
ACADEMIC INTEGRITY AND MISCONDUCT POLICY

1. Purpose

This policy establishes how Proteus Technologies Pty Ltd trading as Ikon Institute of Australia (Ikon) shall promote academic integrity and manage academic misconduct.

2. Scope

The policy applies to all students enrolled in a course of study at Ikon, undertaking placement at a third-party organisation as part of their course, and courses delivered in partnership with another provider. The policy also applies to staff involved in management of academic misconduct. Acts of non-academic misconduct shall be managed under the Student Code of Conduct.

3. Related Documents

This policy should be read in conjunction with the following Ikon policies:

- Assessment Policy
- Student Code of Conduct
- Suspected Academic Misconduct Incident Form
- What is Academic Misconduct?
- Classification of Academic Misconduct Matrix
- Academic Misconduct Penalty Matrix
- Grievance & Appeals Policy

All policies and forms associated with this policy accessed via the [Policy and Procedures](#) section of the Ikon website and/or the student and staff policy libraries.

4. Definition & Key Terms

“Academic Dishonesty” means any fraudulent or deceitful behaviour, or attempt to act in this manner, by a student to gain an unfair advantage, mislead academic efforts or misrepresent academic achievements.

“Academic Honesty” means all academic work results from a student’s own efforts with credit given to the ideas and efforts of others by acknowledging all sources of information and any collaborations.

“Academic Integrity” means academic practice and behaviours that reflect the core values of honesty, trust, fairness, respect and responsibility in relation to teaching, learning and research.

“Academic Misconduct” means dishonest behaviour or acts that breach the core values of academic integrity including cheating, collusion, fabrication, fraud, misrepresentation and plagiarism.

“Allegation” means a claim or assertion of academic dishonesty or academic misconduct.

“Balance of Probabilities” means a standard of proof established by evidence that suggests that something was more likely to have occurred than not occurred.

“Impropriety” means a failure to observe the standards for academic honesty and academic integrity.

“Misconduct Panel” means individuals convened to hear an allegation of misconduct.

“Misconduct Officer” means a member of School designated to receive reports and conduct preliminary assessment of a suspected misconduct, and the determination of minor acts of misconduct.

POLICY

5. Principles

Academic integrity is important for a student’s personal reputation and the reputation of Ikon as a quality education provider. Allegations of academic misconduct shall be managed on a case-by-case basis with consideration of the following key principles:

- 5.1 Students are responsible for their own actions and are expected to maintain high standards of academic honesty and academic integrity.
- 5.2 Ikon considers academic misconduct unacceptable because it undermines the core values of academic integrity (honesty, trust, fairness, respect and responsibility).
- 5.3 Ikon shall investigate suspected dishonest behaviours or acts misconduct to maintain academic integrity and protect the interests and reputation of students and Ikon.
- 5.4 Allegations of academic misconduct shall be subject to the principles of procedural fairness and natural justice. Students shall be judged innocent of any misconduct until such time as they have admitted to, or evidence is found of behaviour that breaches academic integrity.
- 5.5 Allegations of academic misconduct shall be treated separately. Any misconduct in the past shall not be regarded as evidence that a student has again behaved dishonestly and breached academic integrity.
- 5.6 Allegations of academic misconduct shall be treated with confidentiality at all times. Disclosure and access to records shall be provided on a ‘need-to-know’ basis and limited to individuals legitimately involved in the investigation and determination process, or as required by law.
- 5.7 Effective communication underpins the student misconduct framework and the promotion of a culture of academic integrity. Information about what constitutes academic misconduct, how to maintain academic integrity and how allegations and incidents of misconduct are managed is published for access by all students and staff.
- 5.8 Investigations and hearings shall be held promptly and within set timeframes to determine whether there is reasonable evidence to confirm the alleged conduct amounted to academic misconduct. Ikon shall engage in a range of activities to test the reasonableness of evidence relevant to the allegations.
- 5.1 As a principle of natural justice, students who are suspected of having engaged in academic misconduct shall be provided with written notification providing clear and transparent details of the allegation. Students shall be invited to respond to the allegations in person or in writing.
- 5.2 Students choosing to respond by attending hearing proceedings have the right to be accompanied by a nominated support person. A support person cannot be a legal practitioner.
- 5.3 When making a determination, Ikon shall establish the facts as far as it is possible to do so and consider the evidence presented during hearings. Penalties for acts of academic misconduct shall be proportionate and decisions shall consider the circumstances, intent, severity of the incident, previous acts of academic misconduct and any damage, or potential damage, to the reputation of Ikon.
- 5.4 Students have the right to appeal a decision made in relation to academic misconduct.
- 5.5 There is no statute of limitations on suspected acts of academic misconduct. Allegations of

academic misconduct shall be investigated in accordance with policy regardless of whether the student is enrolled, has taken a leave of absence, has withdrawn their enrolment or has graduated.

6. Roles & Responsibilities

6.1 Ikon has a responsibility to:

- provide guidance and resources on academic integrity for students and staff, including professional development opportunities for staff covering best practices in course design, delivery and assessment to deter academic misconduct and tools to detect it
- take preventative action to mitigate foreseeable risks to academic integrity and address underlying causes of academic misconduct
- take steps to ensure timely investigation of allegations of breaches of academic integrity
- maintain, monitor and act on academic integrity data for the purpose of quality assurance and continuous improvement
- maintain accountability for academic integrity in arrangements with any other party involved in the delivery of learning activities, courses or placement on behalf of Ikon

6.2 Staff have a responsibility to:

- be aware of policies, procedures and guidelines that support and promote academic integrity
- engage in professional development opportunities supporting best practice in maintaining and promoting academic integrity in teaching and learning
- model academic integrity in their teaching, research and professional practice
- provide instruction to students about expectations of academic integrity
- provide students with active learning opportunities, guidance and feedback on academic integrity
- design and implement assessment strategies that minimise the potential for breaches.
- implement security practices for the submission and return of assessments, production and storage of examination papers and the sitting of examinations including in an online forum
- report suspected acts of academic misconduct in accordance with this policy

6.3 Students have a responsibility to:

- familiarise themselves with the rules and expectations of academic integrity by using the information and guidance provided by Ikon and staff
- actively participate in academic integrity education training and support opportunities made available by Ikon and seek additional assistance or clarification when in doubt
- submit original work for all assessments (individual and group) that meets the requirements of academic integrity and good academic practice by appropriately acknowledging all sources of information
- complete assessments independently except where the instruction dictates participation in a group assessment task requiring a joint group response to a task
- ensure the scholarship of the group's submissions has been conducted honestly
- act in accordance with the values of academic integrity and avoid dishonest behaviours that could be considered acts of academic misconduct


7. Promoting a Culture of Academic Integrity

- 7.1 lkon supports and resources the promotion of a culture of academic integrity across all courses and campuses based on the following broad strategies:
- publication of policies, procedures and guidelines to support the student misconduct framework and inform students and staff about expectations for academic integrity, the impact of academic misconduct and the process for managing academic misconduct
 - taking corrective action to mitigate foreseeable risks to academic integrity, including avenues for reporting and hearing suspected academic misconduct, proportionate responses to academic misconduct that include the opportunity for education, and a centralised register to record allegations and incidents of misconduct
 - guide and support students and staff to develop good academic practices to promote and maintain academic integrity, including orientation programs, academic skills training and professional development training for teaching staff and academic integrity decision-makers
 - ensuring academic integrity is also maintained in any third-party arrangements with other providers for the delivery of learning activities, courses or placement on behalf of lkon
 - data driven analysis, monitoring and reporting of breaches, students at risk and third-party performance to understand the underlying patterns and causes of any identified lapses or deteriorations of academic integrity
- 7.2 Assessments are set with the expectation that the work is the sole effort of the student (or the efforts of an assigned group of students) and implements strategies to reduce opportunities for breaching academic integrity, including but not limited to:
- setting standards-based assessment strategies that evidence the level of achievement of prescribed learning outcomes and include a variety of assessment tasks, staged throughout the trimester, to ensure assessment is not solely reliant on a single task
 - structuring group assessments to include a percentage for individual contribution allowing staff to clearly assess individual student performance as well as group outcomes and efforts
 - assessment practices and processes are reviewed and monitored, and actions taken to assure the quality and consistency of the assessment process as part of continual improvement framework
 - educating students about good academic practice including academic writing, referencing and research skills through group and individual academic skills sessions
 - use of electronic text-matching software to check authenticity of written assessment work and identify any potential acts of academic dishonesty such as plagiarism
 - assessment coversheets that include an academic integrity declaration that must be signed by the student for each assessment task submitted for marking
- 7.3 Students have a responsibility to be aware of policy relating to assessment and academic integrity, understand good academic practice, submit their own work, acknowledge the ideas and work of others, and use all available academic support resources to practice and maintain academic integrity.
- 7.4 Staff have a responsibility to be aware of policy relating to assessment and academic integrity, promote academic integrity in teaching and learning, educate students on appropriate academic practice, and practice and maintain academic integrity in their own teaching and learning efforts.

8. Breaching Academic Integrity

Types of Academic Misconduct

- 8.1 Academic misconduct includes any dishonest behaviour that breaches the values of academic integrity (honesty, trust, fairness, respect and responsibility). It includes intentional and unintentional dishonest behaviours, attempts to behave dishonestly, and efforts to incite others.
- 8.2 Acts of academic misconduct include, but are not limited to:
- plagiarism and failures of correct acknowledgement practice
 - contract cheating or paying for another person to prepare assessment work
 - misrepresenting own work or contribution to group work
 - collusion to act with others to engage in dishonest behaviour or misconduct
 - knowingly allowing personal work to be copied by others
 - cheating in examinations and other assessment tasks
 - offering or accepting bribes (money or sexual or other favours)
 - fabrication or falsification of information or student identity

 For examples of academic misconduct, see the *What Is Academic Misconduct?* guidelines

Investigating Allegations of Academic Misconduct

- 8.3 When investigating allegations of academic misconduct, Ikon shall apply the balance of probabilities based on available evidence to reasonably determine whether academic misconduct has occurred.

Classification of Academic Misconduct

- 8.4 Ikon classifies academic misconduct based on the seriousness of the behaviour or incident and its impact on academic integrity by considering the following criteria:
- the type of breach
 - the extent of the breach
 - the experience of the student
 - the intent of the student
 - the impact of the breach
- 8.5 Based on the above, the behaviour is classified as ‘minor’ or ‘major’ academic misconduct:
- Minor Academic Misconduct** is behaviour that is determined to have had little impact on academic integrity and is a result of poor academic practice including a lack of understanding or the careless application of academic writing and referencing protocols due to their level of experience as a student. It is generally unintentional behaviour.
 - Moderate Academic Misconduct** is behaviour that is determined to have had some impact on academic integrity and can be reasonably interpreted as evidence that the student was aware the behaviour breached the core values of academic integrity. It is generally an intentional behaviour, but an element of carelessness may exist due to the limited experience of the student.
 - Major Academic Misconduct** is a behaviour that is determined to have had a significant impact on academic integrity and can be reasonably interpreted as evidence that the student was aware the behaviour breached the core values of academic integrity. It is


generally planned, deliberate and organised behaviour. It may also be a repeated behaviour. Allegations of misconduct in examinations or group work shall be treated as major academic misconduct.

- 8.6 Misconduct Officers shall determine whether, on evidence and the balance of probabilities, the behaviour was the result of poor academic practice or an intentional act to gain unfair advantage.

 For more information, see the *Classification of Misconduct Matrix*

Outcomes of Academic Misconduct

- 8.7 Outcomes, including any penalty-related decisions, for incidents of academic misconduct shall consider the classification of academic misconduct, evidence of any mitigating circumstances and the student's history of academic dishonesty. Outcome cannot result in unfair advantage for the student.
- 8.8 Outcomes for incidents of minor academic misconduct may include, but are not limited to, a written warning recorded on the student file, attendance at academic skills sessions, resubmission of work or mark original work as submitted.
- 8.9 Outcomes for major academic misconduct may include, but are not limited to, academic penalty, the grade of fail, probationary enrolment, suspended enrolment or cancellation of enrolment.

 For more information about outcomes, see the *Academic Misconduct Penalty Matrix*

PROCEDURE

9. Misconduct Officers

- 9.1 The Head of School shall appoint at least one Misconduct Officer within their School who is responsible for the management of academic and non-academic misconduct, including:
- receiving reports of suspected incidents of misconduct
 - conducting a preliminary assessment of incident reports
 - conducting hearings into allegations of minor misconduct
 - determining and administering outcomes for minor misconduct
 - referring allegations of major misconduct to a Misconduct Panel
 - administering outcomes for major misconduct on behalf of the Misconduct Panel
 - maintaining all documentation and records related to misconduct
- 9.2 Each appointment is a period of twelve months and reappointment maybe made at the discretion of the Head of School. A list of Misconduct Officers shall be posted to the Canvas Policy Library.
- 9.3 Misconduct Officers shall complete professional development training as provided by Ikon and attend moderation activities to ensure the consistent application of this policy across Ikon and shall also advise the Head of School of any trends in misconduct and areas that may require additional staff training and resources.

Suspected Academic Misconduct

10. Identifying Suspected Breaches of Academic Integrity

- 10.1 Ikon may check the authenticity of submitted assessment work to identify any potential behaviours suggesting academic dishonesty or misconduct such as plagiarism, cheating, collusion etc.
- 10.2 If staff suspect, or become aware of, potential student academic misconduct, they may engage in a range of activities to explore their suspicions including, but not limited to, the use of electronic text-matching software, web search engines, checking sources cited by the student, comparison with other assessment work and consultation with colleagues (or any combination of these).
- 10.3 If reasonable suspicion remains, staff must report the potential misconduct to a Misconduct Officer within two working days using the *Suspected Academic Misconduct Incident Form*.
- 10.4 A student who suspects another student, or group of students, has engaged in potential academic misconduct should in the first instance report the suspected behaviour to the lecturer.
- 10.5 If an individual suspects, or becomes aware of, potential staff academic misconduct, they should in the first instance report the suspected breach of academic integrity to the Head of School who shall take on the role of Misconduct Officer for staff-related matters.

11. Reporting Suspected Academic Misconduct

- 11.1 A potential incident of academic misconduct must be formally reported by lodging a *Suspected Academic Misconduct Incident Form* with the Misconduct Officer via mailbox misconduct@ikon.edu.au. The form can be downloaded from the Policy Library.
- 11.2 The *Suspected Academic Misconduct Incident Form* (Incident Report) should provide clear and sufficient information about the potential incident to assist the preliminary assessment process, including:
 - description of the suspected behaviour or conduct
 - steps taken to informally investigate suspicions
 - impact, if any, on the integrity of the assessment process
- 11.3 The Incident Report should attach copies of evidence that led to the suspicion such as, but not limited to, the assessment brief, a copy of the work, an annotated copy of the work, the text matching report and previous assessment work as relevant.
- 11.4 The report should be lodged within two working days of becoming aware of the potential incident (Lodgement Date).
- 11.5 A report of suspected academic misconduct may be withdrawn at any time by giving written notice to the Misconduct Officer via mailbox misconduct@ikon.edu.au. Ikon reserves the right however to continue to investigate where there is reasonable evidence to suggest an incident of academic misconduct has occurred or identifies potential areas of academic risk or improvement.

12. Preliminary Assessment

- 12.1 The Misconduct Officer shall complete a preliminary assessment of the Incident Report within three working days of the Lodgement Date (Preliminary Assessment Date).
- 12.2 The preliminary assessment shall examine the Incident Report to determine whether there is evidence to suggest potential academic misconduct may have occurred. In conducting their

assessment, the Misconduct Officer shall engage in a range of activities to gather information and test the reasonableness of evidence put forward by the report.

- 12.3 Where the Misconduct Officer determines the Incident Report does not disclose reasonable evidence to suggest the suspected behaviour amounted to academic dishonesty or misconduct, they shall dismiss the matter and direct the work be marked without penalty. The outcome shall be logged in the Misconduct Register as 'No Impropriety' and the matter closed. Dismissed reports are not saved to the student record.
- 12.4 Where the Misconduct Officer determines the Incident Report discloses reasonable evidence to suggest academic misconduct, they must classify the academic misconduct to instigate the investigation and hearing process (see [Classification of Academic Misconduct](#)):
 - a) where they determine alleged minor academic misconduct, the Misconduct Officer conducts a hearing to determine the outcome (see [Allegations of Minor Academic Misconduct](#))
 - b) where they determine alleged major academic misconduct, the Misconduct Officer convenes a Misconduct Panel and refers the matter for their determination (see [Allegations of Major Academic Misconduct](#))
- 12.5 The Misconduct Officer shall advise the student of their decision in writing within two working days of the Preliminary Assessment Date (Allegation Notification). The notification shall advise the decision, the reasons for the decision, the details of the allegation and the hearing details.

13. Allegation Notification

- 13.1 A template is available for download from the Policy Library to assist drafting the decision advice but, as a minimum, the *Allegation Notification* should include the following elements:
 - the nature of the alleged incident of misconduct
 - any material that may impact the student's defence against the allegation(s)
 - the date, time and location of the hearing
 - the names of other persons who shall attend the hearing
 - have the right to be accompanied by a support person (but not a legal practitioner)
 - links to online copies of relevant policies and procedures
- 13.2 Evidence may be excluded or redacted from the Allegation Notification if full disclosure at that time could compromise the investigation process or risk the safety or welfare of another person. Where evidence is excluded or redacted, the Allegation Notification must provide sufficient detail to allow the student to make an informed response to the allegations.
- 13.3 The Misconduct Officer shall record the potential incident in the Misconduct Register and advise all staff relevant to the Incident Report of the outcome of their preliminary assessment.

14. Conflicts of Interest

- 14.1 Where the Misconduct Officer has a conflict of interest, the matter shall be referred to another Misconduct Officer within their School or another School (as appropriate). If there is no other officer available, the Incident Report shall be referred to the Registrar to act as the Misconduct Officer in the matter.
- 14.2 A conflict exists if the Misconduct Officer is:
 - reporting the suspected incident of academic misconduct
 - the student is enrolled in a subject where they have a teaching or coordinator role
 - they have a close familial, personal, legal or business relationship with the student

- 14.3 If in doubt, the Misconduct Officer should declare any potential conflicts to the Head of School for determination and advice.

Managing Allegations of Academic Misconduct

15. Allegations of Minor Academic Misconduct

Hearing Interview

- 15.1 Hearings for allegations of minor academic misconduct are conducted by the Misconduct Officer.
- 15.2 The Misconduct Officer shall invite the student to attend a hearing interview so they may respond to the allegations. The Misconduct Officer shall also invite at least two staff to attend (at a minimum one academic).
- 15.3 The date for the hearing interview shall be set within ten working days of the Allegation Notification. The student shall be advised of the hearing interview date in the Allegation Notification.
- 15.4 The student can choose to address the allegations by attending the hearing interview (in person or via videoconference) and/or via a written submission. The student should respond to advise their choice within three days of the date of the Allegation Notification. If the student chooses not to attend the hearing interview or submit a written response, a decision shall be made in their absence.
- 15.5 Where the allegation involves more than one student or a group assessment, each student shall be heard individually.
- 15.6 During the hearing process, allegations may be varied as a result of new evidence. The Misconduct Officer shall advise the student of any changes via an Amended Allegation Notification providing the student the opportunity to respond to the new allegations (see [Allegation Notification](#)).
- 15.7 Students may nominate a support person to accompany them to the hearing interview. A support person cannot act as an advocate or make direct comment or arguments on the student's behalf unless permission is given by the Misconduct Officer. A support person cannot be a legal practitioner.
- 15.8 The Misconduct Officer shall make their determination within three working days of the hearing interview. If a determination cannot be reached within the prescribed timeframe, the Misconduct Officer shall advise all parties in writing outlining the reasons for the delay and the new timeframe for decision.
- 15.9 The Misconduct Officer shall maintain all documentation, evidence and communication during hearing proceedings for the student file.



Determination

- 15.10 When making their determination, the Misconduct Officer shall establish the facts as far as it is possible to do so and consider the evidence presented during the hearing interview.
- 15.11 The Misconduct Officer may determine the allegation on the same day as the hearing interview or may reserve its decision to a later date being no later than three working days of the hearing.
- 15.12 Where the Misconduct Officer determines there was insufficient evidence to substantiate the allegation of minor academic misconduct, they shall direct the work be marked without penalty as soon as practical. The decision shall be recorded as 'No Impropriety' in the Misconduct

Register and the matter closed.

- 15.13 Where the Misconduct Officer determines there is reasonable evidence to substantiate poor academic practice or minor academic misconduct, they may apply one or more of the following outcomes with the intent to educate the student in good academic practice:
- attend academic skills support
 - attend personal counselling
 - a written undertaking to not repeat the behaviour
 - direct the original work (non-plagiarised content only) be marked as submitted
 - resubmission of the work within 48 hours
 - replacement assessment task
- 15.14 Outcomes must be proportionate to the intent, severity and impact of the behaviour and must not result in unfair advantage for the student (or disadvantage other students). Where the outcome is resubmission or a replacement assessment, the work shall be marked on merit however the student cannot receive more than the grade of Pass for that assessment.
- 15.15 The Misconduct Officer shall advise the student of their decision in writing within five working days of the hearing interview (Outcome Letter). The Outcome Letter shall advise the decision, the reasons for the decision, the outcomes to be taken and warn future repetition of the same poor academic practices may be considered as acts of major academic misconduct.
- 15.16 The Misconduct Officer is also responsible for advising relevant staff of their decision and ensuring the actions are carried out as instructed as soon as practical.

Additional Resources:

-  [Classification of Academic Misconduct Matrix](#)
-  [Academic Misconduct Penalty Matrix](#)

16. Allegations of Major Academic Misconduct

Hearing Panel

- 16.1 Hearings for allegations of major academic misconduct shall be conducted by a Misconduct Panel.
- 16.2 The Misconduct Officer shall convene a Misconduct Panel and invite the student to attend a panel hearing so they may respond to the allegations. The Panel may invite other staff to participate in the hearing as part of their investigation.
- 16.3 The date for the hearing shall be set within ten working days of the Allegation Notification. The student shall be advised of the hearing date in the Allegation Notification.
- 16.4 The student can choose to address the allegations by attending the hearing (in person or via videoconference) or via a written submission if they do not feel comfortable attending. The student should respond to advise their choice within three days of the date of the Allegation Notification. If the student chooses not to attend the hearing or submit a written response, a decision shall be made in their absence.
- 16.5 During the hearing process, allegations may be varied as a result of new evidence. The Misconduct Officer shall advise the student of any changes on behalf of the Misconduct Panel via an Amended Allegation Notification providing the student the opportunity to respond to the new allegations (see [Allegation Notification](#)).
- 16.6 Students may nominate a support person to accompany them to the hearing. A support person cannot act as an advocate or make direct comment or arguments on the student's behalf unless

permission is given by the Misconduct Panel Chair. A support person cannot be a legal practitioner.

- 16.7 The Misconduct Panel shall make their determination within three working days of the hearing. If a determination cannot be reached within the prescribed timeframe, the Panel Chair shall advise the student in writing outlining the reasons for the delay and the new timeframe for decision.
- 16.8 The Misconduct Officer shall maintain all documentation, evidence and communication during hearing proceedings for the student file, and ensure information is made available to the Panel.

Misconduct Panel



- 16.9 The Misconduct Panel shall comprise of three persons, each of whom has had no prior involvement in the allegation to date for example, but not limited to, the Dean, a Head of School and an Academic. Other staff may be invited appropriate to the allegation. The Panel shall appoint a Panel Chair.
- 16.10 Members of the Misconduct Panel are required to declare any perceived conflicts of interest. Where a conflict of interest exists, the member shall be required to withdraw from hearing the matter and the Panel Chair shall nominate an alternate.

Determination

- 16.11 When making their determination, the Misconduct Panel shall establish the facts as far as it is possible to do so and consider the evidence presented at the hearing. Any penalties must be proportionate to the misconduct. When deciding penalties, the Misconduct Panel shall consider the following:
- the level of experience of the student
 - the intent, severity and impact of the conduct
 - any previous findings of misconduct against the student
 - any extenuating circumstances or mitigating factors
 - the advantage or benefit gained
 - admission by the student
 - the need to protect the community of learning and reputation of Ikon
 - relevant policies, codes and guidelines on expected standards of behaviour
- 16.12 Decisions of the Misconduct Panel shall be by a majority vote, with each member of the Panel entitled to one vote. If necessary, the Panel Chair shall have the casting vote and the decision of the Misconduct Panel shall be final. The Panel may determine the allegation on the same day as the hearing or may reserve its decision to a later date no later than three working days of the hearing.
- 16.13 Where the Misconduct Panel determines there was insufficient evidence to substantiate the allegations, they may direct the work be marked without penalty as soon as practical. The decision shall be recorded as 'No Impropriety' in the Misconduct Register and the matter closed.
- 16.14 Where the Misconduct Panel determines there is reasonable evidence to substantiate major academic misconduct, they may apply one or more penalties in accordance with the *Academic Misconduct Penalty Matrix*, including but not limited to:
- mark of zero for the assessment task
 - a replacement assessment task
 - the grade of Fail for the subject
 - probationary enrolment

- suspended enrolment
 - cancellation of enrolment
 - period of suspension (or exclusion) noted on transcripts
 - revocation of an award
- 16.15 Outcomes and penalties must be proportionate to the intent, severity and impact of the breach. Penalties for major academic misconduct may seriously impact a student's academic progress, enrolment, qualification, and/or certification even where the student has graduated.
- 16.16 The Misconduct Officer shall advise the student of the decision in writing within five working days of the hearing (Outcome Letter). The Outcome Letter shall advise the Panel's decision, the reasons for their decision and the penalties to apply. The Misconduct Officer is also responsible for advising relevant staff of the decision and the actions to be taken.

Additional Resources:

-  *Classification of Academic Misconduct Matrix*
-  *Academic Misconduct Penalty Matrix*

17. Admission of an Allegation

- 17.1 A student may admit an allegation of academic misconduct at any stage of the hearing process. An admission must be made in writing admitting the alleged conduct to the Misconduct Officer via misconduct@ikon.edu.au (Admission of Misconduct Date).
- 17.2 Where a student clearly admits to an allegation of major academic misconduct, the Misconduct Officer and Head of School shall make a determination in relation to actions and/or penalties without the requirement to convene a Misconduct Panel.
- 17.3 The Misconduct Officer and Head of School shall invite the student to a meeting to discuss the proposed penalties (Admission Meeting). The date for the meeting shall be set within five working days of the Admission of Misconduct Date.
- 17.4 The Misconduct Officer shall forward the final decision in writing within two working days of the meeting (Outcome Letter).

18. Notification of Decisions

- 18.1 In all cases, the Misconduct Officer shall provide written notification of the determination and decisions as an outcome of the hearing (Outcome Letter) to the student via email. The Outcome Letter shall advise the determination, reasons for the decision, outcomes and the right to appeal.
- 18.2 Where the student is an international student and the decision may affect their ability to complete their course in the duration recorded in their Confirmation of Enrolment (CoE), they shall be advised in the Outcome Letter. Ikon shall not report any changes to the Department of Home Affairs until the closure of the appeals window or the appeals process, whichever comes first.

19. Enforcement of Decisions

- 19.1 The Misconduct Officer shall ensure all actions and penalties are taken within the timescale identified in the Outcome Letter and shall report any failure to do so to the Head of School.

20. Appeals

- 20.1 A student who is dissatisfied with a decision relating to academic misconduct may lodge an

appeal with Ikon. The appeal shall be conducted in accordance with the *Grievance & Appeals Policy*.

21. Record Keeping

- 21.1 The Misconduct Officer is responsible for maintaining all documentation, evidence and communication relating to allegations of misconduct. The Misconduct Officer shall forward the hearing file to Education Services Manager to maintain as part of the student record at the completion of the process.
- 21.2 The Education Services Manager shall record the outcome in the *Academic Misconduct Register* and close the matter.

22. Reporting

- 22.1 The Dean shall present an annual report to the governing bodies, including the Academic Misconduct Register, highlighting statistics of relevance, actions taken to address any endemic issues and any special initiatives implemented to promote a culture of academic integrity
- 22.2 The Dean shall present the report to the governing bodies at the first meeting of the following academic year.

23. Publication

- 23.1 This policy is to be published in the [Policy and Procedures](#) section of the Ikon website and the student and staff policy libraries.

Policy Information & History

Policy Category	Academic, Enrolment
Policy ID	EN004A
Approved by	Academic Board
Date of Approval	9 December 2021
Previous Versions	31 March 2021, 20 February 2017, 25 March 2016, 8 October 2014, 1 July 2011
Next Review Date	March 2024
Government Legislation	Tertiary Education Quality and Standards Agency Act 2011 Higher Education Standards Framework (Threshold Standards) 2021 Higher Education Support Act 2003 Education Services for Overseas Students Act 2000 National Code 2018
Responsible Officer	Dean
Sources:	In developing the student misconduct framework, Ikon considered the following: University of South Australia (2013). Exemplary Academic Integrity Project . Griffith University (2012). Academic Integrity Policy Toolkit . Tertiary Education Quality and Standards Agency (2019), Guidance Note: Academic Integrity , Version 1.2, 28 March 2019
Benchmarking:	External referencing activities were conducted to determine sector best practice using publicly available information, including from: University of Adelaide, La Trobe University, Western Sydney University, Victoria University, Griffith University, Canberra University, Curtin University, Endeavour College, Holmesglen, University of Melbourne, Monash University and James Cook University.
Minor Editorial Changes	27 July 2022 References to Head of Faculty replaced with Head of School, Student Experience team replaced with Education Services Manager, and the Registrar replaced with the Dean. Approved by the Quality Assurance Manager and the Education Academic Manager

CLASSIFICATION OF ACADEMIC MISCONDUCT



This matrix is a guide to assist the classification of suspected academic misconduct based on the seriousness of the breach (behaviour, incident) and its impact on academic integrity

Assessment Criteria	POOR ACADEMIC PRACTICE	MINOR ACADEMIC MISCONDUCT	MAJOR ACADEMIC MISCONDUCT
Type of Breach for example plagiarism, contract cheating, collusion, cheating, misrepresentation, fabrication and solicitation etc.	Isolated instance of: Direct copying of material from sources including websites, books or other publications Referencing or attribution of work is unclear, inadequate, has numerous minor errors or inappropriate paraphrasing	Frequent instances of: Direct copying of material from other sources or other student's assessment work Failing to reference and/or cite adequately Recycling parts of previous assessment work Resubmitting previous assessment work without instruction or permission Completing individual assessment with peers Misrepresentation of contribution to group work, attendance, or citations to incorrect sources	Extensive or wholesale instances of: Significant copying of work from other sources, other students or other assessment work Fabrication of information, data or results Misrepresentation of participation in placement, or citations to non-existent sources Cheating in an examination including passing notes, using mobile phones and copying others Contract cheating (assessment or examination) Collusion Submitting fraudulent documentation
Extent of the Breach the proportion of the assessment work that is not the student's own, degree to which the assessment process was compromised	A few paragraphs or graphics or other inputs A few elements of computer code Unintended editing assistance, sharing or inadequate understanding of individual effort	A proportion, fragments or segments of work Multiple elements of computer code Sharing information about assessment work or examination questions	Significant appropriation of ideas or artistic work Multiple pages, sections, graphics or code Purchasing, selling, commissioning or exchanging assessment work or an examination paper
Experience of the Student expectation that students are aware of good academic practice and avoid dishonest behaviour	First year, first semester student who has not yet had a reasonable opportunity to learn expected academic standards and practices. First offence	Student has completed their first trimester but are not yet in their final year of study before One previous breach recorded	Final year student who is expected to understand and exhibit academic integrity. Repeated breaches recorded
Intent of the Student assessed after investigation, determination made on the basis of evidence available	Behaviour appears unintentional and a result of misunderstanding, inexperience or carelessness (poor academic practice) Mitigating circumstances (no instruction or unclear instructions, cultural perspectives) Use of unauthorised materials is accidental	Breach is moderate in scale and scope Behaviour appears intentional Intent to deceive or gain advantage is probable Solicitation was a result of carelessness, misunderstanding or coercion from others Inadvertent use of unauthorised materials	Breach is significant in scale and scope Behaviour appears deliberate and planned Intent to deceive or gain advantage is evident Solicitation was deliberate with wilful intent Sophisticated use of unauthorised materials Deliberate efforts to incite others
Impact of the Breach the likely effects of the behaviour on other students, the learning community and Ikon	No material advantage gained The academic achievement of other students completing the assessment is not impacted	Material advantage gained The academic achievement of other students and/or the reputation of the course is impacted	Significant advantage gained The reputation of Ikon is impacted
Determination	Is this a minor breach of policy?	Is this a minor breach of academic integrity?	Is this a substantial breach of academic integrity?
	POOR ACADEMIC PRACTICE	MINOR ACADEMIC MISCONDUCT	MAJOR ACADEMIC MISCONDUCT

ACADEMIC MISCONDUCT PENALTIES MATRIX



This matrix is a guide to assist in the determination of outcomes and penalties proportionate to the intent, severity and impact of substantiated acts of academic misconduct

POOR ACADEMIC PRACTICE	MINOR ACADEMIC MISCONDUCT	MAJOR ACADEMIC MISCONDUCT
<p>Outcomes</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <input type="checkbox"/> Direct the work be marked as submitted disregarding plagiarised content (no penalty) <input type="checkbox"/> Direct resubmission of the work within 48 hours (no penalty) <input type="checkbox"/> Formal warning and/or reprimand for poor academic practice <p>Corrective Actions (Academic Interventions)</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <input type="checkbox"/> Student required to complete a series of academic skills practice sessions <input type="checkbox"/> Student required to undertake personal counselling sessions <input type="checkbox"/> Written undertaking from student to not repeat the behaviour and achieve milestones set to practice academic skills 	<p>Penalties</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <input type="checkbox"/> Direct the work be marked as submitted disregarding plagiarised content (penalty $\leq 20\%$) <input type="checkbox"/> Direct resubmission of the work within 48 hours (marked on merit but maximum grade is the grade of Pass) <input type="checkbox"/> Direct a replacement assessment (marked on merit but maximum grade is the grade of Pass) <input type="checkbox"/> Mark of zero for the work submitted <p>Corrective Actions (Academic Interventions)</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <input type="checkbox"/> Student required to complete a series of academic skills practice sessions <input type="checkbox"/> Student required to undertake personal counselling sessions <input type="checkbox"/> Written undertaking from student to not repeat the behaviour and achieve milestones set to meet expected academic practice 	<p>Penalties</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <input type="checkbox"/> Mark of zero for the work submitted <input type="checkbox"/> Grade of Fail for the subject <input type="checkbox"/> Probationary period of enrolment <input type="checkbox"/> Suspended enrolment without readmission for one study period (trimester) <input type="checkbox"/> Suspended enrolment without readmission for a period of twelve months <input type="checkbox"/> Cancellation of enrolment (exclusion) without readmission <input type="checkbox"/> Suspension or exclusion for academic misconduct to be recorded on the student's academic transcript <input type="checkbox"/> Revocation of an award <input type="checkbox"/> Report the incident to appropriate authorities (for acts of fraud and contract cheating) <p>Corrective Actions (Academic Interventions)</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <input type="checkbox"/> Student required to undertake personal counselling sessions <input type="checkbox"/> Written undertaking from student