

ACADEMIC HONESTY AND MISCONDUCT POLICY & PROCEDURE

Policy / Document Approval Body:	Academic Board
Date Created:	23 February 2009
Policy Custodian:	Dean of Engineering
Policy Contact:	Accreditation and Compliance Manager
Location on EIT website:	https://www.eit.edu.au/about/policies-procedures/
Review Period:	Every Three Years from Commencement
Revision No:	12
Date of Revision:	25 May 2023
Date Approved:	29 August 2023
Date Commenced:	14 September 2023

1.0 Purpose

The purpose of this policy is to:

- Reflect EIT’s commitment to supporting and encouraging academic integrity;
- Set out EIT’s position on academic integrity and honesty and the consequences resulting from failing to adhere to these expectations; and
- Provide a fair and transparent process for handling allegations of academic integrity breaches.

2.0 Scope

This policy applies to all EIT students, staff, exchange students and research collaborators for VET and Higher Education coursework and coursework undertaken as part of higher degree research. This policy also applies to former students who were enrolled at the time the conduct occurred. EIT has developed this policy taking account of TEQSA’s [Guidance Note Academic Integrity](#) and associated [Academic Integrity Toolkit](#).

A dedicated EIT **Research Code of Conduct** outlines details of research practices and codes of conduct.

3.0 Objectives

The nature of scholarly endeavour and research, dependent as it is on the work of others, binds all members of EIT community to abide by the principles of academic honesty. Academic honesty is an integral part of the core values and principles contained in EIT’s **Freedom of Speech and Academic Freedom Policy**. Its fundamental principle is that all staff and students act with integrity in the creation, development, application and use of ideas and information.

EIT regards academic honesty as the foundation of teaching, learning, research, and scholarship. It requires its academic staff and students to observe the highest ethical standards in all aspects of academic work. EIT demonstrates its commitment to these values through educative approaches to communicate the meaning of academic integrity, its importance, and consequences of failing to adhere to the academic integrity

requirements. EIT upholds natural justice by awarding due credit for honestly conducted scholarly work, and by penalising academic dishonesty and all forms of academic misconduct.

EIT expects that:

- all academic work, including research, claimed as original is the work of the author making the claim;
- all academic and research collaboration is acknowledged academic work and is not falsified in any way (such as when the ideas of others are used, and that these ideas are acknowledged appropriately); and
- all academic and professional staff involved in learning, teaching and research are expected to display leadership in this area.

One of EIT's objectives is to produce ethically and socially aware graduates, capable of applying the skills and knowledge they have developed at EIT to all aspects of their lives, as well as to their academic work. Academic dishonesty undermines the integrity of EIT's academic awards, research quality and assessment processes, and damages EIT's reputation. It also reduces the effectiveness of a student's time at EIT.

The key principles of this policy are that EIT will:

1. Require all students and staff to undertake their academic work with honesty and integrity;
2. On a continuous basis, use a range of approaches to educate students and staff to practise honesty in their academic work and raise awareness of the importance of ensuring ethical behaviour with respect to scholarship and research;
3. Take consistent and equitable action to manage dishonest student behaviours by:
 - a. communicating to students that any piece of academic work can be checked at any time using an appropriate process;
 - b. implementing a common remedial and penalty framework across EIT;
 - c. creating well designed assessment which encourages critical thinking, creativity and originality that demonstrates academic achievement of the intended learning outcome including academic integrity;
 - d. establishing and applying appropriate, consistent procedures for detecting and investigating alleged academic misconduct; and
 - e. providing and communicating the appeal process.
4. Apply the appropriate processes of EIT's staff contract agreements to manage alleged academic misconduct by staff.

4.0 Implementation

EIT regards plagiarism, cheating and all forms of academic misconduct as serious misconduct. While EIT encourages students to communicate with each other and share ideas and experiences, all assignments (other than specifically denoted group assignments) must be completed independently.

Any established instance of academic misconduct will result in the determination of a penalty in consultation with all relevant academic and administrative staff.

The **Academic Misconduct Detection Policy** outlines details of EIT's activities to prevent academic misconduct. EIT will further uphold academic integrity and engage staff and students by:

- using appropriate mechanisms to advise staff and students of this policy;
- using educational strategies to promote academic honesty and integrity, including a mandatory requirement for all students to successfully complete EIT's Academic Integrity Module, and the provision of training and support for staff;
- developing assessment strategies that reduce opportunities for academic misconduct, such as plagiarism;
- designing strategies to increase student engagement with their study, and their ability to submit their own work;
- adopting preventative strategies that mitigate the risk of academic misconduct;
- managing academic misconduct in a consistent and transparent manner; and
- reviewing these strategies at appropriate intervals.

4.1 Student Responsibility for Academic Integrity

It is the responsibility of students to:

1. understand the expectations of the student code of conduct and academic integrity requirements;
2. comply with instructions for assessment tasks;
3. comply with the expected standards of academic integrity including:
 - a. individually undertaking all work and assessment and other requirements for a unit and course where specified; and
 - b. acknowledging any legitimate collaboration, ensuring that ideas and conclusions in individually assessable work presented is the independent work of each student.
 - c. use of appropriate referencing and paraphrasing
4. seek clarification, if necessary, to ensure they clearly understand assessment conditions and requirements, and appropriate writing, referencing and assessment practice in their units and course(s);
5. properly acknowledge the thoughts, ideas, conclusions, drawings, designs, data, software programs or other work they have extracted, developed, or summarised;
6. complete an assessment cover sheet or online declaration for all non-examination assessment tasks stating that the work is the student's own and that all cited works have been acknowledged and referenced;
7. complete the academic integrity module where required in a course or unit; and
8. protect their work from being copied or misused by other students.

4.2 Types of Misconduct

4.2.1 Plagiarism

This refers to the reproduction of someone else's words, ideas or findings and presenting them as one's own ideas without proper acknowledgement, and includes:

- Direct copying or paraphrasing from someone else's published work (either electronic or hard copy) without acknowledging the source (or authors);
- Using facts, information and ideas derived from a source without acknowledgement;
- Assisting another person to commit an act of plagiarism;
- Submitting a paper or thesis to be graded or reviewed that the student has not written on their own;
- Copying answers or text from another classmate and the student then submitting it as their own;
- Citing data without crediting the original source;
- 'Reworking' data from another source (such as another student's lab results) without acknowledgement or for the student to pass it off as their own work; and
- Proposing another author's idea as if it were the student's own.
 - Fabricating references or using incorrect references;
 - Submitting someone else's presentation, program, spreadsheet, software, code, or other file with only minor alterations;
 - Falsifying lab or experimental data or observations; or
 - A modern form of plagiarism is known as "washing". This occurs when Google Translate or similar services are used to translate a plagiarised assessment into another language and then back again into English. This process involves automatically substituted generated synonyms and phrases and creating an ostensibly "new" document.

4.2.2 Cheating

This is taken to include producing assignments or theses (required explicitly or implicitly to be independently produced) in collaboration with and/or using the work of other people. It is defined as acting dishonestly or unfairly in order to gain an advantage.

It also includes cheating in examinations or tests by:

- copying or attempting to copy from another student (or external party);
- attempting to use unauthorised material either in written or electronic format;
- verbally communicating with another student or attempting to communicate with another student, fabricating information, data, research, or other elements; and
- requesting or permitting another person to take your place (impersonate you) at a test or examination.

4.2.3 Contract Cheating

This occurs when a student engages someone else to produce all or part of an assessment task or thesis that is submitted as their own work, including arrangements through a third party. Contract cheating usually is a paid arrangement, but not exclusively.

Third party services may include, academic custom writing, private tutors, copy editing services, online labour markets, pre-written essay banks, file sharing sites, paid exam takers, sites disguised as tutoring websites.

Contact cheating is a serious breach of academic integrity and code of conduct and is a form of fraud.

4.2.4 Research Misconduct

Additional misconduct that has not already been outlined, that applies to Research misconduct includes, but is not limited to:

- breaching occupational health and safety requirements knowingly while undertaking research activities;
- working without ethical clearance where it's required;
- failure to declare conflicts of interest; and
- wilful collusion or facilitation of research misconduct by others.

4.2.5 Falsification of Information

Falsifying any information, including fabrication of data, is a breach of academic honesty.

Falsification of information includes, but not limited to:

- providing incorrect or misleading statement about one's academic qualification, results, work history, personal data;
- distorting or inventing data to support an assessment or research argument;
- distorting or inventing arguments or quotations, ascribed to other individuals;
- impersonation;
- inventing references or intentionally providing incorrect references;
- unauthorised omission of data, information or results in documents, reports, and presentations;
- misrepresentation of data using inappropriate scales, magnification in graphs, charts and hiding data, results, or information;
- falsifying information pertaining to the subjects participating in an experiment;
- misleading subjects for research recruitment for experiments without revealing the purpose of the experiments or receiving institutional approval for involving subjects in the experiment; and
- unauthorised use of another individual's login credentials.

4.2.6 Intentional and Unintentional Plagiarism or Cheating

The seriousness of the misconduct is determined, in part, by whether the conduct is regarded as intentional or unintentional. Intentional plagiarism is carried out knowingly with an intent to deceive and is therefore considered as serious misconduct. Unintentional plagiarism may occur due to lack of familiarity with academic writing practices and is therefore considered to be less serious the first time that it occurs.

4.2.7 Use of generative artificial intelligence

Using material produced by a generative artificial intelligence in an academic exercise and submitting as your own work is unacceptable.

Examples of unacceptable use of generative artificial intelligence are:

- a. produce or retrieve information and then using that information in an academic exercise;
- b. paraphrase text;
- c. increase or enhance the quality of an academic exercise, beyond the purposes permitted within the academic exercise;
- d. produce an answer for a quiz, assessment, assignment, exam or research work; and / or
- e. produce non-text-based work and then using that non-text-based work in an academic exercise.

4.3 Other Misconduct

4.3.1 File Sharing

File sharing can have legal ramifications.

File sharing, or the distribution of EIT course material through digital networking technology (such as peer-to-peer file sharing networks), is the practice of distributing or providing access to digitally stored course material. This includes posting, publishing, or selling material to websites, private tutoring or ghost-writing companies, including reading materials, lecture slides and assessment questions.

All course material is the intellectual property of EIT. Course material includes the subject content and teaching material created and shared with students through Moodle (EIT's Learning Management System) and other means, such as lecture notes, PowerPoint presentations, subject guides, exam papers and marking guides.

Providing your institute login details to private tutoring, third party and ghost-writing companies so they can access teaching and assessment material hosted by EIT is also considered file sharing.

4.3.2 File Sharing Penalties

File sharing by students is a breach of copyright law and EIT's intellectual property rights. As a result, the following disciplinary actions will be taken against any student, including EIT graduates, who have been found engaging in file sharing activities.

Offender:	Frequency of offence:	Disciplinary action typically resulting in:
EIT students (Higher education and vocational education)	First time offence	Educative response (reprimand, repeat the assessment, resubmission, alternate assessment, failure of unit/module etc)
	Repeated offence	Suspension of up to a year or termination of enrolment (based on severity)
EIT graduates	First time offence	Written warning
	Repeated offence	Revocation of qualification

4.3.3 Collusion

This is unauthorised collaboration with one or more students for completing assessment activities or assisting another student in an act of academic misconduct.

Collusion maybe with another EIT student or students external to EIT.

4.3.4 Bribery

Bribing, or an attempt to bribe, a person who has influence over any aspect of student’s academic performance is both a breach of academic honesty, code of conduct and potentially a corruption matter considered to be very serious.

Bribery does not always have to involve money. Any offer to exchange favours or benefits of any kind is also considered bribery.

4.3.5 Recycling

Where a student submits (or resubmits) previously assessed work from any unit undertaken for any qualification, whether at this institute or elsewhere without the approval of the Unit Lecturer (UL) for another unit or assessment and acknowledgement of the source.

4.3.6 Sabotage

Sabotage involves disrupting or destroying another person’s work so that the person cannot complete an academic activity successfully.

Sabotage may include:

- installing malware, spyware, viruses, or other damaging software in EIT’s computers or another person’s computer;
- colluding with others to falsely accuse them of academic dishonesty;
- disturbing experimental setup or calibration of equipment arranged by another person;
- destroying academic resources to prevent other students from completing their work successfully; or

- revealing confidential data or experimental results from another person's project or procedures to others.

4.4 Levels and Penalties for Student Academic Misconduct (other than File Sharing)

It is understood that students in early stages of study may make minor errors as part of their academic learning process. These errors do not constitute academic misconduct if EIT believes that this is part of the regular learning process. Students will be warned and counselled in such circumstances. Students enrolled in doctoral courses are not in 'early stages of study' and are therefore expected to have a higher level of knowledge of academic integrity.

4.4.1 Factors

Levels of academic misconduct are determined based on several factors that determine the seriousness of the academic misconduct. These factors are:

- The type of misconduct;
- Whether the misconduct was intentional or unintentional;
- The knowledge and experience of the student;
- Longevity of study; and
- Whether the misconduct has occurred before.

EIT will also consider the order of academic integrity breaches, which may relate to:

1. subsequent instances – If a student who has committed a higher-level academic misconduct, then commits a subsequent academic misconduct at a lower level, that subsequent breach is not considered as a first offence. In such cases, the subsequent breach is automatically treated as at least a second academic misconduct for that higher-level and attracts the appropriate penalty;
2. concurrent instances – In cases where students submit items for assessment concurrently in different units or modules, and those items are found to exhibit evidence of violation of Academic Integrity, such collective violations are, for the purposes of a penalty, treated as a single instance only. Such leniency only occurs if it is clear that the student because of a concurrent or near concurrent submission has not been able to benefit from remedial counselling, has not previously received counselling for an earlier instance, and is likely to have committed the violations without intent.

For remote invigilated exams, an analysis of the recordings will be completed by a Learning Support Officer (LSO), or other appropriately trained EIT staff member, (or automated process), and the type of issue detected will determine the seriousness of the academic misconduct.

4.4.2 Levels of Misconduct

The level of academic misconduct has been divided into three categories:

- **Level 1 – Minor**

The conduct is judged to be unintentional, typically a first offence, and due to lack of knowledge or experience.

Examples include plagiarism of less than 10% due to poor referencing and using paraphrasing that is too close to the original; copying of a few sentences without referencing.

- **Level 2 – Moderate**

The conduct is judged to be possibly unintentional or intentional; the student should have sufficient knowledge and experience to understand academic misconduct; it may be a repeated offence; but only constitutes a moderate breach rather than a major breach.

Examples include moderate plagiarism of between 10-20%, other than a thesis or dissertation; fabricating or falsifying data in an assessment other than a thesis or dissertation; colluding with other students and submitting work as individual work, other than group work that has been stated as acceptable; remote invigilation - purposely not having a working webcam, or no audio, or no screen share is visible in recording.

- **Level 3 – Major**

The conduct is judged to be intentional and constitutes a serious and substantial breach or may be constitute multiple instances of academic misconduct.

Examples include cheating in examinations; major plagiarism of more than 25%, and particularly in a thesis or dissertation; fabricating or falsifying data in a thesis or dissertation; use of generative artificial intelligence to complete the academic task; remote invigilation shows the student leaving the room, having another person present in the room, talking to another person, failure to supply a recording altogether (technical problems considered).

4.4.3 Penalties

Penalties should consider the level of academic misconduct and the contributing factors. Consideration is to be given to the experience of the student and whether academic misconduct has occurred before, when determining the penalty.

The decision-makers for academic misconduct are:

- Level 1 – Learning Support Officer in conjunction with the Lecturer for HE coursework students; Associate or Assistant Supervisor for research students; Learning Support Officer for vocational (VET) courses.
- Level 2 – Course Coordinator in conjunction with Unit Coordinator for HE coursework students; VET College Manager for VET students; Principal Supervisor in conjunction with research coordinator for research students;
- Level 3 – Deputy Dean or Dean for all students;
- Level 3 (multiple instances) – Deputy Dean or Dean and escalation to Academic Board where relevant.

The available penalties, from minor to major, may include one or more of the following:

Level 1 outcomes:

- A written student warning;

- Requiring a student to undertake learning support or other counselling;
- Requiring a student to complete or repeat the Academic Integrity Module, and/or undertake another learning activity;
- An opportunity to resubmit the assessment item or thesis, or undertake supplementary assessment, with a limitation on the maximum achievement to be awarded (e.g., maximum of a pass grade);
- A reduction in the marks allocated to the relevant assessment component consistent with the level of academic misconduct;
- A mark of zero allocated to part of the assessment item.

Level 2 outcomes:

- Requiring a student to complete or repeat the Academic Integrity Module, and/or undertake another learning activity;
- Requirement to undertake another form of assessment which has improved integrity;
- A mark of zero allocated to the assessment item;
- Resubmit thesis for research units.

Level 3 outcomes:

- A Unit/Module fail, with the option to re-enrol at a future date;
- Exclusion from the Course with the option to re-enrol at a future date;
- Exclusion from a course without the option to re-enrol at a future date;
- Withdrawal of the relevant publication for research students;
- Suspension of ethics/safety clearance for research students;
- Withdrawal of an awarded qualification.

4.5 Process for VET Students

1. The Instructor or Assessor refers the alleged academic misconduct issue to the Learning Support Officer (LSO) (or vice versa) in the first instance to determine the level of misconduct, together with any evidence, such as an assignment, proctoring recording, or Turnitin report;
2. The LSO then asks another assessor to check to see whether academic misconduct has occurred;
3. The LSO investigates, compiles evidence, and completes the ‘*STEP 1 – Academic Misconduct Review Report*’ detailing the findings;
4. The LSO then sends via email to the student the “*STEP 2 – Initial Notice of Academic Misconduct*” letter to the student which will include details of the alleged misconduct;
5. The student is invited to respond to the letter within fourteen (14) calendar days;
6. Once the student has responded the LSO will investigate if the student has had any prior warning in other units/modules or been involved in any other case of misconduct;

7. If the misconduct is deemed by the LSO to be a minor (Level 1) offence, and a first offence then the LSO, in conjunction with the VET College Manager, will decide a penalty to be applied. The LSO will close out the Step 1 report and issue the formal '*STEP 3 - Notification of Academic Misconduct*' notice to the student and record it on the student's file. This notice will also outline the student's right to appeal the decision;
8. If the case is complex, or the student has been involved in multiple cases, the LSO may discuss the case with the VET College Manager to either agree with the LSO's initial proposed penalty or to suggest a new penalty. In extreme (Level 3) cases it may go to the Dean, Deputy Dean or Academic Board:
 - a. The VET College Manager will then advise the LSO of the outcome, including the reasons behind it;
 - b. Once a penalty is determined and agreed on, the LSO will close out the Step 1 report;
 - c. The LSO will issue the formal '*STEP 3 - Notification of Academic Misconduct*' notice to the student and record it on the student's file. This notice will also outline the student's right to appeal the decision.
9. If the student does not respond to the initial notice within the 14-day timeframe, the LSO makes a decision on whether a penalty will be imposed; defines the penalty; and determines if any supports are required. The LSO will close out the Step 1 report and issue the formal '*STEP 3 - Notification of Academic Misconduct*' notice to the student and record it on the student's file. This notice will also outline the student's right to appeal the decision; and
10. Copies of the notice and subsequent actions are sent to relevant administrative and academic personnel to ensure that it is recorded on the student's file, and assessments are adjusted accordingly.

4.6 Process for Higher Education Students

1. The Lecturer or Assessor (for coursework) refers the alleged academic misconduct to the Learning Support Officer (LSO) (or vice versa) in the first instance to propose the initial level of misconduct, together with any evidence, such as the relevant assignment, proctoring recording, or Turnitin report. For research students the Assistant and/or Associate Supervisor compiles the evidence and proposes the initial level of misconduct;
2. The LSO will investigate if the student has had any prior warning in other units or been involved in any other cases of academic misconduct, by consulting the Academic Misconduct Register. The Assistant and/or Associate Supervisor undertakes the investigation for research students;
3. The LSO and lecturer (for coursework students) compile the evidence, including information on any previous cases, and complete the '*STEP 1 – Academic Misconduct Review Report*' detailing the findings. The Assistant and/or Associate Supervisor prepares the Step 1 Report for research students and determines the level of misconduct if Level 1;
4. If higher than Level 1 for course work students, then the LSO refers the matter to the relevant decision maker for review. If higher than Level 1 for research students, then the Associate Supervisor refers the matter to a higher level for review;

5. Once the relevant decision-maker has reviewed the case and has all the necessary information, the LSO will send a notice to the student via email, “STEP 2 – Initial Notice of Academic Misconduct” letter;
6. The student is invited to respond to the letter within fourteen (14) calendar days. A meeting may also be held with the coursework student, LSO, and lecturer to discuss the case, or in order to gather further information or evidence regarding the case. For research students a meeting may also be held with the Assistant or Associate Supervisor, student, and relevant decision-maker to discuss the case, or in order to gather further information or evidence regarding the case;
7. Once the student has responded and/or attended a meeting, the relevant decision-maker will consider all evidence and finalise the case, or if the student does not respond with the fourteen (14) day timeframe, a decision will be made based on the evidence at hand:
 - a. If academic misconduct has not been substantiated, the LSO (for coursework students) or the Assistant or Associate Supervisor (for research students) will notify the student of the outcome and record the outcome on the student's file.
8. If academic misconduct has been substantiated, the decision-maker will determine, whether a penalty will be imposed and the type of penalty, and if any support is required for the student. The following penalties may be applied:
 - a. In the case of Level 1 minor academic misconduct, the student may simply be issued with a warning and/or marks may be deducted for the assessment in question;
 - b. In the case of Level 2 moderate academic misconduct, a mark of zero may be awarded for the assessment in question, or for research student a request to re-submit their thesis;
 - c. In the case of Level 3 major academic misconduct, a mark of zero may be awarded for the assessment and/or the whole project and/or the entire unit, or for research students, the withdrawal of the publication or suspension of ethics/safety clearances;
 - d. In the case where multiple instances of academic misconduct have been committed by a student, the Dean may refer the matter to the Academic Board which may impose any of the above penalties and also has the right to expel the student. If a decision for expulsion is made, then all fees paid by the student to date will be forfeited and the student will not be allowed to continue with their course or seek a refund.
9. The LSO will close out the Step 1 Report and issue the formal ‘STEP 3 - Notification of Academic Misconduct’ notice to the student and record it on the student’s file. This notice will also outline the reasons for the decision, any penalties imposed, and the student’s right to appeal the decision. The Reporting and Notice for research students will be undertaken by the Principal Supervisor; and
10. Copies of the Step 3 Notice and subsequent actions are sent to relevant administrative and academic personnel by the LSO to ensure that it is recorded on the student’s file, and assessment/thesis marks are adjusted if such a penalty was imposed.

4.7 Appeals for Students

The grounds for an appeal are:

- Evidence that an irregularity in the application of EIT policy and/or procedures has occurred;

- New demonstrated evidence and/or facts have emerged that could change the decision.

A student who has been judged to have committed an act of misconduct, and has grounds for an appeal, can appeal in accordance with EIT's ***Student Complaints, Grievances and Appeals Policy and Procedure***.

4.8 Academic Integrity for Staff

Staff are responsible for maintaining high ethical standards in conducting research and scholarly activities within the guidelines of the ***Freedom of Speech and Academic Freedom Policy and Procedure*** by:

- a. Promoting academic integrity and honesty amongst students;
- b. Monitoring and detecting student academic misconduct; and
- c. Reporting academic misconduct to their manager or a senior member of academic staff.

4.8.1 Staff Academic Misconduct

Matters of alleged staff academic misconduct should be reported to the Deputy Dean. If the Deputy Dean determines that there may be a case of academic misconduct, then the matter should be referred to the Dean, together with a report on the alleged misconduct.

4.8.2 Process for Staff Misconduct

The Dean will commence an investigation of the matter, and may appoint other persons to assist with the investigation which will proceed as follows:

- a. The staff member shall be notified in writing of the allegations made against them, including any evidence. The staff member will be given seven (7) calendar days to provide a response to the allegations, including the provision of evidence to counter the allegation;
- b. The Dean will arrange for a meeting to be held between the staff member, the Dean the Deputy Dean, and a member from the Academic Board. The staff member may bring a representative who is not a practising lawyer or barrister;
- c. The Dean will ensure that any new information is promptly provided to all parties for consideration and response;
- d. On completion of the investigation, the Dean will prepare a report to the Academic Board outlining the findings, evidence, conclusions, and recommendations;
- e. The Academic Board will consider the report and make a recommendation on whether to:
 - i. Take no further action;
 - ii. Request further information from any of the parties;
 - iii. Take disciplinary action.
- f. The Dean will make the final decision on any actions or penalties, also taking into account the appropriate processes of EIT's staff contract agreements to manage alleged academic misconduct by staff; and

- g. Copies of the outcome are sent to relevant human resources personnel by the Dean or Deputy Dean to ensure that it is recorded on the staff member's personnel file and in the Academic Misconduct Register.

4.9 Appeals for Staff

If the staff member is not satisfied with the decision, they may seek an appeal as outlined in the Staff Grievance Policy and Procedure.

4.10 Reporting

Cases of substantiated student and staff academic misconduct will be reported to the Academic Board and Governance Board, at least annually, whilst maintaining appropriate confidentiality.

5.0 Definitions:

Please refer to the EIT Glossary that can be found [here](#) for all definitions not listed below.

6.0 Related Documents:

- Academic Misconduct Detection Policy.HE
- EIT01.4 Conduct Effective Assessments Policy
- Freedom of Speech and Academic Freedom Policy.DS
- Research Code of Conduct.HE
- Rise of AI Tools in Education.DS
- Student Code of Conduct.DS
- Student Complaints, Grievances and Appeals Policy.HE
- Student Complaints, Grievances and Appeals Policy.VET
- Student Complaints, Grievances and Appeals Procedure.HE
- Student Complaints, Grievances and Appeals Procedure.VET

7.0 Related Legislation

The following legislation is relevant to this policy, however not all are mandatory education providers:

- [Copyright Act 1968 \(Cwth.\)](#)
- [Equal Opportunity Act 1984 \(WA\)](#)
- [Freedom of Information Act 1992 \(WA\)](#)
- [Higher Education Standards Framework \(Threshold Standards\) 2021 \(Cwth.\)](#)
- [Privacy Act 1988 \(Cwth.\)](#)
- [Standards for Registered Training Organisations \(RTOs\) 2015 \(Cwth.\)](#)
- [Tertiary Education Quality and Standards Agency Act 2011 \(Cwth.\)](#)

8.0 Accountabilities

The Academic Board is responsible for review and approval of this policy.

The policy is to be implemented via induction and training of staff and distribution to students and EIT's community via the website and other publications.

Acknowledgement is accorded to the University of Western Australia in the development of the levels and penalties of student academic misconduct in this policy.