

Academic Integrity and Honesty Policy

Policy number	P33	Version	6
Approved by ABG on	10 June 2021	Scheduled review date	June 2024

1. Purpose

The National Institute of Organisation Dynamics Australia (NIODA) values excellence and rigour in delivery and learning that is achieved in an intellectual environment where integrity is highly valued and carefully upheld.

This policy reflects NIODA's intent to promote the highest standards among staff, students and candidates.

2. Scope

This policy applies to all NIODA teaching and learning activities undertaken by its staff and students/candidates whether online or onsite.

3. Policy Statement

NIODA adheres to the common understanding of academic integrity and honesty in that its staff require of themselves and the student/candidates to openly distinguish between the claims for knowledge that they attribute to themselves and those generated by others from which they have drawn. This applies to written assignments, published work and other 'knowledge' such as design for organisational interventions.

In addition to this common and fundamental understanding, the course offered by NIODA raises many contemporary dilemmas of integrity and honesty within the work lives of staff or student/candidates. In the literature this has been described as the emergence of perverse organisational cultures in which student/candidates both witness the erosion of standards of behaviour and at the same time deny to themselves meaningful 'knowing about' the implications of this change. The experiential learning methods used by NIODA bring forward such experience in the work lives of student/candidates and make space to examine such dynamics both at work and within the course.

4. Academic Misconduct

'Academic Misconduct' includes all conduct which compromises NIODA's integrity and honesty. The following definitions are examples of academic misconduct:

- Plagiarism: Direct copying or paraphrasing of sentences, paragraphs, or other extracts without acknowledging the source or failing to appropriately use quotation marks. Using ideas, facts or information derived from a source without acknowledgment
- 'Contract Cheating': Employment or use of a third party to undertake assessed work for the student. These third parties may include: essay writing services; friends, family or other students; private tutors; copyediting services; agency websites; or 'reverse classifieds' where a request is put out to the market and a supplier responds.
- Fabrication: Submitting changed or made up information
- Multiple submissions: submitting without prior authorisation work that has been submitted for other assessment

Academic Integrity and Honesty Policy

- Falsifying information for academic records
- Supporting others in Academic Misconduct: knowingly assisting another person to engage in conduct that compromises integrity and honesty at NIODA.
- Unfair advantage: for example falsifying reasons for request for extensions to submit assignments or keeping library books purposefully past due dates to prevent others having access to them.

4.1 Academic Misconduct and Group Work

Collaborative group work is integral to the learning experience at NIODA. In some subjects students will work in small learning groups on a group project with either a group or an individual written assignment required. Every student who is part of a group undertaking an assignment or other piece of assessed group work is required to take, and will be deemed to have taken, individual as well as joint responsibility for all the work submitted by the group. In particular, this includes individual as well as joint responsibility for compliance with course integrity and honesty policies. Any action taken in the event of an offence will normally be applied to all members of the group. The two exceptions to the application of this process to all members of the group are:

- i. where a member of the group acknowledges, in writing to the Academic Program Lead that they has contravened the course integrity and honest policy; and
- ii. where the offence can be shown to have been committed by (a) specific member(s) of the group responsible for those sections of the work that contravened the integrity and honest policy.

In these cases action will only be taken with the (those) member(s) of the group.

4.2 Student/candidate Responsibilities

Students and candidates at NIODA have a responsibility to ensure that they develop a clear understanding of what constitutes, and how to avoid, dishonest and /or unethical practices in all aspects of their learning, research and scholarship practices.

4.3 Staff Responsibilities

NIODA recognises its obligation to educate student/candidates in the definition, identification and avoidance of academic misconduct. NIODA, as an organisation, is also aware that different cultures have varied attitudes towards scholarly authority and value student/candidate originality differently. Student/candidates entering NIODA will be informed clearly of the academic standards expected in subjects and units, and the precise requirements of the required Harvard referencing style.

NIODA is committed to the following strategies to reduce the incidence of plagiarism and academic misconduct. Staff will:

- ensure all student/candidates are aware of the relevant NIODA policies
- teach student/candidates skills they need to avoid plagiarism
- inform student/candidates that rigorous standards in referencing and acknowledgment of sources will be required in their course work
- encourage student/candidates to give attention to the role of reference lists, and full referencing within the body of assignments

- ensure that subject outlines are prepared according to the same high standards of referencing that they demand of student/candidates.

4.4 Procedures for Responding to Academic Misconduct

When academic misconduct is suspected, a staff member involved in the subject is required to put the matter to the student/candidate, identify specifically the type of misconduct and all details related to the alleged incident, and report the matter to the Subject Coordinator. If it is alleged that an internet site is the source of plagiarism, it would be advisable to print out the material in case the site is changed.

If the staff member, in discussion with the student/candidate, believes the incident has in fact occurred and is a minor offence, the student/candidate will be required to re-submit the assessment task with all appropriate corrections, referencing additions or deletions and will have their work monitored carefully in the assessment of subsequent assignments.

Minor offences are limited instances of academic misconduct, for example, breaches in referencing/collaboration/contravening assessment expectations and regulations which in the case of first year student/candidates may be due to inexperience or a lack of understanding. In such cases NIODA staff will work with the student/candidate to ensure any breaches do not recur.

If the staff member believes, in discussion with the student/candidate, that a serious breach of the guidelines has occurred then the matter is reported to the Academic Program Lead who advises the Education Committee to convene an Academic Misconduct subcommittee. The sub-committee will review the case and report back to the Education Committee with its findings.

The subcommittee will proceed with reference to the following guiding principles:

- the issue must be handled in a timely, efficient, fair and equitable way
- the Subject Coordinator should provide a detailed report of the alleged misconduct to the subcommittee
- the student/candidate must have the opportunity to present their case to the subcommittee
- the student/candidate may invite another person to support them when presenting their case to the subcommittee
- the student/candidate must receive a written report of outcomes within 10 working days of a resolution being determined by the subcommittee
- the subcommittee must record decisions and actions taken by the subcommittee and the reasoning behind them for record keeping, and to be used (in a non identifiable form) in institutional and/or course review processes

In determining their decision and resolutions the subcommittee should take into account:

- a) the extent of the misconduct
- b) the seriousness of the misconduct
- c) whether it is a repeat offence
- d) evidence of mitigating circumstances

The subcommittee may impose penalties including:

- a) a formal reprimand

Academic Integrity and Honesty Policy

- b) repeat of assessment task
- c) failure of parts or whole of the assessment task
- d) in serious repeat cases, suspension or expulsion from the course

5. Grievances

Grievances relating to Academic Misconduct subcommittee decisions should be taken up as per the NIODA Student Grievance Policy. The Policy is published on the NIODA website.

6. Related Documents

Intellectual Property Policy

Candidate and Student Grievance Policy

Academic Misconduct Policy

TEQSA Good Practice Note: *Addressing contract cheating to safeguard academic integrity* (2017)