



ACADEMIC INTEGRITY POLICY

Purpose

To provide clear definitions of academic integrity and the consequences of academic misconduct. The principles guiding academic integrity are that AIB is committed to ensuring students, staff and consultants of AIB produce their own work and acknowledge the work of others to enable quality teaching or learning experiences that can be fairly evaluated.

Scope

All students, staff and consultants of AIB.

Definitions

Unless otherwise defined in this document, all capitalised terms are defined in the [glossary](#).

Plagiarism

Plagiarism can be defined as submitting another person's words or ideas as one's own. This includes use of ideas, sentences, paragraphs, or other extracts from books, articles, and other published or unpublished work, without acknowledging their sources. This means that unacknowledged use of quotations or ideas from materials including but not limited to books, articles, the internet, or another student's work is plagiarism.

Collusion

Collusion refers to a situation where a student advertently or inadvertently assists, or is assisted by, someone else with assessment work that should have been the work of an individual student. This includes a student giving or sharing an assessment with another student, making an assessment available to others for potential use, using an assessment written by someone else and writing an assessment together. Collusion comprises any way of submitting assessment work as if it reflects individual effort while in reality it includes the work of another person, as determined by AIB; hence, collusion includes 'ghost-writing' or 'contract writing'. It is not academic misconduct if the assessment instructions specifically identify the work as a group assessment; however, collusion occurs if two or more students fail to abide by directions from the examiner regarding the permitted level of collaboration on an assessment.

Students must not publish their work or related AIB materials (such as publishing their assignments or assessment questions online or in chat rooms).

Fabrication

Fabrication refers to results or data that does not exist and have been made up.

Falsification

Falsification refers to results or data that have been manipulated to reach a specific conclusion. Falsification refers to content of assessment items and also to other documentation (for example, medical certificates used in an attempt to obtain extensions or approval for special circumstances).

Double submission

This occurs when a student submits substantially the same piece of work for more than one subject unless agreed upon with the facilitators of the different subjects.

Misconduct in examinations

This includes, but is not limited, to:

- being in possession of any books, calculators, diagrams, notes or other material other than those permitted by the invigilator
- directly or indirectly giving assistance to any other person
- speaking to any other student during an examination
- copying from or otherwise seeing or using the papers or Exam Booklet of another student
- allowing any other student to copy from or otherwise see or use the student's papers or Exam Booklet
- using any means to obtain an undue advantage in completing the examination
- unruly or disruptive behaviour during an examination.

1. Details

The values that underpin the AIB policy on academic integrity are honesty and responsibility on the part of students, staff and consultants. Any breach of the requirements of academic integrity are deemed as academic misconduct and this includes plagiarism, collusion, fabrication, falsification, double submission of work and misconduct in examinations. This list is not exhaustive as there may be other forms of dishonest or irresponsible conduct which may be deemed as academic misconduct by AIB. Depending on the circumstances and the nature of the academic misconduct, consequences including penalties may be expected to follow.

2. Responsibilities

2.1 AIB is responsible for:

- (a) providing information about this policy via its website to all students and staff, including those staff employed by Teaching Centres,
- (b) providing access to resources that explain academic integrity,
- (c) ensuring the materials provided to students advise them of the assessment methods, clearly identifying when an assessment is a group assessment (since the standard assignment and project are an individual assessment) and explaining what level of collaboration is appropriate for work that is a group assessment,
- (d) ensuring consistent and equitable application of this policy,
- (e) ensuring timely investigation of allegations of academic misconduct,
- (f) providing access to an appeal process.

2.2 Academic Staff are responsible for:

- (a) being familiar with the AIB policies and procedures in relation to academic integrity;
- (b) appropriately acknowledging the work of others in their teaching and research;
- (c) providing students with appropriate guidance and feedback on academic integrity;
- (d) designing assessment tasks that minimise the potential for academic misconduct.

2.3 The Academic Director (or nominee) ("Academic Director") is responsible for:

- (a) ensuring that staff understand their responsibilities under this policy
- (b) taking steps to ensure that the policy is implemented.

2.4 Students are responsible for:

- (a) familiarising themselves with this policy and complying with it
- (b) seeking additional assistance if in doubt about any aspect of what is required.

3. Procedures for Academic Misconduct by Students

3.1 Allegation of plagiarism, collusion, falsification, fabrication and double submission with respect to coursework subjects or during examinations

- (a) For the purposes of this section 3.1, AIB identifies three levels of academic misconduct as follows:
 - (i) Minor Academic Misconduct – this refers to any instance of academic misconduct which the Academic Director (or academic nominee) deems to be a minor breach of this Academic Integrity Policy (or any such academic misconduct rules). Examples may include (but are not limited to) minor plagiarism, minor exam misconduct or a first instance of academic integrity breach;
 - (ii) Moderate Academic Misconduct – this refers to any instance of academic misconduct which the Academic Director (or academic nominee) deems to be a moderate breach of this Academic Integrity Policy (or any such academic misconduct rules). Examples may include (but are not limited to) moderate plagiarism or collusion, or the second breach of academic integrity;
 - (iii) Major Academic Misconduct – this refers to any instance of academic misconduct which the Academic Director (or academic nominee) deems to be a major breach of this Academic Integrity Policy (or any such academic misconduct rules). Examples may include (but are not limited to) the following:
 - (A) Third breach of academic integrity;
 - (B) Major plagiarism;
 - (C) Any serious cases of collusion, double submission, fabrication or falsification;
or
 - (D) Any serious cases of misconduct in examinations.
- (b) When an academic, examiner or facilitator believes that a student may be involved in a case of academic misconduct (“Case”), they must collate any evidence and recommend the alleged level of academic misconduct or plagiarism.
- (c) Also, where an invigilator believes that a student is involved in a case of academic misconduct during an examination (“Case”), the invigilator shall provide the AIB with a written incident report and, where possible, evidence of the issue (for example, a photo of notes not permitted in exam).
- (d) The Academic Director (or academic nominee) will determine whether the Case amounts to academic misconduct. If it is deemed to not amount to academic misconduct an appropriate note is be made in the student management system. If it does amount to academic misconduct, the Academic Director (or nominee) shall determine the appropriate level of the academic misconduct (taking into account relevant factors including, but not limited to, the exact nature of the alleged plagiarism or collusion, the extent of a student’s academic experience, the student’s previous record of academic misconduct) and action to take.

- (e) The Academic Director (or academic nominee) will determine in their absolute discretion the appropriate penalty to be applied, according to the categories below:
- (i) If the Case is deemed to be Minor Academic Misconduct, the student may be issued with a warning and/or some marks may be deducted for the assessment (or relevant part or question within the assessment).
 - (ii) If the Case is deemed to be Moderate Academic Misconduct, marks may be deducted for the assessment (or relevant part or question within the assessment) and/or a mark of zero may be awarded for the assessment (or relevant part or question within the assessment).
 - (iii) If the Case is deemed to be Major Academic Misconduct, a mark of zero may be awarded for the assessment (or relevant part or question within the assessment) and/or for the whole subject.
- (f) In cases of severe or ongoing breaches of academic integrity (of any type and any level), the Academic Director can decide that the appropriate penalty is that the student be expelled.
- (g) In a case of recurring breaches of academic integrity the student will be warned that a further incident may result in the penalty of expulsion and when a further incident occurs the penalty may be applied.
- (h) In a case of a severe breach of academic integrity the penalty of expulsion may be applied without prior warning. In such a case the student will be informed of the likely penalty and be given the opportunity to 'show cause' before the final decision about the penalty is made.
- (i) If the Academic Director makes the decision for the student to be expelled, then the fees for their enrolled subjects which have not yet commenced will be refunded and the student will not be permitted to continue with their course or later return to undertake the course. Also, Teaching and Learning Committee and Academic Board will be informed about expulsions as a consequence of academic integrity breaches.
- (j) In relation to all decisions made, the Academic Director (or nominee) shall arrange for an appropriate note (including details of the alleged misconduct, action taken and penalty applied) to be made in the student management system.
- (k) Students who receive any warning or penalty for academic misconduct are encouraged to arrange for an academic support session with academics at their Teaching Centre or AIB, as appropriate. Students are entitled to appeal the allegation or the process in accordance with the Academic and Non-Academic Grievance Handling policy.

3.2 Academic misconduct such as plagiarism, collusion, falsification, fabrication and double submission with respect to research higher degree theses/dissertations

- (a) When a research supervisor believes that a student may be involved in academic misconduct, the research supervisor will request the Academic Director to check the student management system to determine if the student has been reported for academic misconduct. The Academic Director will advise the research supervisor of the search result.

- (b) Where there is no record of the student in the student management system and the research supervisor believes that the academic misconduct has resulted from a misunderstanding of academic conventions or accepted research practices or from poor academic practice, the research supervisor will counsel the student about appropriate academic and research practices. A record of this incident and the fact that the student has been advised of appropriate academic and research practices will be made in the student management system.
- (c) Where the research supervisor believes that there was academic misconduct, or where the information in the student management system makes it appropriate to refer the matter further, the research supervisor will advise the Academic Director, who will refer the matter and all evidence to the Chair of the Research and Higher Degrees Committee.
- (d) The Chair of the Research and Higher Degrees Committee will inform the student in writing of the allegation and seek to arrange a discussion of the matter by the most appropriate means (in person, by email or by teleconference).
- (e) The student may invite a staff or student member of AIB or Teaching Centre to be present at the meeting or take part in the discussion by email or teleconference. If the student fails to respond or refuses to attend the meeting or take part in the discussion, the Research and Higher Degrees Committee will proceed with its deliberations.
- (f) The Research and Higher Degrees Committee will determine
 - (i) that there is no academic misconduct, or
 - (ii) that there is academic misconduct, but that it is not in respect of a substantial component of the thesis, or
 - (iii) that there is academic misconduct, and that it is in respect of a substantial component of the thesis.
- (g) The Research and Higher Degrees Committee will select one of the following courses of action:
 - (i) that the student's candidature be permitted to continue unconditionally
 - (ii) that the student's candidature be permitted to continue subject to such conditions as the committee may impose
 - (iii) that the student's candidature be transferred to another appropriate degree (for example, a PhD student be transferred to a masters degree)
 - (iv) that the student's candidature be terminated, with a recommendation as to whether the student should be permitted to re-apply within a specified period of time.

A record of the nature of any breach and the action taken will be made in the student management system.
- (h) The student will be provided with the decision and reasons for the decision. If appropriate, students are encouraged to arrange for an academic support session with academics at AIB. Students are entitled to appeal in accordance with the Academic and Non-Academic Grievance Handling policy.

3.3 Academic misconduct with respect to a thesis - allegations by examiners of research higher degree theses/dissertations

- (a) Where an examiner of a research higher degree thesis or dissertation has reported an alleged academic misconduct in relation to a thesis or dissertation, the Chair of the Research and Higher Degrees Committee will inform the student in writing of the allegation and provide the research supervisor, the Academic Director and student with copies of the Examiner's Report(s). In this process the examiners' identities shall not be revealed to the student.
- (b) The Academic Director will ensure that a check is made of the student management system to determine if the student has been reported for academic misconduct.
- (c) The Research and Higher Degrees Committee will seek written comments from the student and the research supervisor on the Examiner's Report(s) and will contact the student to conduct an interview by the most appropriate means (in person, by email or by teleconference).
- (d) The student may invite a staff or student member of AIB or Teaching Centre to be present at the meeting or take part in the discussion by email or teleconference. If the student fails to respond or refuses to attend the meeting or take part in the discussion, the Research and Higher Degrees Committee will continue with its deliberations.
- (e) The Research and Higher Degrees Committee may seek clarification from the examiners regarding their comments in the Examiner's Report(s) and will determine, on the evidence available either:
 - (i) that there is no academic misconduct, or
 - (ii) that there is academic misconduct, but that it is not in respect of a substantial component of the thesis, or
 - (iii) that there is academic misconduct, and that it is in respect of a substantial component of the thesis.
- (f) If the Research and Higher Degrees Committee determines that there is academic misconduct but not in respect of a substantial component of the thesis, the Research and Higher Degrees Committee will require the student to undertake the amendments as stated in the Examiner's Report(s). A record of the nature of the breach and the action taken will be made in the student management system.
- (g) If the Research and Higher Degrees Committee determines that there is academic misconduct in respect to a substantial component of the thesis:
 - (i) the examination of the thesis will not proceed,
 - (ii) the student's candidature will be terminated, and
 - (iii) the student will not be allowed to present for the degree again.

A record of the nature of the breach and the action taken will be made in the student management system.

- (h) The student will be provided with the decision and reasons for the decision. If appropriate, students are encouraged to arrange an academic support session with academics at AIB. Students are entitled to appeal in accordance with the Academic and Non-Academic Grievance Handling policy. The Secretary of the Research and Higher Degrees Committee will advise the examiners of the outcome.

4. Recording of academic misconduct

- 4.1 A record of all alleged and proven breaches of academic integrity will be maintained by AIB in the student management system or another confidential location.
- 4.2 The Academic Director (or nominee) shall arrange for an appropriate note (including details of the alleged misconduct, action taken and penalty applied) to be made in the student management system.
- 4.3 Access to information in these records in the student management system is restricted.
- 4.4 Where an allegation of academic misconduct is found to be substantiated this information will not be printed on student academic transcripts.
- 4.5 Students are entitled to have access to view a copy of any entries relating to their academic misconduct in the student management system.

5. Procedures for Academic Misconduct by Staff or Consultants

Academic misconduct by staff (whether full-time, part-time or sessional) or consultants is a serious transgression. Alleged academic misconduct is investigated by the Academic Director (or nominee). Where misconduct is confirmed, the matter is forwarded to the Human Resource department. Confirmed and intentional academic misconduct is likely to lead to termination of employment at or contract with AIB.

Related Forms:

Student Handbook
Staff Induction Manual

Related Policies:

Academic and Non-Academic Grievance Handling

Responsibility:

Academic Director

Current Status:	Version 8
Approved By:	Academic Board
Date of Approval:	21 June 2017
Previous version:	7 October 2016
	27 January 2016
	7 October 2016
	24 February 2012
	27 October 2011
	1 July 2011
	9 December 2008
Date of Next Review:	21 June 2019