

## Academic Integrity Guidance for Staff and Students

<b>Last Modified</b>	June 2016
<b>Review Date</b>	June 2017
<b>Approval Authority</b>	Deputy Vice-Chancellor (Academic)
<b>Contact Person</b>	Academic Services Group, Head – Office of the Deputy Vice-Chancellor (Academic)

### Introduction

This document is intended as a guide for Heads of Departments/Schools (HOD/Ss), academic staff and students and should be read in conjunction with, but subject to, the [Discipline Regulations \(University Regulations website\)](#) and [General Course and Examination Regulations \(GCER\) J: Breach of Instructions and Dishonest Practice \(University Regulations website\)](#)

Academic integrity is at the foundation of good scholarship. A strong emphasis on the development of the conventions of academic practice will help to foster a University community that works together honestly in an atmosphere of trust, fairness, mutual respect and shared responsibility. These values are undermined by academic dishonesty in any aspect of teaching and learning. Cheating and dishonesty damage an individual's learning and development, and undermine academic standards and educational outcomes. A strong emphasis on the academic integrity of staff and students is a quality assurance mechanism that contributes to the safeguarding of the standard of the University's qualifications.

### Definitions

**Academic integrity** – Principle by which University staff and students act honestly, fairly, ethically and with respect for each other in teaching, learning and administration.

**Author or creator** – Person who writes or creates a piece of work.

**Cheating, academic dishonesty and dishonest academic conduct** - Acts of dishonesty intended to gain an advantage for oneself or others in academic work. A key feature of

such dishonesty is the intention to deceive. Examples of actions that are likely to be regarded as cheating can be found in Appendix A.

**Collusion** – Form of cheating whereby two or more people conspire with the intention to deceive.

**Common knowledge** – Body of knowledge that has become part of the public domain and which is not expected to receive specific acknowledgement; e.g. Einstein formulated the theory of relativity.

**Double dipping or self-plagiarism** – Submission of a student's own work that has been earlier submitted to satisfy the requirements for another course.

**Ghost writing** – Occurs when a professional writer or other person undertakes work that is then officially credited to another person.

**Plagiarism** – Form of cheating involving the dishonest presentation of work that has been produced by somebody else as if it is one's own.

**Poor academic practice** – An unintended breach of instructions, carelessness, neglect or similar, where there is no dishonest intent.

**Public domain** – Status of work where the copyright has expired or which has not been subject to copyright. The work may thus be freely quoted but its use must be properly acknowledged.

**Source** – Books, journals, visual displays, electronic media (including television and the internet), paid providers and other repositories of work.

**Work** – Written text, research data, music scores, artistic production, technical production, computer files, oral presentations or other kinds of material product of academic endeavour.

## Principles

1. Cheating and academic dishonesty are not tolerated. Plagiarism is a form of cheating, as is assisting a person to plagiarise.
2. A staff member or student who suspects cheating must advise the HOD/S or his/her delegate\*. In all cases where cheating is suspected in an examination, the In-Charge Supervisor must advise the Senior Examination Arrangements Co-ordinator.
3. Where cheating or academic dishonesty<sup>#</sup> is suspected, students must be given an opportunity to explain their actions to the HOD/S or his/her delegate\*. A student may be accompanied by a support person.

\*Throughout this policy the HOD/S may be replaced by his/her delegate. However, in order to ensure consistency it is important that this is a continuing delegate appointed for this purpose. Should the HOD/S suspect academic dishonesty in a course for which they are the examiner, they should delegate the investigation to the Dean or another senior

academic staff member. Should a staff member feel unsupported by their HOD/S in a matter of academic integrity they should approach the Dean.

#For matters relating to the suspected academic dishonesty of staff please refer to the [Staff Code of Conduct](#).

4. Students have the right to be informed of the suspicion of cheating and to see relevant supporting information, including the evidence on which the suspicion is based. Students will be allowed sufficient time to consider this evidence before they are asked to respond to it.
5. HOD/Ss, the Proctors and the Discipline Committee shall report all admitted and proven cases of cheating to the Secretary of the Discipline Committee who shall maintain a Register recording relevant details of such discipline matters. Reporting shall be twice a year after the mid-year and end-of-year examination periods.
6. Evidence of previous cheating must not be used to determine guilt, but may be used to determine the penalty if guilt is established.
7. Originality detection software (such as Turnitin) may be used in departments and schools to assist in the maintenance of academic integrity. Where such software is used, students should be advised at the time they receive the assignment task.

## University Staff and Student Responsibilities

### 1. University Responsibilities

In order to minimise the possibility of cheating:

- 1.1 All students will be provided with, or have access to, information about cheating, which will include guidelines and descriptions about what is unacceptable or acceptable in their course discipline, in particular regarding citation conventions and any canon of common knowledge.
- 1.2 All students will be provided with, or have access to, instructions on the academic conventions or referencing styles relevant to their course discipline.
- 1.3 All students will be provided with, or have access to, instructions on correct conduct in university examinations and other assessment activities.

### 2. Staff Responsibilities

In order to minimise the possibility of cheating it is expected that:

- 2.1 Academic and other relevant staff will assist students to understand the concept of academic integrity within their discipline and students will be given opportunities to demonstrate and practise their understanding of it in the course of their studies.
- 2.2 Academic staff will set appropriate guidelines for group work and will make clear the distinction between group work and individual work (see the [Assessment Policy, Principles and Guidelines \(PDF, 208KB\)](#) for guidelines on group work).

- 2.3 Academic staff will work to minimise the opportunity for cheating by taking a proactive approach to assessment design and programme design (see Appendix B for suggestions).
- 2.4 All staff, including relevant administrative staff, will respond to allegations of cheating in a consistent and professional manner. Course Coordinators will advise all relevant teaching staff (including tutors/teaching assistants) of University policy and departmental/school guidelines with respect to managing academic dishonesty.
- 2.5 Staff will report all suspected instances of cheating to the relevant Course Coordinator (for information) and HOD/S.
- 2.6 Staff will provide appropriate role models by acting with academic integrity in their own work.
- 2.7 Staff will foster an atmosphere in which the members of the University community work together honestly in an atmosphere of trust, fairness, mutual respect and shared responsibility.
- 2.8 HOD/Ss and Proctors will report all admitted and proven cases of cheating to the Secretary of the Discipline Committee for recording on the Register.

### 3. Student Responsibilities

Students are expected to act with academic integrity. In order to minimise the likelihood of cheating students will:

- 3.1 Read and apply the [Examination Instructions for Candidates \(PDF, 139KB\)](#) for University examinations.
- 3.2 Learn and apply the academic conventions and referencing styles relevant to their course discipline.
- 3.3 Inform themselves about conditions for all forms of assessment, particularly those relating to group work.
- 3.4 Submit only work that is their own or that properly acknowledges the work of others.
- 3.5 Be careful to whom they lend their original work (there have been instances where students offering to hand in another's work have copied that work before submitting it).
- 3.6 Discourage others from cheating and advise the HOD/S or Senior Examination Arrangements Coordinator should they suspect another student or student/s of cheating.
- 3.7 Foster an atmosphere in which the members of the University community work together honestly in an atmosphere of trust, fairness, mutual respect and shared responsibility.

## Guidance for Heads of Departments/Schools

The following guidance is given to assist HOD/Ss in deciding whether to refer matters to the Proctor or to deal with matters themselves.

After receipt of an allegation of cheating the HOD/S should carefully consider the following:

- i. did the student commit the alleged act?
- ii. did the student act with dishonest intent?

It is essential that both these questions are answered in the affirmative for the allegation to be sustained. If they cannot be answered in the affirmative, either by the HOD/S or Proctor, then no penalty related to academic dishonesty can be imposed. A dishonest act requires an intention to deceive.

### **1. Standard of Proof**

The standard of required proof is the criminal standard, i.e. the person considering the allegation must be satisfied beyond all reasonable doubt. If this standard is not satisfied, the matter may still be treated as one of poor academic practice. HOD/Ss are encouraged to consult the Proctors on the principles and process for dealing with matters of academic integrity, especially when they are uncertain about dishonest intent. HOD/Ss should not, however, discuss particular individual's cases with the Proctors.

### **2. Poor Academic Practice**

If the HOD/S considers that there has been an unintended breach of instructions, carelessness, neglect or similar, but that there was no dishonest intent, then the work should be dealt with on its academic merits, or lack thereof (see section on Poor Academic Practice below).

### **3. Admission of Guilt**

If the student admits the offence, the HOD/S may decline to mark the work in question, give a mark of zero, deduct marks or resolve the matter in any other appropriate way (Refer to the [Discipline Regulations \(University Regulations website\)](#) and [GCER J: Breach of Instructions and Dishonest Practice \(University Regulations website\)](#)). HOD/Ss should note that a decision to exclude or suspend a student from a course requires the approval of the relevant Dean.

### **4. Serious or Multiple Offences**

- 4.1 If an HOD/S considers an offence to be serious, he or she should refer the matter to a Proctor. Whether or not s/he is satisfied that the offence has been proven, an HOD/S should also refer the matter to a Proctor if s/he considers that the allegation requires further investigation. Important considerations in determining whether an alleged offence is sufficiently serious for consideration by a Proctor are:
  - i. the nature and extent of the alleged cheating;
  - ii. the seniority of the student;

- iii. the degree of intention to deceive;
  - iv. instructions received in relation to the work;
  - v. in the case of plagiarism, the proportion of material plagiarised in relation to the work as a whole;
  - vi. any other relevant factors.
- 4.2 Cases where the student has offended more than once should also be referred to a Proctor. To determine whether the student has previously offended, an HOD/S may ask the Secretary of the Discipline Committee to consult the Register.

## 5. Contested Allegation

Where the evidence of cheating or academic dishonesty is strong, but the allegation is contested by the student, the matter should be referred to a Proctor.

## Poor Academic Practice

Poor academic practice is practice arising primarily from a student's limited knowledge about academic integrity, or how to conform to academic conventions, or how to behave in formal examinations, or from carelessness or neglect rather than dishonest intent.

Where the HOD/S is not satisfied that there was dishonesty, but considers there was poor academic practice; s/he may make a decision on the academic merits of the work as s/he sees fit. This may include:

- allowing the student to resubmit the work;
- deducting marks;
- giving the work a mark of zero; or
- resolving the matter in any other appropriate way.

In addition, the HOD/S may:

- require the student to undertake appropriate activities at the Learning Skills Centre, and report to the HOD/S when these have been completed;
- if appropriate, refer the student to Student Support; and
- if appropriate, discuss with the teacher of the course strategies for developing students' academic skills and good practice.

## Appeals

An HOD/S's decision under [GCER J: Breach of Instructions and Dishonest Practice \(University Regulations website\)](#) may be appealed to the Discipline Committee; a decision of a Proctor may be appealed to the Discipline Committee; and a decision of the Discipline Committee may be appealed to Council.

## Maintaining Records

Secure and confidential records of confirmed incidents of cheating will be held in a Register.

- The Register will be maintained by the Secretary of the Discipline Committee.
- Information will be recorded on the Register only after an allegation of cheating has been admitted or proven.
- No details will be lodged if an allegation of cheating is unproven.
- Information from the Register may be released to HOD/S only after an allegation of cheating is admitted or proven, in order to assist the HOD/S in determining a penalty or deciding whether to refer a case to a Proctor.
- HOD/Ss may not access the Register directly.
- The Proctors and the Chair of the Discipline Committee may access the Register directly.
- Records will be removed from the Register ten years after the offence was committed.

## Annual Review and Reporting

Staff in the Academic Services Group (ASG) will conduct a regular review of the effectiveness of the University's academic integrity management procedures, including the recording system (Register), use of electronic search tools, number and type of offences and penalties imposed.

## Related Documents and Information

### Regulations

- [Discipline Regulations \(University Regulations website\)](#)
- [GCER J: Breach of Instructions and Dishonest Practice \(University Regulations website\)](#)

### UC Policy Library

- [Assessment Policy, Principles and Guidelines \(PDF, 208KB\)](#)
- [Examination Instructions for Candidates \(PDF, 139KB\)](#)
- [Staff Code of Conduct \(PDF, 177KB\)](#)
- [Student Code of Conduct \(PDF, 124KB\)](#)

## Appendices

- Appendix A: Examples of Cheating

- Appendix B: Suggestions for 'Designing Out' Opportunities for Cheating
- Appendix C: Example of Assessment Cover Sheet

<b>Document History and Version Control Table</b>			
<b>Version</b>	<b>Action</b>	<b>Approval Authority</b>	<b>Action Date</b>
<i>For document history and versioning prior to 2013 contact <a href="mailto:ucpolicy@canterbury.ac.nz">ucpolicy@canterbury.ac.nz</a></i>			
1.00	Conversion of document into new format. Updated hyperlinks	Policy Unit	Sep 2013
1.01	A/A changed from Chair, Academic Board to DVC(A&I).	Policy Unit	Mar 2014
1.02	Hyperlinks updated, formatting.	Policy Unit	Jun 2014
1.03	Contact Officer updated.	Policy Unit	Apr 2015
1.04	'Faculty' references removed to reflect College-Faculty merger; scheduled review date moved to June 2016 to align with regulations review.	DVC(A)	Jun 2016



## Appendix A: Examples of Cheating

The following are examples of actions that are likely to be regarded as cheating (this list is not exhaustive):

1. Plagiarism
  - i. Copying phrases from a source without acknowledging that source by the use of quotation marks and/or other appropriate citations.
  - ii. Copying directly from a source with appropriate citation, but without quotation marks or indentation to indicate where the original author's work starts and finishes.
  - iii. Paraphrasing work without acknowledging its source.
  - iv. Presenting the work (with or without acknowledgement) of another person that has not been disclosed in the public domain without the creator/author's permission or knowledge.
2. Collusion
  - i. Copying (without acknowledgment) the work of another person, with that person's permission or knowledge.
  - ii. Allowing someone else to copy (without acknowledgement) all or part of an item of work.
  - iii. Without disclosure, having someone else do all or part of some work on one's behalf.
  - iv. Without disclosure, doing all or part of someone else's work on their behalf.
3. Impersonating someone else or having someone impersonate you in an examination or other assessment activity.
4. Fabricating data, for example in laboratory reports or publications, or in quotations by interview subjects.
5. Using unauthorised notes or aids, or copying from another person in an examination or other assessment activity.
6. Misrepresenting disability, temporary illness, injury or exceptional circumstances beyond one's control in order to claim special conditions or aegrotat consideration.
7. Using material obtained from commercial essay or assignment services.
8. Double dipping (self-plagiarism) where this has not specifically been allowed.

## **Appendix B: Suggestions for “Designing Out” Opportunities for Cheating**

- Advise students of the University’s assessment methods and expected standards, including clear examples of preferred citation methods and guidance on how they are to be used.
- Use a realistic assessment regime, preferably one which is coordinated across a programme, to prevent undue workload pressure on students at key times of the academic year.
- Provide clear instructions about whether students may work in a group or must work individually. If group work is to be allowed, the instructions must emphasize whether students must submit an individual assignment or can submit a group assignment.
- Use ‘course specific’ assessment exercises, in order to prevent assignments on ‘generic’ topics being submitted.
- Change assignment topics between course occurrences.
- Restrict the scope of references that students may use.
- Develop assessment items based on ‘specific’ scenarios.
- Require students to use their personal experiences as the basis for assessed work.
- Require students to defend or justify their work, for example through the use of poster sessions and/or tutorials.
- Use cover sheets for assessments that require students to confirm that the work is their own (see Appendix C for an example).
- Staff may consult with the Academic Development Group for further assistance.

## Appendix C: Example of Assessment Cover Sheet

### ASSIGNMENT COVER SHEET

Name: \_\_\_\_\_ ID \_\_\_\_\_

Course Code and Title \_\_\_\_\_

Assignment \_\_\_\_\_

Due Date \_\_\_\_\_

Lecturer \_\_\_\_\_

#### Honesty Declaration

- I declare that this is an original assignment and is entirely my own work.
- The work in this assignment has not previously been presented for assessment at the University of Canterbury or elsewhere.
- Where I have made use of the ideas, words or work of others, I have acknowledged the source in every instance.
- Where I have used any diagrams (including modifications) prepared by others, I have acknowledged the source in every instance.
- I am aware of what constitutes cheating, and the penalties for plagiarism and cheating as described in University publications.
- I am aware that the content of this written work may be checked against an electronic database.

Student's Signature: \_\_\_\_\_ Date: \_\_\_\_\_

Marker's signature \_\_\_\_\_

Date \_\_\_\_\_