

ACADEMIC INTEGRITY AND MISCONDUCT POLICY

(INCLUDING PLAGIARISM, CHEATING AND COLLUSION POLICY)

1. POLICY

Academic integrity is an essential component of vocational teaching and learning. The ideas and work of others must be acknowledged rather than claimed as one's own.

This policy supports the requirements of the Standards for RTOs 2025, ensuring that assessment outcomes are valid, authentic, and uphold the integrity of qualifications. It reflects current practices, including the responsible use of AI, the role of detection tools, and structured staff/student support to manage and prevent academic misconduct for St Albans Institute Pty Ltd t/a Hawk Institute hereinafter referred to as HAWK.

2. PURPOSE

The purpose of this Academic Integrity and Misconduct Policy is to outline:

- Hawk Institute's commitment to high standards of academic integrity
- The issues associated with plagiarism and collusion and their effect on student learning
- The principles under which preventing, detecting and dealing with cases of plagiarism and collusion and related forms of cheating are managed

3. SCOPE

This policy applies to all Hawk Institute students and staff involved in academic assessment tasks and scholarly work.

4. DEFINITIONS

- 4.1. **Academic Integrity:** Adherence to ethical and honest practices in learning, teaching, and assessment.
- 4.2. **Academic Integrity Breach:** Any action or attempted action that compromises academic integrity, including plagiarism, cheating, collusion, AI misuse, contract cheating, and unauthorized collaboration.
- 4.3. **Artificial Intelligence (AI) Misuse:** Use of AI tools (e.g., ChatGPT, Grammarly, paraphrasing tools) to generate or modify assessment responses in a way that misrepresents a student's own work or understanding, unless specifically permitted by the assessor.
- 4.4. **Attribution:** Acknowledging the author or artist of words, music, computer code, artistic works, designs or ideas.
- 4.5. **Citation:** Directly quoting or paraphrasing another person's text, work or idea, and giving credit to the author by referencing it.
- 4.6. **Collaboration:** An academic activity involving more than one person.
- 4.7. **Collusion:** Another person assisting in the production of an assessment submission without the express requirement, consent or knowledge of the assessor.
- 4.8. **Copyright:** The legal right granted to an author, artist, publisher, or distributor to exclusive publication, production, sale, or distribution of literary, musical, dramatic, or artistic work.
- 4.9. **Paraphrasing:** Repeating a section of text using different words which retain the original meaning.
- 4.10. **Plagiarism:** To take and use another person's ideas and or manner of expressing them and to pass them off as one's own by failing to give appropriate acknowledgement. This includes material from any source, staff, students or the Internet – published and un-published works.
- 4.11. **Quotation:** Placing an excerpt from an original source into a paper using either quotation marks or indentation, with the source cited, using an approved referencing system in order to give credit to the original author.
- 4.12. **Referencing:** Providing a full bibliographic reference to the source of the citation.

5. POLICY PRINCIPLES

- 5.1. Plagiarism, collusion and other forms of cheating are expressly forbidden under the HAWK's Rules for Assessment, which state that:
 - 5.1.1. No student will submit for assessment any piece of work that is not entirely the student's own, except where either:
 - The use of the words, designs, computer code, creative works, ideas of others or is appropriate and duly acknowledged, or
 - The assessor has given prior permission for joint or collaborative work to be submitted.
 - 5.1.2. No student will assist any candidate in any piece of assessed individual work, and no student shall accept assistance in such a piece of assessed individual work, except in accordance with approved study and assessment schemes.
 - 5.1.3. No student will submit the same piece of work for assessment in two different courses, except in accordance with approved study and assessment schemes.
 - 5.1.4. No student will submit responses generated through use of artificial intelligence (AI) tools without express permission or acknowledgement is considered a breach of academic integrity. Students must declare the use of any AI tools if permitted by the trainer.
- 5.2. HAWK regards all plagiarism as unacceptable. At the very least, unintentional plagiarism is a lowering of the standards of academic integrity and an impediment to student learning. Where plagiarism is intentional and/or systematic, it is cheating.
- 5.3. In order to maintain high standards of academic integrity, it is the obligation of every member of HAWK to know and respect the rules concerning plagiarism, and to seek and foster a learning environment that encourages the development of academic skills that are appropriate for each discipline.
- 5.4. Plagiarism is always unacceptable but can occur as a result of inadequate understanding of the procedures of appropriate referencing or because of a lack of skills in academic writing.
- 5.5. All work submitted must be an accurate reflection of the Student's level of competence. The evidence used to make a decision at HAWK about competence will be valid, sufficient, authentic and current.
- 5.6. All staff are required to undertake annual professional development related to academic integrity, assessment validation, and emerging risks (e.g., AI misuse) as per RTO Standards 2025.

6. TYPES OF PLAGIARISM THAT WILL INCUR PENALTIES

Plagiarism that will incur penalties can take several forms:

- Presenting works in any format, without appropriate attribution to the original source.
- Paraphrasing sentences or whole paragraphs without due acknowledgement by reference to the original work.
- Submitting assessment work with the intention to deceive the assessor as to the contribution made by the student submitting the work.
- Students submitting the same piece of work with the intention to deceive the assessor as to the contribution they have made to the assessment task.
- A student submitting the same piece of his or her own work, or significant parts of that work, for two (or more) different courses, without the assessor's permission.

7. REFERENCING

- 7.1. Referencing is a way of acknowledging the sources of information that a person uses to research your assignments. References should be provided whenever someone else's words, ideas or research are used. One should also provide references for any information used. Websites, Journals, Research papers, Blogs, articles and any other online sources need to be referenced.
- 7.2. Not referencing other people's work can constitute plagiarism.
- 7.3. While students are referencing, it is important that students add their own comments on the basis of their understanding.

8. CONSEQUENCES OF PLAGIARISM AND COLLUSION

- 8.1. Plagiarism is unacceptable and each case of plagiarism will be treated on its own merits. Educational procedures will be in place to assist students to avoid submitting assessment work that does not meet the required standards of evidence-based writing.
- 8.2. All assessment work submitted by a student will be assessed in accordance with its academic merit. If a student fails an assessment task because of the absence of appropriate citations and references, it may be a consequence of the student failing to meet the stated criteria for the task, rather than as a punishment for plagiarism.
- 8.3. Inappropriate practices in the use of referencing, citations, quotations or attributions for formative assessment may be dealt with by the assessor, who may refer students to appropriate resources to improve their academic skills. Suspected incidents of plagiarism involving summative assessments must be dealt with according to the guidelines of this policy.
- 8.4. The penalties associated with plagiarism are designed to impose sanctions that reflect the seriousness of the HAWK's commitment to academic integrity. Penalties may include resubmitting assessment work i.e., further reassessment and/or possible financial penalty or failing the unit. It may also lead to students being re-enrolled in the unit which will incur additional payment.
- 8.5. The student's assessment will be deemed Not Yet Competent (NYC). The student will be given a warning and will be required to redo the assessment. Additional charges may apply for re-assessments.
- 8.6. If the student is unsuccessful after three (3) assessment attempts, they will be required to repeat the unit and Pay the Repeat Unit Fee. To know more about fees and charges please refer to Assessment Policy and Procedures. Students can send an email at info@hawkinstitute.edu.au for any further queries.
- 8.7. Training Manager will keep a record of all suspected incidents of plagiarism brought to attention by the trainers. Procedural aspects of these records will be reviewed to ensure that they have been dealt with fairness.
- 8.8. If trainer and/or Training Manager finds that a student has committed multiple and/or systematic acts of plagiarism, or admits to, or is found to have committed, conduct that prejudices the interests of other students or the integrity of an assessment scheme itself, then the case will be dealt with as a complaint of student misconduct under the Student Code of Conduct at HAWK, and a further penalty may be imposed.

All procedures used for dealing with cases of plagiarism must incorporate the following principles:

- A. **Procedural Fairness** (also called "natural justice") in the handling of a complaint involves all of the following elements:
 - The student must have the opportunity to present her or his case to the decision-maker; to be informed of the nature and substance of all allegations and of all information used in arriving at the decision; and to respond to that information. Normally students will also be given the opportunity for an oral hearing, but this is not required by procedural fairness, unless credibility is at issue.
 - The right to an independent, unbiased decision-maker. This includes that the person laying the charge cannot be the decision-maker, nor must there be a reasonable apprehension of bias.
 - A final decision must be based solely on the relevant evidence.
 - Reasons must be given for the decision.
- B. **Transparency:** The procedures aim to be easily accessible to all staff and students, with transparent operation and outcomes, and capable of resolving plagiarism cases in a timely manner with clear deadlines for each stage of resolution. Reasons for each decision will be provided to all parties concerned and are fair to and cognizant of the interests of both students and staff.
- C. **Confidentiality:** All information provided in plagiarism procedures are strictly confidential and can be used only for the investigation of the suspected plagiarism incident, unless the express consent of the individual(s) concerned is obtained; or HAWK has reasonable grounds for believing that the use of the information will reduce a threat to the life or health of any person; or the use is specifically required by law.
- D. **Equity:** Plagiarism cases are dealt with in an equitable and culturally sensitive manner and are judged strictly on their merits.
- E. **Representation/Support:** Persons subject to allegations of plagiarism should have the option of attending meetings to discuss those allegations and to review plagiarism decisions in the company of a designated advocate, representative, friend or support person.

- F. Balance of Probabilities:** The rules of evidence under common law and other legal conventions do not apply to meetings dealing with plagiarism cases. The principle to be applied to the evidence in reaching a decision is the “balance of probabilities” rather than the criminal law principle of “beyond reasonable doubt”.

Written records will be kept by the Training Manager, of all official meetings once an investigation has commenced. A copy of the assessment work, written records of meetings, phone conversations, emails and oral presentations involving the student and the assessor, the Training Manager, will be kept as confidential records.

9. APPEALS

A student who wishes to appeal against the decision or action taken by Hawk Institute may do so in writing under HAWK Feedback, Complaints and Appeals Policy. Students will also be informed of this right in the notification of an investigation. The Feedback, Complaints and Appeals Policy are available on HAWK’s website www.hawkinstitute.edu.au and HAWK’s Students Handbook which can also be made available from HAWK’s reception.

10. PROCEDURE FOR DETECTING AND RESPONDING TO PLAGIARISM

The following procedure outlines the approach adopted by HAWK to detect, assess, and respond to suspected incidents of plagiarism and collusion. This process is designed to uphold academic integrity, support student development, and ensure compliance with institutional expectations and standards.

10.1. Assessment Preparation and Prevention

- Trainers must ensure that all students are made aware of what constitutes plagiarism and collusion as defined in this policy, and the consequences of engaging in such conduct.
- Students are to be provided with clear guidance on academic referencing conventions and are expected to use an approved referencing system when submitting assessments.
- Each student must submit a signed declaration with their assessment confirming that the work is their own and that appropriate credit has been given to all sources used.

10.2. Use of Plagiarism Detection Software

- HAWK employs Plagiarism Checker X as the official tool to support the detection of potential academic misconduct.
- Trainers will apply Plagiarism Checker X selectively across a sample of student assessments. The selection may be influenced by factors such as the complexity of the task, academic level, observed inconsistencies in student performance, or any prior indications of academic misconduct.
- Where appropriate, assessments may be scanned using either the Full Scan or Side-by-Side Comparison functions, including Batch Comparison where collusion is suspected.

10.3. Interpretation of Similarity Reports

- Trainers must review and interpret similarity reports generated by Plagiarism Checker X with care and professional judgment, considering the context and nature of matched content.
- The following general guide is provided to support interpretation:

Similarity Range	Guidance
0–10%	Generally acceptable; may include common phrases, titles, or standard referencing.
10–30%	Requires closer inspection. May reflect poor paraphrasing or incomplete referencing.
30% and above	Must be investigated further to determine whether plagiarism or collusion has occurred.

- Trainers must carefully distinguish between similarities found in:
 - Student responses, which are subject to academic integrity requirements, and
 - Non-student content, such as assessment instructions, case studies, or question wording, which may be common across all submissions and thus inflate the similarity percentage.
- A high similarity percentage does not automatically indicate plagiarism. Trainers are expected to determine:
 - Whether the highlighted sections are part of the student's original answer or copied instructional content.
 - Whether student responses show independent thought, correct referencing, and academic integrity.
- Final judgement must be based on whether the student's own work is appropriately original, paraphrased where required and properly referenced.

10.4. Consequences and Action

Actions taken in response to plagiarism will align with the principles outlined in Section 6 of Academic Integrity and Misconduct Policy.

- For minor or first-time incidents:
 - The student's assessment will be marked Not Yet Competent (NYC).
 - The student will be given a warning and offered an opportunity to resubmit the work.
 - Penalties may include resubmitting assessment work i.e., further reassessment and/or possible financial penalty or failing the unit. It may also lead to students being re-enrolled in the unit which will incur additional payment as classified under the Assessment Policy & Procedures.
- For serious, repeated, or intentional incidents:
 - If trainer and/or Training Manager finds that a student has committed repeated acts of plagiarism, or admits to, or is found to have committed, conduct that prejudices the interests of other students or the integrity of an assessment scheme itself, then the case will be dealt with as a complaint of student misconduct under the Student Code of Conduct at HAWK, and a further penalty may be imposed.

10.5. Documentation and Recordkeeping

- Trainers must retain:
 - A copy of the plagiarism report,
 - The submitted assessment,
 - All related communications and notes.
- These records must be submitted to the Training Manager for record keeping purposes.
- The Training Manager is responsible for maintaining a confidential record of all suspected and confirmed cases of plagiarism and ensuring that due process has been followed.

10.6. Student Notification and Appeal Rights

- Students will be formally notified of any findings related to plagiarism and advised of any penalties, opportunities for resubmission, or re-enrolment requirements.
- All students have the right to appeal decisions under the HAWK Feedback, Complaints and Appeals Policy, which is available via the HAWK website www.hawkinstitute.edu.au and Student Handbook.