

# ACADEMIC MISCONDUCT POLICY AND PROCEDURE

**PP96** 

## **PURPOSE**

This policy promotes the core values of academic integrity, defines academic misconduct and outlines Southern Cross Educations Institues (SCEI) approach to fostering integrity and addressing academic misconduct violations.

The procedure section details how allegations of academic misconduct will be managed to ensure transparency and fairness.

## **SCOPE**

This policy applies to all SCEI students and staff, including third-party delivery partners (if applicable).

DEFINITIONS		
Academic Integrity	A commitment to honesty, trust, fairness, respect, responsibility, and courage in academic work (International Centre for Academic Integrity, 2014).	
Academic Misconduct	Any dishonest action in assessments or examinations to gain an unfair advantage.	
Bribery or Coercion	Offering money, gifts, threats, or force to gain academic advantage.	
Collusion	Unauthorised collaboration on an individual assessment task.	
Continuing Student	Any student who does not meet the definition of a New Student.	
Contract Cheating	Paying or engaging a third party to complete assessments.  Examples include but are not limited to:  outsourcing, purchasing, exchanging, selling, or offering to outsource, purchase, exchange, or sell any whole or part of an assessment task, whether pre-written or specially prepared, including through the unauthorised or improper use of internet or file-sharing sites;	



DEFINITIONS		
	<ul> <li>undertaking part or all assessment tasks for another student, or submitting an assessment task produced, in part or fully, by another person, including a friend, family member, current or former student, private tutor or a staff member; or</li> <li>impersonating another person or allowing a third party to impersonate oneself for the purposes of undertaking an examination or assessment task.</li> </ul>	
	Under the Prohibiting Academic Cheating Services Act 2019 it is a criminal offence to provide or advertise an academic cheating service on a commercial basis.	
	Contract cheating cases must be reported to Quality Partnerships. The Academic Integrity Policy Page 7 of 9 Unit will instigate further investigation in accordance with the Prohibiting Academic Cheating Services Act 2019.	
Educational Response	A corrective measure for minor academic misconduct, such as requiring resubmission or educational interventions.	
International student	A person (whether within or outside Australia) who holds a student visa as defined by the ESOS Act, but does not include students of a kind prescribed in the ESOS Regulations	
National Code	The National Code of Practice for Registration Authorities and Providers of Education and Training to Overseas Students 2018	
New Student	A student enrolled in SCEI courses at the time of the alleged academic misconduct who:              has been enrolled for two or fewer teaching periods at SCEI in either a full-time or part-time capacity; and             has not been found to have committed an act of academic misconduct at SCEI previously.	
Penalty	Consequences for serious academic misconduct, including assessment failure, suspension, or expulsion.	
Plagiarism	Presenting another's work or ideas as one's own without proper citation. Plagiarism includes copying either identically, substantially, or in essence:  • sentences or whole passages of written text or material from electronic resources without appropriate paraphrasing and referencing the original source or author,  • another person's ideas, creative work, images, sounds, computer code or software,	
	another student's assessment tasks in whole or in part, unless this is specifically allowed in the course outline.	
Procedural Fairness	Ensuring unbiased, evidence-based decisions with adequate notice and reasoning.	
SCEI / Institute	Southern Cross Education Institute	



ROLES AND RESPONSIBILIES		
Level 3 Decision Maker Academic and Leadership Committee  Level 3 Decision Maker National Program Coordinator / Training Manager	<ul> <li>Advises on compliance and quality standards.</li> <li>Oversees academic integrity reports.</li> <li>Trains staff on detecting and responding to academic misconduct.</li> </ul>	
Level 3 Decision Maker  Quality Assurance Manager	<ul> <li>Maintains academic misconduct records in the student management portal.</li> <li>Ensures policy adherence within the institution.</li> </ul>	
Level 2 Decision Maker (except for suspension/expulsion cases). Course Coordinator	<ul> <li>Supports academic integrity in teaching and assessments.</li> <li>Analyses trends in misconduct and implements interventions.</li> <li>Where the recommended penalty is a suspension or an expulsion, the matter shall be referred to the Level 3 Decision Maker - Chief Executive for determination.</li> </ul>	
Level 1 Decision Maker Trainer and Assessor	<ul> <li>Educates students on academic integrity.</li> <li>Detects and manages academic misconduct cases.</li> <li>Advises the Course Coordinator of reportable instances of contract cheating and/or other illegal practices.</li> </ul>	
Student	<ul> <li>Upholds academic integrity in assessments.</li> <li>Properly cites sources and declares original work.</li> </ul>	
Support staff  (e.g., from Student service, work placement team, counselling)	Upholds academic integrity in assessments.	



#### **POLICY**

- 1. SCEI promotes an environment where academic honesty and critical judgment are fundamental. Prevention and education are prioritised to uphold integrity standards.
- 2. Students must work independently and adhere to ethical academic practices. Staff must educate students on integrity principles and policy compliance. Academic misconduct, including cheating and plagiarism, undermines learning quality and will be addressed accordingly.
- 3. SCEI distinguishes between:
  - a. Level 1a (Minor): Unintentional breaches due to inexperience.
  - b. Level 1b (Concerning): Negligence or minor intent to gain an advantage.
  - c. Level 2 (Serious): Deliberate attempts to gain unfair advantage.
- 4. There is **no statute of limitations** for academic misconduct cases. Misconduct may be investigated before, during, or after course completion and can impact admissions, credits, and qualifications.
- 5. Where the allegation is against a staff member, the matter must be reported to the Course Coordinator / CEO and the Human Resources Officer to be addressed as a separate process under the authority of the Respectful Behaviours Policy.

#### **PROCEDURE**

#### 1. Recording and investigating allegation of Academic Misconduct

- 1.1. Use of the SCEI Student management portal as a register.
  - 1.1.1. All staff who are responsible for managing, investigating, or determining an allegation regarding Academic Misconduct, will record current, accurate and detailed records (including links to any documentary evidence that may be available) on the SCEI Student management portal under the student's individual profile.
- 1.2. Concerns identified by staff, students, or the public.
  - 1.2.1. The procedures for recording and investigating concerns of Academic Misconduct are illustrated in **Attachment A.**
  - 1.2.2. Where staff or a student identifies or is made aware of a concern relating to possible Academic Misconduct the matter will be referred to the nominated Course Coordinator of the program area who will record the concern in the SCEI Student management portal under the student's individual profile.
  - 1.2.3. The Course Coordinator reviews and categorises the case within 7 days or reporting:
    - 1.2.3.1. identify whether the alleged conduct relates to either:
      - 1.2.3.1.1. Matrix: Academic Breach and Academic Misconduct (New Student) Attachment B will apply,
      - 1.2.3.1.2. Matrix: Academic Breach and Academic Misconduct (Continuing Student) Attachment C will apply;
    - 1.2.3.2. identify whether the student has any previous adverse finding of Academic Misconduct at SCEI;
    - 1.2.3.3. notify the Trainer and Assessor of the Program sector to investigate the matter and conduct a student review for classification of a decision by a Level 1 or Level 2 Decision Maker, depending on the severity of misconduct.

#### 2. Investigation of Academic Misconduct

- 2.1. Investigations must commence within fourteen (14) days of reporting.
- 2.2. At any time during the investigation the Trainer and Assessor may seek advice from relevant experts within SCEI, including the Quality and Compliance Officers, Course Coordinator, Senior Trainer and Assessors and the Manager for Student Services, provided such experts do not have a conflict of interest.
- 2.3. At any time during an investigation, the Trainer and Assessor conducting the investigation may refer the allegation to the Quality Control / Compliance Officer for allocation to another Trainer and Assessor or, Senior Trainer and Assessor for reasons including:

Page 4 of 11

2.3.1. Trainer and Assessor having a conflict of interest; or



2.3.2. Trainer and Assessor changing the nature of their appointment.

#### 3. Student interviews

- 3.1. As part of the investigation, the Trainer and Assessor conducting the investigation will take reasonable steps to interview the student.
- 3.2. Any student interview will be held as soon as practicable following the occurrence of the alleged misconduct, but in any event within twenty-eight (28) days of the allegation being reported.
- 3.3. Interviews may be conducted in person, by telephone, virtual online meeting, or by any other means provided that the student's preference is considered when making that decision.
- 3.4. The student may be accompanied at any interview by a support person, who may be a friend or a family member.
- 3.5. The Trainer and Assessor conducting the investigation may be accompanied by another staff member. That person may only function as an observer or a note-taker during the interview,
- 3.6. A student will be given reasonable notice and opportunity to attend an interview. If, after reasonable steps have been made to contact the student and the student fails to attend the interview, the Trainer and Assessor conducting the investigation may conclude the investigation for consideration by the Level 1 or Level 2 Decision Maker.
- 3.7. The Level 1 or Level 2 Decision Maker will take into consideration any relevant written materials submitted by the student before coming to a decision.
- 4. Decisions, outcomes, and notifications
  - 4.1. Following an investigation, the Decision Maker will either:
    - 4.1.1. dismiss the allegation if there is insufficient evidence to determine Academic Misconduct; or
    - 4.1.2. determine that an act of:
      - 4.1.2.1. Level 1 (Minor or Concerning) Academic Misconduct or
      - 4.1.2.2. Level 2 (Serious) Academic Misconduct has occurred (as described in Attachments B and C).
  - 4.2. A determination of Academic Misconduct is not based on the existence of any previous incident by the student. However, a history of Acedemic Misconduct may influence the appropriate outcome to be imposed. The Level 1 or Level 2 Decision Maker can decide based on the information within the SCEI Student management portal under the student's individual profile.
  - 4.3. The outcome(s) imposed will:
    - 4.3.1. be consistent with any guides or resources published by SCEI related to misconduct and outcomes;
    - 4.3.2. include mandatory outcome(s) (if applicable) as set out in Attachment B or C.
  - 4.4. Within 7 days of concluding the investigation and coming to a decision, the Level 1 or Level 2 Decision Maker will record any dismissal or finding of Academic Misconduct and outcome imposed in the Academic Misconduct Register.
  - 4.5. The Level 1 or Level 2 Decision Maker will notify:
    - 4.5.1. the student in writing, of the decision, reason for the decision and outcome(s) imposed; and
    - 4.5.2. the relevant Trainer and Assessor of the decision and outcome(s) imposed.
  - 4.6. The notice to the student will include information about their right to appeal the decision of the Level 1 or Level 2

    Decision Maker in accordance with SCEI's Complaints and Appeals Policy and Procedure. If the finding relates to an international student, and the outcome imposed is the suspension, exclusion, or expulsion of the student from SCEI, the notification to the student will also advise that:
    - 4.6.1. the suspension, exclusion or expulsion will be reported to any relevant government department or agency;
    - 4.6.2. the student needs to seek advice from the relevant government department or agency on the potential impact on their student visa; and
    - 4.6.3. the suspension or cancellation will not take effect until SCEI's internal appeals process is completed.



#### **ATTACHMENT A- Flowchart for Academic Misconduct**

•Issue identified and reported to SCEI by public, student or staff member
Issue recorded in the Student Managment System under the student's profile.
•Issue determined and actioned based on the Matrix A or B below
•The Trainer and Assessor investigates the matter and conducts student interview

and makes a decision to determine the appropriate outcome in accordance to the relavent academic misconduct matrix

•Level 1 or Level 2 decision maker reviews the investigation findings, conducts additional consultations if required

- •The decision maker records the decision and outcome in the Student Management System under the student profile.
- Student is notified of the decision in writting via the communication portal in the the Student Management System
  and is provided with the oportunity to appeal the decision based on the SCEI Complaints and Appeal Policy and
  Procedure.
- •A student can challenge the decision by lodging an appeal according to PP11 Complaints and Appeals Policy and Procedure.
- •All appeals lodged will be processed in accordance with the PP11 Complaints and Appeals Policy and Procedure.
- •An appeal application should be submitted within ten (10) working days of notification of the outcome of the academic misconduct incident.
- Where the appeal is sucessful, the decision will be reversed or amended and recorded on the student file in the Student Managment System



Source: Edith Cowan University, Griffith University Academic Integrity Framework, TEQSA Academic Integrity Toolkit

CRITERIA	Minor Misconduct	Concerning Misconduct	Serious Misconduct
Form or extend of the conduct	Student conduct which by its form and/or extent represents an act of minor and unintentional Plagiarism	Student conduct which by its form and/or extent represents a moderate or concerning breach of academic integrity	Student conduct which by its form and/or extent represents a significant or serious breach of academic integrity
PLAGIARISM  Indicative examples  OTHER CONDUCT as applicable	Copied some elements of written text (i.e., sentences, paragraph, or isolated paragraphs) or other source material (e.g., computer code, designs, figures, multimedia, artefacts) without appropriate paraphrasing, referencing or acknowledgement	<ul> <li>Copied some elements of written text (i.e., sentences, paragraph, or isolated paragraphs) or other source material (e.g., computer code, designs, figures, multimedia, artefacts) without appropriate paraphrasing, referencing or acknowledgement</li> <li>Copied some elements of another Student's assignment</li> <li>Duplicated some elements of Student's own work (self-plagiarised) that has been:         <ul> <li>published, without proper referencing in the submitted assessment task; or</li> <li>submitted for an assessment task at another time or at another institution, without Trainer's permission</li> </ul> </li> <li>Received inappropriate editorial assistance from another person on a written assessment task</li> <li>Worked with one or more people on an assessment task when an individual response was required</li> <li>Completed a group assessment task with assistance from another group or other groups when an individual group response was required</li> <li>Misrepresented contributions of individual members to a group Assessment Task.</li> </ul>	<ul> <li>Deliberately copied sections or essential elements of written text or other source material (e.g., computer code, designs, figures, multimedia, artefacts) without referencing or acknowledgement – repeat offence</li> <li>Copied sections or essential elements of another Student's assignment</li> <li>Duplicated sections or essential elements of one's own work (self-plagiarised) that has been:         <ul> <li>published, without proper referencing in the submitted Assessment Task; or</li> <li>was submitted for an assessment task at another time or at any other institution, without the Trainer's permission</li> </ul> </li> <li>Submitted an Assessment Task produced, in part or fully, by a third party or undertook an Assessment Task, or part thereof, for another Student</li> <li>Accessed, exchanged, offered for purchase, or sold an assessment item or task</li> <li>Impersonated another Student or allowed a third party to impersonate them in an assessment task</li> <li>Fabricated or falsified content and/or cited and referenced non-existent sources</li> <li>Fabricated or falsified documents (e.g., medical certificates, police reports, academic records) for purposes of assessment</li> <li>Stole another Student's work</li> <li>Coerced, blackmailed, intimidated, or facilitated coercion blackmail or intimidation of another person, or offered or accepted a bribe for an assessment outcome of grade</li> </ul>



CRITERIA	Academic Breach	Concerning Academic Misconduct	Serious Academic Misconduct
INTENT OF THE	There is no basis to suggest that the conduct was	The conduct was due to negligence or recklessness	The conduct was due to a deliberate and planned attempt
STUDENT	intentional	where the issue should have been foreseen; or an intent to gain advantage	to gain advantage where otherwise marks would not have been awarded
IMPACT OF CONDUCT  Assessment integrity	Student made a genuine attempt to address learning outcomes, however, Student's ability is unclear as work, to some extent, relies on that of others	Student's ability is unclear as work, to some extent, relies on that of others or previous work to address learning outcomes	Student's ability is not demonstrated as work relies largely or entirely on that of others or previous work or fabricated content and/or sources; or
and SCEI reputation		, and the second	Student's conduct has the potential to undermine assessment integrity more broadly or impact the reputation of SCEI.
OUTCOME(S)	One or more of the following  Give the Student a Verbal warning – using the provided email template from Paradigm.  Require the Student to engage in educational interventions (participation / completion of the Academic Integrity online workshop with the Students Councillor)  Require resubmission of an assessment task – with clearly defined resubmission dates (min 14 days from the verbal warning step).	One or more of the following  Give the Student a Written Warning - — using the provided email template from Paradigm.  Require the Student to engage in educational interventions (participation / completion of the Academic Integrity face to face (or via teams) workshop with the Students Councillor)  Require resubmission of an assessment task (min 14 days from the verbal warning step).	Optional  Require the Student to engage in educational interventions (participation / completion of the Academic Integrity face to face (or via teams) workshop with the Students Councillor)  Mandatory (one or more of the following)  Disallow all marks for the assessment task which the Academic Misconduct relates to (the assessment will not be graded and must be resubmitted)  Record a Fail by the Student in the relevant unit or subject (student will be required to be reenrolled for the relevant unit of competency at an additional cost of the unit)  Suspend the Student from SCEI, for no more than 12 months  * Expel the Student from SCEI
DECISION MAKER	Level 1 Decision Maker	Level 1 Decision Maker	Level 2 Decision Maker
	Trainer and Assessor	Trainer and Assessor	Course Coordinator or there representative



Source: Edith Cowan University, Griffith University Academic Integrity Framework, TEQSA Academic Integrity Toolkit

CRITERIA		Concerning Misconduct	Serious Misconduct	
Form	or extend of the uct	Student conduct which by its form and/or extent represents a moderate or concerning breach of academic integrity	Student conduct which by its form and/or extent represents a significant or serious breach of academic integrity	
	PLAGIARISM  Indicative examples	<ul> <li>Copied some elements of written text (i.e., sentences, paragraph, or isolated paragraphs) or other source material (e.g., computer code, designs, figures, multimedia, artefacts) without appropriate paraphrasing, referencing or acknowledgement</li> <li>Copied some elements of another Student's assignment</li> <li>Duplicated some elements of Student's own work (self-plagiarised) that has been:         <ul> <li>published, without proper referencing in the submitted assessment task; or</li> <li>submitted for an assessment task at another time or at another institution, without Trainer's permission</li> </ul> </li> </ul>	<ul> <li>Deliberately copied sections or essential elements of written text or other source material (e.g., computer code, designs, figures, multimedia, artefacts) without referencing or acknowledgement – repeat offence</li> <li>Copied sections or essential elements of another Student's assignment</li> <li>Duplicated sections or essential elements of one's own work (self-plagiarised) that has been:         <ul> <li>published, without proper referencing in the submitted Assessment Task; or</li> <li>was submitted for an assessment task at another time or at any other institution, without the Trainer's permission</li> </ul> </li> </ul>	
FORM OF CONDUCT	OTHER CONDUCT as applicable	<ul> <li>Received inappropriate editorial assistance from another person on a written assessment task</li> <li>Worked with one or more people on an assessment task when an individual response was required</li> <li>Completed a group assessment task with assistance from another group or other groups when an individual group response was required</li> <li>Misrepresented contributions of individual members to a group Assessment Task</li> </ul>	<ul> <li>Submitted an Assessment Task produced, in part or fully, by a third party or undertook an Assessment Task, or part thereof, for another Student</li> <li>Accessed, exchanged, offered for purchase, or sold an assessment item or task</li> <li>Uploaded SCEI's Assessment on a file sharing site</li> <li>Impersonated another Student or allowed a third party to impersonate them in an assessment task</li> <li>Fabricated or falsified content and/or cited and referenced non-existent sources</li> <li>Fabricated or falsified documents (e.g., medical certificates, police reports, academic records) for purposes of assessment</li> <li>Stole another Student's work</li> <li>Coerced, blackmailed, intimidated, or facilitated coercion blackmail or intimidation of another person, or offered or accepted a bribe for an assessment outcome of grade</li> </ul>	



CRITERIA	Concerning Academic Misconduct	Serious Academic Misconduct
INTENT OF THE	The conduct was due to negligence or recklessness where the issue should have been	The conduct was due to a deliberate and planned attempt to gain advantage where
STUDENT	foreseen; or an intent to gain advantage	otherwise marks would not have been awarded
IMPACT OF CONDUCT Assessment integrity and SCEI reputation	Student's ability is unclear as work, to some extent, relies on that of others or previous work to address learning outcomes	Student's ability is not demonstrated as work relies largely or entirely on that of others or previous work or fabricated content and/or sources; or Student's conduct has the potential to undermine assessment integrity more broadly or impact the reputation of SCEI.
OUTCOME(S)	First offence of Academic Misconduct	First offence of Academic Misconduct
OUTCOME(S)	One or more of the following  Give the Student a written warning Require the Student to engage in educational interventions Disallow all marks for the assessment task which the Academic Misconduct relates to (the assessment will not be graded and must be resubmitted)  Second offence of Academic Misconduct Optional Require the Student to engage in educational interventions Mandatory (one or more of the following) Disallow all marks for the assessment task which the Academic Misconduct relates to (the assessment will not be graded and must be resubmitted) Record a Fail by the Student in the relevant unit or subject (student will be required to be re-enrolled for the relevant unit of competency at an additional cost of the unit)  Third offence of Academic Misconduct Optional (one or more of the following) Disallow all marks for the assessment task which the Academic Misconduct relates to Record a Fail by the Student in the relevant Unit or subject Mandatory  * Suspend the Student from SCEI, for no more than 12 months; or * Expel the Student from SCEI	Optional  Require the Student to engage in educational interventions  Mandatory (one or more of the following)  Disallow all marks for the assessment task which the Academic Misconduct relates to (the assessment will not be graded and must be resubmitted)  Record a Fail by the Student in the relevant unit or subject (student will be required to be re-enrolled for the relevant unit of competency at an additional cost of the unit)  * Suspend the Student from SCEI, for no more than 12 months  * Expel the Student from SCEI  Second offence of Academic Misconduct  Optional (one or more of the following)  Disallow all marks for the assessment task which the Academic Misconduct relates to (the assessment will not be graded and must be resubmitted)  Record a Fail by the Student in the relevant unit or subject (student will be required to be re-enrolled for the relevant unit of competency at an additional cost of the unit)  Mandatory  * Suspend the Student from SCEI, for no more than 12 months; or  * Expel the Student from SCEI * Refer to Chief Executive for determination  * Refer to Chief Executive for determination
	* Refer to Chief Executive for determination	
DECISION MAKER	Level 1 Decision Maker (Trainer and Assessor)	Level 2 Decision Maker (Course Coordinator or their representative)



## **RELATED DOCUMENT**

PP11 Complaints and Appeals Policy and Procedure

PP77 Assessment Policy and Procedure

**PP79 Student Rules Policy** 

PP95 Examination Policy and Procedure

# **LEGISLATIVE CONTEXT**

- Australian Qualifications Framework
- Education Services for Overseas Students Act 2000
- Standards for NVR Registered Training Organisations (RTOs) 2025; Standards 1.4, 2.1, 2.7, 2.8
- National Code of Practice for Registration Authorities and Providers of Education and Training to Overseas Students
   2018
- Education Services for Overseas Students Act 2000

Author	Quality Assurance Manager
Approved by	Chief Executive Officer
Effective date	22 June 2017
Reviewed	July 2025
Version	3
Review date due	July 2026