

Student Academic Integrity Procedures

Table of Contents

1. Governing Policy
2. Purpose
3. Definitions
4. Responsibilities
 - 4.1. Students
 - 4.2. Staff
5. Academic Integrity Register
6. Handling an allegation of failure to meet academic integrity requirements
 - 6.1. Reviewers
 - 6.2. Allegation
 - 6.3. Preliminary Assessment
 - 6.4. Misunderstanding (prima facie case)
 - 6.5. Level 1 Academic Misconduct (prima facie case)
 - 6.6. Level 2 Serious Academic Misconduct (prima facie case)
7. Reviews and appeals
8. Authorities
9. Related links

1. Governing Policy

[Student Academic Integrity Policy](#)

2. Purpose

To set out:

- a. the responsibilities of students and staff in respect of academic integrity
- b. the process by which allegations of a student's [failure to meet student academic integrity requirements](#) are investigated and dealt with.

3. Definitions

Failure to meet student academic integrity requirements

Misunderstanding
Level 1 Academic Misconduct
Level 2 Serious Academic Misconduct
—as defined in Schedules 1 and 2 of the [Student Academic Integrity Policy](#)

4. Responsibilities

4.1. Students

Students are responsible for:

- a. Acquiring a clear understanding of student academic integrity requirements and how to meet them, by:
 - i. being aware of the [Student Academic Integrity Policy](#) and these procedures
 - ii. undertaking the online FLO Academic Integrity tutorial
 - iii. informing themselves about the expectations of the University and relevant discipline/s through:

- College-provided information (e.g. topic information, topic Statements of Assessment Methods, information provided by teaching staff and research component supervisors), and
 - University-wide information (e.g. websites such as [Academic Integrity for Students](#), library information and related policies)
- iv. taking advantage of the education opportunities provided for education on academic integrity, and seeking additional assistance if required
 - v. understanding how to use the University's text-matching software to check their text-based assessments, and how to respond to similarity reports
 - vi. understanding the difference between collaboration with other students (which is encouraged) and collusion with other students or non-students (which may not meet academic integrity requirements).
- b. Employing ethical practices and the required academic integrity standards in their academic work submitted for assessment, by:
- i. complying with the requirements of the Student Academic Integrity Policy, including ensuring that all work submitted is their own work unless appropriately referenced otherwise
 - ii. including:
 - an academic integrity declaration with the submission of all assessments, and
 - a text-matching report with the submission of text-based assessments (except where exempted under [Procedure 8](#) due to special circumstances) — taking into account the need to interpret similarity reports in the specific context of the discipline and/or topic
 - iii. adhering to any instructions given by staff about the acceptable level of working together and how their work will be individually or jointly assessed
 - iv. acknowledging that they are aware of, and have met, academic integrity requirements, by signing an appropriate statement to be submitted with all assessed work.

4.2. Staff

4.2.1. Teaching staff

Academic and professional staff involved in teaching are responsible for:

- a. Being an **exemplar** of good academic practice, including:
 - i. keeping up-to-date with the policies and procedures on academic integrity
 - ii. employing high ethical and academic standards in all their teaching.
- b. Taking **preventative** action, including:
 - i. keeping up-to-date with issues of academic integrity in education
 - ii. regularly consulting the [Academic Integrity for Staff](#) website
 - iii. designing assessment tasks that minimise the potential for students to fail to meet academic integrity requirements
 - iv. engaging with information provided by, and consulting with, their relevant Topic, Course Coordinator, College Dean (Education) and/or [Learning and Teaching Innovation](#) on the prevention of academic dishonesty.
- c. Carrying out an **educative** role, including:
 - i. providing students with appropriate guidance, learning activities and feedback on academic integrity, including through incorporation of academic integrity requirements into first-year topics

- ii. clearly communicating to students:
 - the assessment methods and expectations relating to academic integrity
 - the common conventions that uphold academic integrity, as well as any specific requirements of the disciplines
 - that electronic text matching software will be used for all text-based assessment submissions
 - the existence of University information on text-matching, including how to use the software and interpret the results
- iii. communicating to students the acceptable level of working together and the difference between collaboration with other students (which is encouraged) and collusion with other students or non-students (which may not meet academic integrity requirements) and how their work will be individually or jointly assessed.
- d. Taking active steps to **detect** all forms of academic dishonesty, including:
 - i. using the University's text-matching software and understanding how to interpret the results of text-matching in the context of academic integrity
 - ii. ensuring that all text-based student assessments have undergone text-matching upon submission (except where exempted under [Procedure 8](#) due to special circumstances) — taking into account the need to interpret similarity reports in the specific context of the discipline and/or topic
 - iii. identifying any anomalies in work submitted by students, as well as any significant differences in the quality of a student's writing when compared to other assessment tasks or communication from the student, which may indicate a failure to meet academic integrity requirements
 - iv. ensuring that appropriate action is taken in accordance with this policy and supporting procedures if potential failures to meet student academic integrity requirements are revealed.

4.2.2. Course Coordinators / Teaching Program Directors, Deans (Education), College Education Committees

Course Coordinators / Teaching Program Directors, Deans (Education), and College Education Committees are responsible for:

- a. monitoring academic integrity in the courses for which they are responsible or have oversight
- b. providing leadership to Topic Coordinators, supervisors and teaching staff on preventative and educative strategies to reduce the opportunities for students to fail to meet academic integrity requirements, and
- c. conducting any other responsibilities specified elsewhere in these procedures.

4.2.3. Academic Integrity Officers

- a. A Vice-President and Executive Dean must appoint one or more academic staff members as Academic Integrity Officers in their College.
- b. Academic Integrity Officers are responsible for:
 - i. any responsibilities delegated to them under these procedures
 - ii. ensuring consistency in handling cases of failure to meet academic integrity requirements and responses/penalties within the College
 - iii. providing case management and reporting advice and support to assessors and Topic Coordinators/First Reviewers in the College, and
 - iv. providing advice on the implementation of University-wide and College-specific academic integrity strategies and detection mechanisms.

4.2.4. Student Policy and Integrity Services

Student Policy and Integrity Services is responsible for:

- a. advising College academic staff on the application of the [Student Academic Integrity Policy](#), these procedures and [Statute 6.4–Student Conduct](#), and
- b. supporting Board of Inquiry processes under Statute 6.4 – Student Conduct.

5. Academic Integrity Register

- a. There is an Academic Integrity Register maintained by Student Policy and Integrity Services.
- b. A student's previous record on the Register will not be used to determine whether an alleged failure to meet academic integrity requirements actually occurred, but will be used in determining the category of the failure, and hence the nature of the process to be conducted and the appropriate consequence.
- c. Requests from staff for information contained in the Register must be lodged using the Academic Integrity Allegation Form on Service One or made in writing to confidential.register@flinders.edu.au.
- d. Students are entitled to access any entries about them in the register, in accordance with the [Student Information Management Procedures](#).
- e. Aggregated data may be reported for the purposes of academic integrity monitoring, quality improvement and research, but must not disclose the identity of individuals.
- f. Records will be retained in accordance with the [Records Management Policy](#).

6. Handling an allegation of failure to meet academic integrity requirements

6.1. Reviewers

- a. The responsibility and authority to act as a First or Second Reviewer is set out below.
- b. A staff member cannot be both a First Reviewer and a Second Reviewer. A staff member cannot be a Reviewer if they have a conflict of interest as defined in the [Conflict of Interest Policy](#).
- c. If a Second Reviewer has already acted as the First Reviewer (e.g. where the Dean (Education) or College Academic Integrity Officer is also the Topic Coordinator for the relevant topic), or is unavailable, the inquiry must be referred to the other Second Reviewer in the College. If the other Second Reviewer is unavailable, the inquiry must be assigned by the Vice-President and Executive Dean to another appropriate academic staff member in the College (e.g. the Course Coordinator or Teaching Program Director). The academic staff member assigned with the inquiry will hold all the responsibilities and authorities of a Second Reviewer.

First Reviewer	Topic Coordinator, unless, if the allegation relates to a research component, the Dean (Education) approves otherwise
Second Reviewer	Dean (Education) or College Academic Integrity Officer

6.2. Allegation

- a. Any University staff member or student, or member of the public, may report an allegation that a student has failed to meet academic integrity requirements, in accordance with either b. or c. below.
- b. **Reports from staff members:**

- i. A staff member, on identifying a suspected failure to meet student academic integrity requirements, will collate evidence of the failure and complete an Academic Integrity Allegation Form on Service One.
 - ii. Upon receipt of the Academic Integrity Allegation Form, Student Policy and Integrity Services will undertake a check of the Academic Integrity Register. The Form and the Register check will be forwarded to a First Reviewer for a Preliminary Assessment.
 - iii. Where the staff member who identified the suspected failure to meet academic integrity requirements is also the Topic Coordinator the staff member has the authority to serve as a First Reviewer under these procedures.
 - iv. Where the staff member is relying on an electronic text-matching software report, the Academic Integrity Allegation Form must be accompanied by an analysis of the text-matching report, and the reasons why the staff member believes there has been a failure to meet academic integrity requirements.
- c. **Reports from a student or member of the public:**
- i. A student or member of the public, on identifying a suspected failure to meet academic integrity requirements, may report the alleged failure to Student Policy and Integrity Services (confidential.register@flinders.edu.au), with all the relevant evidence.
 - ii. Anonymous allegations may be accepted, but anonymity may constrain the University in the effectiveness of its investigation.
 - iii. Student Policy and Integrity Services will triage the allegation and arrange for investigation and inquiry, as appropriate.

6.3. Preliminary Assessment

- a. A Preliminary Assessment will be conducted by a [First Reviewer](#) upon receipt of an Academic Integrity Allegation Form from a staff member.
- b. The purpose of the Preliminary Assessment is to:
 - i. assess whether there is a **prima facie case** of a failure to meet student academic integrity requirements
 - ii. assess whether there is **sufficient evidence to proceed** under Procedures 6.4, 6.5 or 6.6. The assessment will be based upon a review of the following evidence:
 - the Academic Integrity Allegation Form (where applicable)
 - the assessment item
 - the text matching report (if applicable); and
 - any other relevant evidence.
 - iii. **assess the category** of the failure as per Schedules 1 and 2 of the [Student Academic Integrity Policy](#) (using the Academic Integrity Matrix if required).
- c. The First Reviewer may make such inquiries as they see fit during the Preliminary Assessment.
- d. If the Preliminary Assessment is that there is **sufficient evidence** to proceed under Procedures 6.4, 6.5 or 6.6, the First Reviewer will:
 - i. Consider whether there are any prior Academic Integrity records on the Academic Integrity Register, and
 - ii. refer to the table below to determine the appropriate Reviewer and action.

Preliminary Assessment	Register shows	Appropriate Reviewer	Action
Misunderstanding	None or 1 prior Educational Advice recorded	First Reviewer (i.e. the person who conducted the Preliminary Assessment)	Misunderstanding process – Procedure 6.4
	2 or more prior Educational Advices recorded; or 1 or more Level 1 or 2 Academic Misconduct penalties	Second Reviewer	Level 1 Academic Misconduct Inquiry – Procedure 6.5
Level 1 Academic Misconduct	None or 1 prior Misunderstanding Educational Advices or Level 1 Academic Misconduct penalties	Second Reviewer	Level 1 Academic Misconduct Inquiry – Procedure 6.5
	2 or more prior Level 1 or 2 Academic Misconduct penalties	Second Reviewer	Level 2 Academic Misconduct Formal Report – Procedure 6.6 Prepare a report to the Pro Vice-Chancellor (Academic Quality and Enhancement) under Statute 6.4
Level 2 Serious Academic Misconduct	Not relevant	Second Reviewer	Level 2 Academic Misconduct Formal Report – Procedure 6.6 Prepare a report to the Pro Vice-Chancellor (Academic Quality and Enhancement) under Statute 6.4

- e. If the Preliminary Assessment is that there is **insufficient or no evidence** to substantiate the alleged failure, the First Reviewer will:
- i. notify the staff member who made the allegation, and
 - ii. complete the Report an Academic Integrity Issue Form on Service One and report that there is no case to answer.

6.4. Misunderstanding (prima facie case)

- a. A Misunderstanding Process follows a Preliminary Assessment that an alleged failure to meet the requirements of academic integrity is one of Misunderstanding. The purpose of the Misunderstanding Process is to make a determination on:
 - i. whether the alleged failure to meet academic integrity requirements has been substantiated
 - ii. whether the failure is:

- Misunderstanding, in which case the educational advice, academic response and record specified in Schedule 1 of the [Student Academic Integrity Policy](#) must be applied by the First Reviewer, or
 - Level 1 Academic Misconduct or Level 2 Serious Academic Misconduct, in which case the matter must be referred to a Second Reviewer in accordance with Procedure 6.5 or 6.6 below.
- b. The [First Reviewer](#) will notify the student of the allegation by email (to their University email address) (*template available*), which must include:
- i. details and relevant documentation of the alleged failure to meet academic integrity requirements
 - ii. an invitation for the student to respond to the allegations at a meeting with the First Reviewer, or by telephone or email, within 5 business days
 - iii. advice that the student is permitted to bring a support person to the meeting
 - iv. a link to the [Student Academic Integrity Policy](#) and these procedures.
- c. After discussion with the student, the First Reviewer will make a determination, based on all the evidence before them, on whether the allegation of failure to meet academic integrity requirements has been substantiated.
- d. If the student does not respond to the notice of allegation within 5 University business days, the First Reviewer may make a determination on whether the allegation is substantiated, based on the evidence available.
- e. If the allegation is **substantiated**, the First Reviewer will then determine:
- i. the category of failure in accordance with Schedules 1 and 2 of the [Student Academic Integrity Policy](#) (the Academic Integrity Matrix may be used if required), and
 - ii. the consequences that align to the category.
- f. Consequences:
- i. Where the determination is that there was Misunderstanding, the First Reviewer will:
 - provide educational advice and determine the academic response, as per Schedule 1 of the [Student Academic Integrity Policy](#)
 - notify the student by email:
 - of the educational advice and academic response, and
 - that a Report of a Misunderstanding will be forwarded to the Academic Integrity Register.
 - if applicable, notify the staff member who made the allegation of the outcome
 - complete the Report an Academic Integrity Issue Form on Service One and
 - ensure the appropriate responses are put into effect.
 - ii. Where the finding is that there is prima facie case of a Level 1 Academic Misconduct or Level 2 Serious Academic Misconduct, the First Reviewer will:
 - refer the allegation to a [Second Reviewer](#) by way of the Report an Academic Integrity Issue Form on Service One, and
 - notify the student in writing that the matter has been referred to a Second Reviewer.
- g. If the allegation is **not substantiated** the First Reviewer will:
- i. notify the student in writing of the outcome, and
 - ii. if applicable, notify the staff member, who made the allegation, of the outcome, and

- iii. complete the Report an Academic Integrity Issue Form on Service One and report that there is no case to answer.

6.5. Level 1 Academic Misconduct (prima facie case)

- a. An Inquiry will be conducted by a [Second Reviewer](#) upon receipt of an Academic Integrity Report from:
 - i. a First Reviewer after a Preliminary Assessment, or
 - ii. a First Reviewer after the Misunderstanding Process—when those processes result in an assessment or determination that an alleged failure to meet academic integrity requirements constitutes Academic Misconduct.
- b. The Level 1 Inquiry's purpose is to determine:
 - i. if the alleged failure to meet academic integrity requirements has been substantiated
 - ii. the category of the failure, and
 - iii. the appropriate responses in accordance with s. 5.3 of the [Student Academic Integrity Policy](#).
- c. The Second Reviewer will set the date and time of the Level 1 Inquiry.
- d. The Second Reviewer will give the student a minimum of 5 University business days' notice of the Level 1 Inquiry.
- e. The Second Reviewer will notify the student of the allegation and inquiry by email (to their University email address) (template available), which must include:
 - i. a link to the [Student Academic Integrity Policy](#) and these procedures
 - ii. the details of the allegation, including copies of all related documents
 - iii. the time, date and place of the inquiry—the inquiry may be held in person, or using any technology which enables all those participating to communicate concurrently with each other and to participate effectively
 - iv. an invitation for the student to respond to the allegation in writing, or by attendance at the inquiry (either in person or via technology), or both
 - v. an invitation for the student to be accompanied at the meeting (either in person or via technology) by a support person, namely a Flinders University staff member or student or a representative of the Flinders University Student Association Student Assist team
[Legal representation is not permitted, but a legally qualified student or representative may attend as a support person provided they are not acting in a professional legal capacity.]
- f. A student may request an extension of time to respond to the allegations due to unforeseen or exceptional circumstances beyond the control of the student, which may be granted at the Second Reviewer's discretion.
- g. The Second Reviewer will conduct the Inquiry at the scheduled time, whether the student has responded to the notification or not, or is present or not.
- h. If the student is present at the Inquiry, the Second Reviewer must ensure they are given an opportunity to present a response. The student and their support person may be asked to leave before the final determination is made.
- i. Based on all the evidence before the Inquiry, the Second Reviewer will make a determination on whether the allegation of failure to meet academic integrity requirements has been substantiated.
- j. If the allegation is **substantiated**, the Second Reviewer will then determine, based on the evidence:

- i. the category of failure in accordance with Schedules 1 and 2 of the [Student Academic Integrity Policy](#) (the Academic Integrity Matrix may be used if required)
—notwithstanding the outcome of a Preliminary Assessment or a Misunderstanding Process, a Second Reviewer may determine that a failure is any of Misunderstanding, Level 1 Academic Misconduct or Level 2 Serious Academic Misconduct.
 - ii. the consequences that align to the category, as provided in Schedules 1 and 2 of the [Student Academic Integrity Policy](#).
- k. The Second Reviewer will:
- i. notify the student in writing of the outcome of the Inquiry, which must include:
 - the determination, with reasons
 - if applicable, advice about what has been recorded on the Academic Integrity Register, , and
 - if the finding is Level 1 Academic Misconduct, the student's right to a review and appeal under the [Student Review and Appeal Policy](#)
 - ii. notify the First Reviewer of the outcome
 - iii. complete the appropriate report form in Service One, and
 - iv. ensure the appropriate advice/responses or penalties are put into effect.

6.6. Level 2 Serious Academic Misconduct (prima facie case)

- a. An allegation of failure to meet academic integrity requirements that is assessed as Level 2 Serious Academic Misconduct during a Preliminary Assessment, or determined as Serious Academic Misconduct during an Academic Misconduct Inquiry, will be referred to a Second Reviewer who will arrange for the preparation of a report for the Pro Vice-Chancellor (Academic Quality and Enhancement).
- b. If a Second Reviewer during an Inquiry determines that a failure to meet academic integrity requirements is, or is likely to be, Level 2 Serious Academic Misconduct, the Second Reviewer will arrange for the preparation of a report for the Pro Vice-Chancellor (Academic Quality and Enhancement).
- c. The report will include:
 - i. details of the allegations against the student
 - ii. a copy of all evidence to support the allegation.
- d. Allegations reported to the Pro Vice-Chancellor (Academic Quality and Enhancement) under Statute 6.4 will be managed under the policy and procedures for [Handling a Matter under Statute 6.4–Student Conduct](#).

7. Reviews and appeals

- a. A student may request a review of a determination of Level 1 Academic Misconduct by a Second Reviewer in accordance with the [Student Review and Appeal Policy](#) and procedures.
- b. A student who is dissatisfied with the outcome of the review may appeal to the Student Appeals Committee, if specified grounds are met, in accordance with the [Student Review and Appeal Policy](#) and procedures.
- c. A student may appeal a Level 2 Serious Academic Misconduct decision by a Board of Inquiry in accordance with the policy and procedures for [Handling a Matter under Statute 6.4–Student Conduct](#).

8. Authorities

**College Dean
(Education)**

Approve or reject cases for exemption from the requirement for the application of text-matching software to student assessment due to special circumstances (e.g. because the student work contains confidential material that should not be deposited in the text-matching database).

9. Related links

[Managing an Academic Integrity issue](#)

Approval Authority	Deputy Vice-Chancellor (Students)
Responsible Officer	Pro Vice-Chancellor (Academic Quality and Enhancement)
Approval Date	21 March 2024
Effective Date	21 March 2024
Review Date*	2027
Last amended	Pro Vice-Chancellor (Academic Quality and Enhancement), 6 May 2024
CM file number	CF18/1044

* Unless otherwise indicated, this policy or procedures still apply beyond the review date.

Printed versions of this document are not controlled. Please refer to the [Flinders Policy Library](#) for the latest version.