:

- a) whether the offence is, or appears from the evidence to be, accompanied by an intention to contravene the Policy;
- b) whether the offence is, or appears from the evidence to be, carefully and deliberately planned or organised;
- c) whether the offence is, or appears from the evidence to be, significant in scale or scope;
- d) if the student is a repeat academic offender and review of the number of prior academic misconduct records;
- e) educational opportunities the student has had to become familiar with the values and expectations associated with Academic Integrity;
- f) other relevant mitigating or aggravating factors.

2.10.2 Research Integrity Penalties for Academic Staff

Ongoing engagement in Scholarship and Research lie at the core of Academic Roles and Responsibilities at Kent. Key duties for Academic Staff include:

- Maintaining and furthering engagement in scholarly and/or research activities;
- Maintaining currency and keep up to date with contemporary developments or advances in the relevant discipline or field; and
- Partaking in Professional Development Activities organised or scheduled by Kent.

Academic Integrity underpins all the above undertakings hence to effectively exercise their responsibilities in an Academic role and fulfil the inherent requirements of their Academic role at Kent Academic Staff members must demonstrate an ability to adhere to and promote the principles of Academic Integrity in the scholarly undertakings and guidance of students in this respect.

Where a staff members actions contravene Academic Integrity Principles and give rise to allegations of a breach of Research or Academic Integrity which is subsequently upheld following subsequent investigation via the **Staff Misconduct Policy and Procedures**, this may be considered a repudiation of their contractual agreement with Kent and may result in the termination of employment as Breaches of Academic Integrity principles are in direct conflict with the inherent requirements of their role.

2.11 Communication of Outcomes of Upheld Academic Integrity Breaches to the Student

The student will receive a written outcome from the Associate Dean or the Head of Vocational Education or nominee usually via the Higher Education or Vocational Education Administrators. This outcome will contain the following information:

- a) Details of the basis on which the misconduct was determined;
- b) The outcome including any penalty imposed; and
- c) Confirmation of student's appeal right in accordance with the **Complaints and Appeals Policy and Procedures**.
- d) Referrals to any support services and resources which may assist the student is exercising their Academic Integrity Responsibilities in future.

If the penalty has enrolment implications, the Associate Dean or the Head of Vocational Education shall notify Executive Manager Student Services within five (5) working days of the notification date of the decision.

2.12 Application of Penalties

- i. The Course Co-ordinator or the Head of Vocational Education is ultimately responsible for ensuring the penalty is applied to the student's grade and updated in the relevant systems, e.g. Moodle, RTO.
- ii. The Associate Dean or the Head of Vocational Education or nominee will record, by an intervention entry on the Academic Misconduct Register in the Kent Student Information System (SIS), the details of the academic misconduct including the *Student Academic Misconduct Form*, relevant original submission, Turnitin reports, *Invigilator Report Examination Incidents* and other supporting evidence.
- iii. Students will not be able to access course/unit material on Moodle for future periods of study and a sanction will be placed on their account until and unless they successfully complete the required ALS session on the foundations of academic integrity. This will not restrict access to Moodle in the period of study in which the academic misconduct decision is made.

3.0 Appeals Process

A Kent student may appeal the outcome of the Academic Misconduct case. Students have access to Kent's complaints and appeals process by referring to the *Complaints and Appeals Policy and Procedures* (Kent Website [MyKent Student Link](#)> Student Policies and Forms > POLICY - Complaints & Appeals Policy and Procedures – Student Login Required). A Student Complaints & Appeals Form (Kent Website [MyKent Student Link](#)> Student Policies and Forms > FORM - Complaints & Appeals Form – Student Login Required) must be lodged within twenty (20) working days from the notification date of the Kent decision.

4.0 Records and Reporting

Records of all cases of student academic misconduct will be maintained in strict confidence in the student's file on the Kent Student Information System (SIS).

The Associate Dean or the Head of Vocational Education will record all details on the **Academic Misconduct Register**.


Breaches of Academic Integrity inclusive of Academic Misconduct among Students breaches of Research Integrity will be reported to Academic Board by the Executive Dean) at the completion of each Trimester for Higher Education and by the Head of Vocational Education (VET) at the end of each Term as designated by the Kent Academic Calendar. Particular details of cases that are addressed by a convened Academic Misconduct Tribunal will be also reported to Academic Board.

The Chief Risk and Compliance Officer or the equivalent officer will provide an annual report on Academic Misconduct or Research Misconduct to the Audit & Risk Management Committee.

5.0 Copyright

Copyright is a part of Intellectual Property and hence should also be considered within the scope of the principles of Academic Integrity with particular reference to the use and acknowledgement of sources of information.

All Kent staff and students are required to comply with the *Copyright Act 1968* (Cth) and the Copyright Amendment (Digital Agenda) Act 2000 by, for example, not photocopying more than 10% or one chapter (whichever is greater) of a book.



The *Copyright Act 1968* (Cth) provides the legislative framework for the creation, copying, and communication of electronic, print, graphic, and audio-visual works. Staff are expected to comply with all laws relating to copyright.

The *Copyright Act 1968* gives authors and other copyright owners of original 'works' the exclusive right to reproduce, publish, communicate, and adapt their material; and to licence, transfer, or sell it to other people.

Almost all written material, images, as well as music and other sound recordings, films and other visual media, are considered as 'works' protected by copyright, whether they are in print format or digital, in a book, a magazine, a DVD, or on a website. Using copyright protected works without permission from the copyright owner, or according to the provisions of the Copyright Act 1968, could lead to infringement of the Act, with possibly severe repercussions for both the individual and Kent.

Document Title: Academic Integrity Policy and Procedures	
Date Compiled: January, 2012	By: Associate Dean
Due Date for Review: 23 August 2024	Website Access Permission: Public and Students
Date Updated: 10 th September, 2014 22 nd June, 2015 4 th October, 2016 11 th April, 2017 7 th December, 2017 27 th August, 2018 24 th May, 2019 (minor amendment – no version control change) 11 th November, 2019 22 nd June, 2020 23 rd August, 2022 6 July 2023 24 May 2024	Reviewed By: V2 – CEO V3 – Executive Dean V4 – Executive Dean V5 – Associate Dean V6 – General Manager Campus Ops/CD V7 – Associate Dean (Melbourne) Executive Dean Executive Dean Associate Dean (Sydney)/Head of Vocational Education Executive Manager Governance, Risk and Compliance Executive Dean (Teaching and Learning) Chief risk and Compliance Officer, Executive Dean (Teaching and Learning)
Version Control Update (Current): Version 2 – 10 th September, 2014 Version 3 – 22 nd June, 2015 Version 4 – 4 th October, 2016 Version 5 – 11 th April, 2017 Version 6 - 7 th December, 2017 Version 7 – 27 th August, 2018 Version 8 – 11 th November, 2019 Version 9 – 23 rd August 2022 Version 10 – 6 July 2023 Version 11 – 24 May 2024	Endorsed By: Academic Board Meeting Dates: V2 - 13 November, 2014 - Written Resolution 28/10/2014 V3 – 16 th July, 2015 V4 – Written Resolution 11 October, 2016 V5 – 23 rd May, 2017 V7 – 4 th September, 2018 V8 – 6 th November, 2019/11 March 2020 Approved By: Governing Board Meeting Dates: V2 - 10 th December, 2014 V3 – 12 th August, 2015 V4 – 15 th November, 2016 V5 – 7 th June, 2017 V6 – Managing Director – 7 th December, 2017 V7 - Governing Board 17 th October, 2018 V8 – 4 th December, 2019 CEO – 24 th May, 2019 Managing Director/CEO – 28 th June, 2020 V9 – Academic Board 23 rd August 2022, Governing Board 7 th September 2022 V10 – Academic Board 6 July 2023, Governing Board 9 July 2023 V11 – endorsed Academic Board 24 May 2024, approved Governing Board 5 June 2024

AMENDMENTS:

11/04/2017 – inclusion of clauses related to Copyright Laws and additional minor word changes.

07/12/2017 – minor word changes and additions related to clarification of ‘academic misconduct’ and ‘plagiarism’ definitions. Update of Kent staff position titles and responsibilities for administration and reporting of the procedures in this policy.

27/08/2018 – Revise Definitions to be aligned with TEQSA Standards, revise procedures and detail prevention strategies to be implemented and update to Kent staff position titles.

24/05/2019 – 12 month review noting minor amendments with 2 added Definitions – Academic Offender and Repeat Academic Offender and minor word amendment to Clause 2.6 v) d). Update the Hyperlinks to documents to the new Kent Website Business Management System (BMS) links.

11/11/2019 – amend the membership of the Academic Misconduct Tribunal to include a student representative as proposed by the Academic Board 6th November, 2019 Agenda Item 8.1.

23/08/2022 -

22/06/2020 – update and review of Clause 2.0 and addition of Examination Interview Record for Higher Education student interview following assessment tasks and other minor word amendments.

23/08/2022 – Removal of references to “Minor Misconduct” and “Serious Misconduct”, updates to the prevention and mitigation strategies which are currently in place at Kent, clarification and expansion of procedures, delegations of authority and accountabilities for relevant stakeholders including Course Co-ordinators and Associate and Executive Deans. Extension of scope of the policy to include Academic Staff and Scholarship and Research Activities at Kent and incorporation of Research Integrity. Change in the name of the Policy to “Academic Integrity Policy and Procedures” to shift focus from Misconduct to Integrity and further align with the inclusion of Research Integrity. Address of new and emerging technologies which pose a threat to Academic Integrity, inclusive of code copying, artificial intelligence and paraphrasing software.

6/07/2023 – Insertion of references to instruction as to if, when and how Artificial Intelligence maybe used. Examination Interview Record Form renamed “*Assessment Interview Record Form*” to capture all types of assessments for which an interview would be required, in response to the emergence of Artificial Intelligence.

24/05/2024 – v11 - Clarification of allegations of misconduct pertaining to use of generative AI Tools (exclusion from plagiarism). Expansion of Lecturer/Tutor responsibilities with respect to the guidance provided to students on the use of AI Tools. Inclusion of best practice with respect to educating students regarding commercial Contract Cheating services. Addition of academic staff requirement to complete training (TEQSA’s self-directed online course, Masterclass: contract cheating detection and deterrence.) Distinguish between cases involving commercial academic cheating service (progressed to Academic Misconduct Tribunal), and ghost-writing and AI tool usage allegations (adjudication by Associate Dean).

PROCEDURE FLOWCHART

