

ACADEMIC INTEGRITY POLICY

1. Purpose and Objectives

- 1.1 This policy details the processes whereby the practice of academic integrity among Le Cordon Bleu Australia (LCBA) students and staff is supported and maintained. It provides the management framework for the administration of student academic misconduct.

2. Scope

- 2.1 This policy applies to all LCBA staff and students enrolled in LCBA higher education (HE) and vocational education and training (VET) programs, with the exception of the Master of International Hospitality Management course (when taught at UniSA).
- 2.2 It applies to all the academic activities in which staff and students engage over the course of their employment or studies with LCBA, in particular all assessments submitted towards a result for a unit/unit of competency, and including but not limited to: written assessments, oral presentations, graphic presentations, group work and work integrated learning assignments.

3. Legislative Context

- Higher Education Standards Framework 2021, Standard 5.2
- National Code 2018, Standard 9
- Standards for Registered Training Organisations (RTOs) 2015, Standard 1

4. Policy Statement

- 4.1 LCBA supports and promotes teaching and learning practices that cultivate and sustain the values of academic integrity across the institution.
- 4.2 LCBA takes a positive and pragmatic approach to academic integrity, which involves acting with the values of honesty, trust, fairness, respect and responsibility in learning, teaching and scholarship.

5. Policy

5.1 Academic Integrity

- 5.1.1 LCBA requires students and staff to uphold the highest standards of academic integrity.
- 5.1.2 Academic integrity is approached as an educative process for students.
- 5.1.3 LCBA ensures consistency in its approach to detecting and addressing academic misconduct, and in promoting the importance of submitting authentic work and acknowledging the work of others.
- 5.1.4 Information about academic integrity is made available to students by several avenues, including in teaching material, at academic skills sessions and in library resources.
- 5.1.5 Failure to demonstrate adherence to academic integrity standards may constitute academic misconduct and is managed according to this policy.

ACADEMIC INTEGRITY POLICY

5.2 Academic misconduct

5.2.1 LCBA identifies cases of academic misconduct and takes appropriate action by following the procedures for Preliminary Discussion, Initial Inquiry and Formal Inquiry as detailed in this policy.

5.2.2 LCBA recognises that academic misconduct can occur through lack of familiarity with academic conventions. The following factors are considered in all allegations of academic misconduct:

- the extent of the misconduct,
- the student's evident intention,
- the stage/level of the program,
- previous instances of misconduct,
- the student's learning background,
- academic conventions within the relevant discipline,
- the impact of a particular outcome on a student's progression,
- information provided to the student about academic integrity as part of their course or program,
- any other information relevant to the case.

5.2.3 A breach of academic integrity is categorised as:

- Level 1 Academic Misconduct: which typically gives rise to educative outcomes and a warning.
- Level 2 Academic Misconduct: where the maximum penalty is failure of an assessment component of a unit/unit of competency with a zero score (HE) or a result of Not Satisfactory (NS) and the opportunity to resubmit (VET).
- Level 3 Academic Misconduct: to which more serious penalties can apply than other instances.

5.2.4 The following may serve as a guide to decision making for the levels of misconduct:

Level 1 Academic Misconduct

- Plagiarism that is due to a lack of familiarity with academic integrity practices, rather than an intention to deceive.
- Student has not yet completed the Academic skills sessions.
- No previous instances of academic misconduct on record.
- Student is in the first study period of their course.
- Student has not previously studied with LCBA.

Level 2 Academic Misconduct

- Assessment shows poor understanding of academic conventions where the student has had sufficient opportunity to learn the conventions.
- One (1) or fewer previous instances of academic misconduct on record.
- Plagiarism is deliberate and there is an element of dishonesty.

ACADEMIC INTEGRITY POLICY

- The assessment process is not greatly compromised, e.g., the amount of plagiarised work is not significant; or it is in a part of the assessment that is not significant; or the assessment itself is not significant to the student's ultimate unit/course result.

Level 3 Academic Misconduct

- Plagiarism is deliberate and compromises the assessment process.
- Student has previously been found to have behaved with academic misconduct.
- Assessment has been obtained from another person or source.
- Assessment is very closely copied from another student or their own previous assessments.
- Assessment contains a significant amount of plagiarised work presented as the student's own.
- Assessment lacks significant citation and referencing or referencing is fabricated.

5.2.5 The following table is intended to guide those deciding what outcomes to apply when a student is found to have breached academic integrity. It is not prescriptive, nor does it represent the entire range of possible outcomes.

Possible Outcomes	Level 1	Level 2	Level 3
Educational counselling	✓	✓	✓
Resubmit assessment	✓	✓	✓
Attend academic support session	✓	✓	✓
Sections of assessment concerned with breach are not marked and do not count towards assessment grade	✓	✓	✓
Resubmit assessment, maximum score 50% (HE only)		✓	✓
Fail assessment with zero score (HE only)		✓	✓
Formal warning (in writing)		✓	✓
Fail or NC for unit (if HE, with zero score)			✓
Suspension			✓
Expulsion			✓
Rescission of any award			✓

5.3 Academic integrity declarations

5.3.1 All text-based assessments are required to be submitted via Turnitin unless this requirement is explicitly waived by the LCBA Learning and Teaching Quality Committee (LTQC) or the VET Quality Management Committee (VQMC).

5.3.2 When submitting work for assessment students are required to declare that:

- the work is their own, except where acknowledgment of sources is made,
- that they have not previously submitted the work for another assessment at LCBA or another education provider, in whole or in part,
- that they have read this policy.

ACADEMIC INTEGRITY POLICY

5.4 Each campus is required to have at least one Academic Integrity Officer (AIO). These are academic staff who are trained to manage cases of academic misconduct. The requirements of the role are:

- to consistently interpret and implement this policy,
- to make balanced and equitable judgments on cases of academic misconduct,
- to apply fair and appropriate outcomes when academic misconduct is established,
- to regularly report breaches of academic integrity.

5.4.1 If required, the Dean or delegate may authorise another staff member to act as a delegate for the AIO for a period of time, or to manage a particular case. It is expected that the authorised nominee will have undertaken training to manage cases of academic misconduct within their discipline.

5.4.2 In the procedures relating to academic integrity outlined below an academic staff member nominated by the Dean, may act for the Dean.

6. Roles and Responsibilities

Roles	Responsibilities
All academic staff	Acting with academic integrity and upholding and promoting the values of academic integrity with students
Lecturers	Educating students about academic integrity Identifying possible breaches of academic integrity by students Referring cases of possible breaches of academic integrity to the Academic Integrity Officer
Academic Integrity Officers (AIOs)	Managing breaches of academic integrity as referred to them by lecturing staff by conducting an initial inquiry Referring serious breaches of academic integrity to Program Managers for formal inquiry Completing relevant records and providing to Program Managers and LCBA Student Services Recording breaches of academic integrity on the Academic Misconduct Register
Program Managers	Reviewing cases of breaches of academic integrity referred to them by AIOs Participating in and overseeing formal inquiries into breaches of academic misconduct Completing relevant records and providing to LCBA Student Services Reporting breaches of academic integrity to the VET Quality Management Committee (VQMC) or Learning and Teaching Quality Committee (LTQC)
Academic Integrity Panels	Conducting formal inquiries into possible breaches of academic integrity
LCBA Student Services	Maintaining records of breaches of academic integrity on the student file

ACADEMIC INTEGRITY POLICY

Roles	Responsibilities
Dean (or delegate)	Authorises another staff member to act as a delegate for the AIO for a period of time, or to manage a particular case.
Chairs of LTQC and VQMC	Reporting academic integrity matters, including the implementation of this policy, to the Academic Board
Academic Board	Overseeing the implementation of this policy

7. Definitions

‘Academic Integrity’ involves undertaking academic activity in a responsible way to ensure information and ideas are generated and communicated in an honest and ethical way and that use of others’ ideas and writing is acknowledged. ‘Academic Integrity Officer (AIO)’ refers to an academic member of staff who manages cases of academic misconduct.

‘Academic misconduct’ refers to:

- plagiarism (see definition below);
- breaches of the examination procedures;
- presenting data that has been copied, falsified or in any way obtained improperly;
- including material in individual work that has involved significant assistance from another person, unless this is specifically allowed in the unit/unit of competency outline or assessment guidelines;
- providing assistance to a student in the presentation of individual work, unless this is specifically allowed in the unit/unit of competency outline or assessment guidelines;
- falsifying or misrepresenting academic records, or any other documents;
- providing assessments to other current or future students;
- obtaining assessments from other current or past students;
- using a writing service or individual to write assessments (irrespective if payment is made or not);
- publishing assessments to, or accessing assessments hosted on, file sharing services or online study platforms;
- unauthorised and/or undisclosed use of artificial intelligence tools;
- using paraphrasing tools; and
- any other actions that contravene the principles of academic integrity.

‘Assessment’ is a process of gathering and evaluating evidence of a student’s performance to determine their achievement of the expected learning outcomes.

‘Assessment task’ is an activity that constitutes all or part of an assessment, including a range of written and oral methods and practice or demonstration. The tangible output of the student’s completion of an assessment task (e.g. text, image, presentation) may be referred to as an ‘assessment piece.’

‘Contract cheating’ is a form of academic misconduct in which students employ or use a third party to undertake their assessed work for them.

‘Co-Delivery Partners’ are the institutions that provide training and assessment in LCBA’s education programs.

ACADEMIC INTEGRITY POLICY

‘Examination’ refers to a form of assessment where a student is required to undertake a specified academic task within a specified period of time. The location of the examination and access to external assistance is regulated. LCBA examinations can be closed book, open book, or part-open book:

- Closed book examinations do not allow students to bring any materials into the examination room. Students who are eligible for an agreed variation are entitled to bring the materials allowed as agreed.
- Open book examinations allow students to bring relevant materials into the examination room, except books from the LCBA and/or delivery provider’s library.
- Part-open book examinations allow students to bring materials into the examination room, as specified by the unit/unit of competency teacher and in the unit/unit of competency outline or assessment guidelines.

‘Learning and Teaching Quality Committee (LTQC)’ monitors and reports on all relevant academic quality assurance processes to ensure quality educational standards are met or exceeded. It also has responsibility for advising on cyclical review-related policy and practices as this relates to LCBA’s higher education programs. The LTQC reports directly to the AB via the Academic Report tabled by the LTQC chair.

‘Mark’ (HE) refers to a quantitative value, often expressed as a percentage, which is awarded for an assessment task.

‘Plagiarism’ refers to:

- directly copying any material from electronic or print resources without acknowledging the source;
- closely paraphrasing sentences or whole passages without referencing the original work;
- submitting another student’s work in whole or in part, unless this is specifically allowed in the unit/unit of competency outline;
- using another person’s ideas, work or research data without acknowledgment;
- appropriating or imitating another’s ideas unless this is specifically allowed in the unit/unit of competency outline;
- submitting a piece of work that has previously been submitted for assessment at LCBA or another education provider in whole or in part, unless allowed for in the unit/unit of competency assessment or authorised by the Program Manager, and with proper acknowledgment.

‘Program Manager’ refers to an academic staff member who is responsible for providing academic leadership of a program.

‘Study Period’ means a defined teaching and study period specified by a faculty for the completion of units of study. For LCBA higher education courses, a study period is one trimester in duration, except the Master of International Hospitality Management course which is one semester in duration. For LCBA VET programs, a study period is the duration of one stage.

ACADEMIC INTEGRITY POLICY

‘Unit’ (Higher Education (HE)) refers to a component of a course of study with a designated code, title and credit point allocation in which students enrol and undertake assessment tasks in order to achieve specified learning outcomes.

‘Unit of competency’ (Vocational Education and Training (VET)) is the specification of knowledge and skill, and the application of that knowledge and skill, to the standard of performance expected in the workplace. A unit of competency is the smallest unit that can be assessed and recognised.

‘VET Quality Management Committee’ (VQMC) refers to the internal committee responsible for Le Cordon Bleu Australia’s vocational education academic quality assurance processes, including policy development and review of academic policies.

8. Related Documents

- Assessment Policy HE
- Assessment Policy VET
- Enrolment Policy
- LCBA Privacy Policy
- Student Code of Conduct
- Student Complaints and Appeals Policy
- Work Integrated Learning Policy

9. Implementation

- 9.1 The Registrar is responsible for ensuring that future major changes to this policy will be accompanied by a completed Implementation Plan, and presented with the policy to the Academic Board.
- 9.2 The Implementation Plan will include a Communication Strategy that identifies key stakeholders and the requirements for effectively implementing and monitoring this policy.

10. Procedure

10.1 Preliminary discussion

- 10.1.1 If a staff member believes that a student has committed academic misconduct as defined in this policy, the staff member will discuss the issue with the student.
- 10.1.2 Where the staff member determines that the student’s actions may constitute Level 1 academic misconduct, but do not constitute academic misconduct Level 2 or Level 3, the staff member may counsel the student to reinforce academic integrity practices, and take no further action.
- 10.1.3 The staff member requests that the AIO keep a record of the incident.
- 10.1.4 Where the staff member believes that the student’s actions may constitute academic misconduct Level 2 or Level 3, the staff member will refer the issue to the campus AIO.

ACADEMIC INTEGRITY POLICY

10.2 Initial inquiry

- 10.2.1 If the AIO believes the issue warrants further investigation, the AIO notifies the student of their concerns in writing within five (5) working days and requests that the student attend a meeting with the AIO to discuss the issue.
- 10.2.2 The student must respond to the request for a meeting within five (5) working days and attend meetings as requested by the AIO.
- 10.2.3 The meeting must occur within 10 working days of the initial notification.
- 10.2.4 If the student is unable to attend the meeting, the discussion may occur via email or phone/internet communications.
- 10.2.5 The student may be assisted or supported at the meeting by:
- an independent person, or
 - a representative of the LCBA Co-Delivery Partner, or
 - any LCBA staff member or student.
- 10.2.6 The AIO will decide on the most appropriate outcome, irrespective of whether the student chooses to participate in the initial inquiry.
- 10.2.7 The AIO will determine one of the following outcomes:
- 10.2.7.1 No academic misconduct was involved. No further action will be taken, and no information will be recorded in the Academic Misconduct Register.
- 10.2.7.2 Academic Misconduct Level 2 has occurred. The AIO provides academic counselling to the student and applies one of the following further outcomes:
- re-submission of the assessment task, or
 - another outcome appropriate to the case but with an impact less serious than failure with a zero score (HE) or Not Satisfactory (VET) in the assessment component of the unit/unit of competency, or
 - failure with a zero score (HE) or Not Satisfactory (VET), in the assessment component of the unit/unit of competency.
- 10.2.7.3 There is a strong likelihood that academic misconduct Level 3 has occurred, in which instance the AIO proposes an outcome more serious than failure of an assessment component of a unit/unit of competency with a zero score (HE) or a result of Not Satisfactory (NS) and the opportunity to resubmit (VET).
- 10.2.8 The student must advise the AIO in writing that they either accept or reject the proposed outcome within five (5) working days from the date specified in the AIO's report.
- 10.2.9 The student's failure to respond will not alter the outcome.

ACADEMIC INTEGRITY POLICY

- 10.2.10 The student may accept the proposed outcome in writing at any time before a formal inquiry.
- 10.2.11 If the student accepts the proposed outcome and penalty for a case of Academic Misconduct Level 2, the matter is resolved. In this case, a record is made in the Academic Misconduct Register and a report is provided to the student and unit/unit of competency teacher.
- 10.2.12 If the student accepts the proposed outcome and penalty for a case of Academic Misconduct Level 3, the AIO advises the Program Manager and provides them with a record of the initial inquiry. The Program Manager:
- Reviews the report together with the relevant Head of School (or delegate). They either accept or reject the proposed outcome.
 - Where they accept the outcome, they indicate their agreement on the report and advise the AIO to apply the penalty. A record is made in the Academic Misconduct Register and a report is provided to the student, the AIO and the unit/unit of competency teacher.
 - Where they reject the proposed outcome, the Program Manager initiates a Formal Inquiry.
- 10.2.13 If the student rejects the proposed outcome, the AIO advises the Program Manager, provides them with a record of the initial inquiry and recommends that the Program Manager initiate a formal inquiry.
- 10.2.14 Cases of academic misconduct that do not relate to a particular unit/unit of competency are referred to the Program Manager to undertake a formal inquiry.
- 10.3 Formal inquiry
- 10.3.1 On receiving a referral from the AIO, the Program Manager will review the case and determine what form of academic misconduct, if any, has occurred.
- 10.3.2 If the Program Manager finds that no academic misconduct has occurred, or that Academic Misconduct Level 2 has occurred, they will refer the case back to the AIO to counsel the student and apply an appropriate penalty according to the procedure set out in Initial Inquiry (above).
- 10.3.3 If, as a result of the preliminary investigation, the Program Manager believes that the student's actions constitute Academic Misconduct Level 3, the Program Manager establishes a Panel consisting of:
- the Program Manager as Chair,
 - a member of academic staff nominated by the Program Manager and not involved in the unit(s) of study concerned,
 - one other member of academic staff,
 - a nominee of the Dean,
 - Minute Taker.
- 10.3.4 The formal inquiry may proceed even if all members are not present, provided there is a quorum of three (3) which must include the Chair, the relevant Head of School (or nominee) and does not include the minute taker.

ACADEMIC INTEGRITY POLICY

- 10.3.5 The academic staff member and/or AIO who initiated the case may present their concerns to the inquiry, but is not permitted to serve as a member of the committee.
- 10.3.6 The Program Manager will write to the student at least five (5) working days before the formal inquiry is due to commence. The letter will:
- provide information about the alleged misconduct,
 - invite the student to attend the inquiry,
 - include a copy of the documentation that is provided to the formal inquiry committee,
 - include a copy of this policy.
- 10.3.7 If the student is unable to attend in person, alternative options such as telephone, email or video conferencing communications may be considered.
- 10.3.8 The Chair of the formal inquiry is responsible for ensuring that confidentiality is maintained where required.
- 10.3.9 The student may be assisted or supported at the inquiry by:
- an independent person, or
 - a representative of the LCBA Co-Delivery Partner, or
 - any LCBA staff member or student.
- 10.3.10 The formal inquiry may proceed whether or not the student responds or attends.
- 10.3.11 The formal inquiry will determine if:
- the student's actions do not constitute academic misconduct, and no further action will be taken. If the inquiry arose following the removal of a student from a placement, the student may be reinstated in the existing placement or arrangements made to undertake an alternative placement at a future date.
 - the student's actions constitute Academic Misconduct Level 2. The student is allowed to resubmit the assessment if re-submission is permitted in the unit/unit of competency, or another appropriate outcome is applied that is less serious than failure with a zero score (HE) or Not Satisfactory (VET) in the assessment component of the unit/unit of competency. Where appropriate, the matter will be referred back to the AIO for implementation. If the inquiry arose following the removal of a student from a placement, the student may be reinstated in the existing placement or arrangements made to undertake an alternative placement at a future date, following academic counselling from the AIO.
 - the student's actions constitute Academic Misconduct Level 3. The formal inquiry committee notifies the student in writing within five (5) days of their decision to apply one of the following outcomes:
 - failure (HE) or a result of Not Competent (VET) in the unit/unit of competency, or

ACADEMIC INTEGRITY POLICY

- failure (HE) or a result of Not Competent (VET) and suspension from the course for a period not exceeding one year, or
- suspension from LCBA for a period not exceeding three (3) years, or
- another outcome appropriate to the case but with an impact less serious than expulsion from LCBA, or
- expulsion from LCBA.

10.3.12 In cases of fraud, the matter may also be referred to police.

10.3.13 If the formal inquiry concludes that the action of the student warrants suspension from LCBA, the letter to the student includes advice that:

- re-admission to any program at LCBA will not normally be considered during the suspension,
- application for re-admission to LCBA will follow normal procedures and is not guaranteed, and
- students who gain re-admission will be classified as new students for the purposes of assessing fees and eligibility for Commonwealth support or assistance.

10.3.14 The Chair will communicate the outcome of the formal inquiry in writing to the following people, within five (5) working days:

- the student
- the relevant AIO
- the unit/unit of competency teacher
- LCBA Co-Delivery Partner administration office and Student Services to be retained on the student's file.

10.3.15 The Program Manager includes a copy of this policy in correspondence to the student, and advises the student of their right of appeal.

10.4 Appeals

10.4.1 The student has the right of appeal against the decision of the formal inquiry committee in accordance with the *Student Complaints and Appeals Policy*.

10.5 Recording information about academic misconduct

10.5.1 LCBA will store information about academic misconduct and breaches of examination procedures on the Academic Misconduct Register and in the student file. The information will be stored for a minimum period of seven (7) years from the date of the last recorded incident.

10.5.2 If the AIO determines that no academic misconduct or breach of examination procedure occurred, then no information will be recorded.

10.5.3 All AIOs will have access to information in the Academic Misconduct Register, for consideration when determining whether a student's actions constitute academic misconduct, and determining the appropriate outcome.


ACADEMIC INTEGRITY POLICY

- 10.5.4 If an AIO determines that a student has breached an examination procedure but that the breach does not constitute academic misconduct, the following information will be recorded in the Academic Misconduct Register:
- details about the student, the program, the unit/unit of competency and the examination,
 - the type of breach, and
 - the counselling provided to the student.
- 10.5.5 If an AIO's initial inquiry determines that academic misconduct occurred, the following information will be recorded in the Academic Misconduct Register and/or the student file:
- details about the student, the program, the unit/unit of competency and the assessment task,
 - the type of academic misconduct,
 - the factors taken into consideration,
 - the information on which the determination is based,
 - the outcome and reasons for the outcome, and
 - whether the student agreed or rejected the proposed outcome.
- 10.5.6 If a case is referred to the Program Manager, the Program Manager has access to the information stored regarding the initial inquiry relating to that case, and to any other cases recorded against that student, in order to assist in their determination.
- 10.5.7 If the Program Manager concludes that the student's actions constituted academic misconduct, they record the outcome and the factors taken into consideration, in the Academic Misconduct Register and/or student file.
- 10.5.8 If a formal inquiry is convened, the committee has access to the information stored regarding the initial inquiry and to any other cases recorded against that student. The committee records its determination in the Academic Misconduct Register and/or student file, including:
- the factors taken into consideration in determining an outcome,
 - the information on which the determination is based, and
 - the outcome, and reasons for that outcome.
- 10.5.9 If a student appeals the outcome of a formal inquiry, the person/s considering the appeal has access to the information stored in the database regarding the initial inquiry, the formal inquiry, and any other cases recorded against that student.
- 10.5.10 In addition to the information stored in the Academic Misconduct Register, copies of any decisions communicated to a student resulting from an investigation into academic misconduct or breaches of examination procedures must be provided to LCBA Co-Delivery Partner administration office to be retained on the student's file.



ACADEMIC INTEGRITY POLICY

10.6 Procedure Workflow



ACADEMIC INTEGRITY POLICY

11. Summary of changes since last review

Authored by	Description
Head of School	Update definition of Academic Misconduct around the use of Artificial Intelligence