POLICY: Tuition Assurance Arrangements for Domestic Students

Policy Group(s)  Group C: Academic – 3: Students (Ref: C3/00105.6-0909)
Related Policy:  Grievance Policy and Procedures for Domestic Students
Commencement Date:  January 2005  Review Date:  September 2014

POLICY STATEMENT

Intent: Circumstances may arise where CHC is no longer able to deliver courses to domestic students. This policy outlines those circumstances and the options available to domestic students in the various instances.

This policy fulfils compliance requirements of the HESA 2003 under the Higher Education Provider guidelines.

Scope: All students who undertake study at CHC.
Restrictions: Domestic students
Exclusions: Overseas students

Objectives:
1. To provide all enrolled students and domestic applicants at CHC with a clear understand of what happens in the instance of a provider default.
2. To provide staff with clear guidelines of the process in the unlikely event that CHC is no longer able to provide a course(s) to domestic students.
3. To maintain compliance with the requirements of the HESA 2003 and the Higher Education Provider Guidelines.

Policy Provisions:
1. General
   1.1 A provider default occurs if:
      1.1.1 a course does not commence on the agreed starting day for any reason and an alternative course with equivalent outcomes is not offered by CHC; or
      1.1.2 the course ceases to be provided at any time after it starts but before it is completed and an alternative course with equivalent outcomes is not offered by CHC; or
      1.1.3 the course is not provided in full to the student because CHC has had its registration as an institution able to offer courses revoked;
      and the student has not withdrawn before the default date.
   1.2 CHC is required by the HESA 2003 and the Higher Education Provider Guidelines to have in place a Tuition Assurance Scheme (TAS).
1.3 The TAS will include the following four parts as required by the HESA:

1.3.1 General Requirements;
1.3.2 Course Assurance requirements;
1.3.3 Student Contribution or Tuition Fee Repayment Requirements;
1.3.4 Administrative and Other Requirements.

1.4 The arrangements under this policy will be clearly available to CHC students and prospective students on the CHC website.

1.5 If CHC ceases to provide a course, a person who is currently enrolled in that course may choose to access either the arrangements under the Course Assurance arrangements or the Student Contribution or Tuition Fee Repayments in respect of replaced units, but only under the following circumstances:

2. Course Assurance Arrangements

2.1 If CHC

2.2 Implicit in this is the concept that learning rests on and builds on the work and ideas of others. However, it is important that student in their learning acknowledge, through appropriate referencing, earlier work and research from which they have drawn conclusions or interpretations or might advance ideas. This is the concept of academic integrity in the western tradition.

2.3 Referencing indicates that the student has read widely, has interrogated the literature, is aware of the authoritative scholarship in the field and has based their ideas on earlier research or evidence. This is central to research-based learning.

2.4 Failure to reference appropriately will be considered unethical academic behaviour and could result in allegations of academic misconduct.

3. Plagiarism defined

3.1 CHC defines plagiarism as the action or practice of using someone else’s ideas or phrasing and representing them as your own original work, either on purpose or through carelessness, without acknowledgement.

3.1.1 ‘Someone else’ can mean an author of a book or journal, an electronic resource such as material found on the worldwide web or another student.

3.1.2 ‘Ideas or phrasing’ includes written or spoken material, from whole papers and paragraphs to sentences, statistics and graphs and even phrases.

3.1.3 This includes:
- published and unpublished documents;
- music and sounds;
- images and photographs;
- computer codes; and
- ideas gained through working in a group.

3.1.4 These ideas, interpretations, works or words may be found in print and/or electronic media.

3.2 Any assignment submitted as part of CHC work must be the original work of the...
student who submits it.

4. **Types and degrees of plagiarism.**

The term ‘plagiarism’ includes a variety of academic misdemeanours, ranging from comparatively minor paraphrasing errors to outright theft of another person’s work. It includes:

- **4.1 Sham plagiarising** – a student copies a paragraph from an online article, changes a few words so it is not a verbatim quite, and then acknowledges the source;
- **4.2 Illicit paraphrasing** – a student paraphrases from another article but does not cite the source;
- **4.3 Verbatim copying** – a student copies entire sentences or paragraphs verbatim from a text without acknowledging the source;
- **4.4 Self-plagiaring, recycling or double-dipping** – a student submits an assignment that was previously submitted for another unit;
- **4.5 Ghost writing** – a student submits an assignment that was written by and/or purchased from someone else;
- **4.6 Purloining** – a student copies from another student’s assignment or another person’s text without the person’s knowledge; and
- **4.7 Providing work to another student to submit as their own.**

(Please refer to the CHC Code of Conduct and the CHC Style Guide for further examples).

5. **Poor academic practice**

5.1 CHC is committed to providing an educative response to instances of poor referencing early in a students’ academic career. Therefore, when a student, in their first year of study at CHC, submits an assessment item(s) in which sources are not correctly and/or fully and/or consistently cited, the student will be deemed to have ‘failed to cite’ these sources, rather than being deemed to have ‘plagiarised’ these sources. Such students will receive a warning and be counselled how to avoid poor academic practice.

5.2 There will be instances where a student unintentionally fails to cite sources or to do so adequately later in their academic career.

5.3 Careless or inadequate referencing will be considered poor academic practice and a demonstration of carelessness in research and presentation of evidence. In such cases the student may be required to re-submit the work, correct the error or receive a grade penalty.

5.4 A student may, for example:

- **5.4.1** clearly recognise the need to referencing, but references carelessly or inadequately in the context of the relevant discipline;
- **5.4.2** use the incorrect referencing system for the relevant discipline or a mixture of systems;
- **5.4.3** have undertaken extensive research but lost track of the source of some
5.4.4 be ignorant of western academic conventions.

5.5 Academic staff have a responsibility to educate students about appropriate citation practices in the context of their discipline and provide clear examples of what is acceptable.

6. **Collusion**

While collaborative learning is now encouraged, it can inadvertently result in collusion and allegations of misconduct unless students fully appreciate the distinction between collaboration and collusion, are given very specific instructions about assessment requirements, and are informed about what and how they will be assessed.

6.1 Unauthorised collaboration where two or more students collaborate and submit individual copies of the work as original is collusion and is a form of plagiarism.

6.2 Plagiarism in group work can occur when, for example:

6.2.1 students discuss how to approach a common assessment item that requires individual submissions and the same or very similar approaches are reflected in the submitted assessments without any acknowledgement of collaboration with colleagues;

6.2.2 a group is required to collaborate on an assessment item where there are also some individual components but the team and individual efforts are not clearly distinguished;

6.2.3 a group effort is required but individual contributions are assessed in a way that does not distinguish between the group’s product and the individual components to process, thereby encouraging a competitive environment to maximise individual grades.

6.3 To minimise the potential for collusion, staff should:

6.3.1 make very clear to students what they consider to be the difference between permitted collaboration (or cooperation) and prohibited collusion; and remind students that collusive behaviour may result in allegations of misconduct;

6.3.2 through the Unit Outlines –

- clearly inform student about the extent to which a piece of assessment may be collaborative and/or must be solely the work of the student;
- set appropriate conditions for group work and make clear the distinction between group work and individual work;
- where a group submission is permitted, remind students that the extent of any collaboration must be acknowledged and inform students how individual contributions will be assessed.

6.4 With the exception of assessment tasks which required a joint submission, all assessment tasks must be submitted individually and the marker is entitled to consider identical layout, identical mistakes, identical arguments and identical presentation to be prima facie evidence of collusion.

7. **Plagiarism as poor academic practice or misconduct**
CHC will not hesitate to use the provisions and procedures of the *CHC Code of Conduct* to investigate suspected misconduct involving plagiarism. Provision 2 of the *CHC Code of Conduct* provides the necessary framework for taking action. Staff who suspect plagiarism should follow the procedures of Provision 8 below.

7.1 Misconduct is defined by Provision 2. Under the heading of Student Integrity in the Supporting Procedures and Guidelines direct reference is made to “cheating” and gives the following examples:

*Example 1:* Knowingly plagiarise the work of another by adapting or incorporating it in a piece of assessment without due acknowledgement (sham plagiarism).
*Example 2:* Knowingly plagiarise the ideas of an author of a text by incorporating them in a piece of assessment without due acknowledgement (illicit plagiarism).
*Example 3:* Knowingly plagiarise the exact words of an author of a text in a piece of assessment without due acknowledgement (verbatim copying).

7.2 The key concept to the allegation of cheating is that the student plagiarised the work or ideas of another intentionally. In such instances formal misconduct proceedings will ensue.

7.3 Where the student is an overseas student, the Registrar must be informed.

7.4 It is possible that a student may carelessly use the work of another in the course of putting together an assignment without due acknowledgement. Instances of careless or inadequate referencing or failure to reference will not be treated as misconduct if the intent to gain an academic advantage is clearly not present.

7.5 Notwithstanding Provision 7.4, ignorance is no excuse and CHC considers carelessness to be as serious as a purposeful violation. Whilst this will not be treated as misconduct it will be dealt with firmly and appropriately.

8. **Dealing with suspected academic misconduct**

8.1 In all cases of suspected academic misconduct, the staff member will report the incident to the Dean of the relevant School.

8.2 The Dean will, in consultation with the staff member, determine if the academic misconduct has resulted from poor academic practice or was intentional. This preliminary step may involve an interview with the student.

8.3 In the case of plagiarism, the Dean and the staff member will:

8.3.1 consider the extent of the plagiarism (noting that the more the extensive the plagiarism, the more likely that it was intentional);

8.3.2 review the Unit Outline and other information provided to the student by the Unit Coordinator or lecturer to determine if adequate information was provided;

8.3.3 investigate whether the student has been previously charged with plagiarism of any kind (noting that previous charges would likely mean that the student understood misconduct and its consequences);

8.3.4 determine whether the student is new to tertiary study (it would be expected that continuing undergraduate students and all postgraduate students
would be more likely to understand plagiarism and its consequences).

8.3.5 If the above factors have been considered and it has been determined that plagiarism has arisen from poor academic practice, an appropriate loss of grade should be recorded. A student may, for example, receive no marks for the portion of the assessment task which has been plagiarised.

8.3.6 However, if on initial investigation based on the allegation of plagiarism, the evidence clearly points to an intention on the student’s part to gain an unfair advantage, the case should be treated as gross academic misconduct and the Dean will proceed in accordance with Provision 4 of the CHC Code of Conduct.

8.4 In the instance of other kinds of academic misconduct, and where the Dean has determined the severity of the misconduct to be minor, the student will receive an official warning and, in addition, one or more of the following:

8.4.1 a reduction of marks of up to two grades;
8.4.2 be required to resubmit the piece of assessment by a specific date (Note: in the case of a resubmit a student may only receive a passing grade of C or 50% for the assessment item, as appropriate).

8.5 Where the academic misconduct is determined by the Dean to be severe, the student will attend a formal hearing under Provision 4 of the CHC Code of Conduct.

9. Plagiarism detection

9.1 CHC does not make official use of any text matching software and maintains that the professional judgement of academic staff remains the most effective means of determining whether a piece of assessment has been plagiarised.

10. Cheating defined

Cheating includes but is not limited to:

10.1 the use of any unauthorised assistance in taking oral or written tests or examinations;
10.2 the acquisition, without permission, of tests or other academic material belonging to CHC, a member of its staff or a member of the student body;
10.3 providing or receiving information which is prejudicial to the fair conduct of the examination during the conduct of the examination;
10.4 tampering or attempting to tamper with any item used in the assessment of students;
10.5 failing to abide by directions from the Unit Coordinator or lecturer regarding the permitted level of collaboration between students on items submitted for assessment;
10.6 acquiring or attempting to acquire, possessing or distributing material not specifically authorised for use in the assessment process by the Unit Coordinator or lecturer in the Unit Outline or on the front cover of the examination paper. Unauthorised material includes current examination question papers or part
10.7 impersonating or attempting to impersonate another student in assessment activities;

10.8 transmission of information on the contents of an examination paper to another candidate who is still to sit that paper.

11. Appeals

11.1 Should a student become aggrieved by a decision regarding a case of allegation of plagiarism, the student has the right of appeal. CHC’s appeals processes are outlined in the *Grievance Procedures for Domestic Students* and the *Grievance Procedures for Overseas Students*.

11.2 These arrangements do not negate the right of any overseas student to pursue any other legal remedies under the Australian Consumer Protection laws.

12. Communication

12.1 After a decision is made the person or panel who has made the decision will communicate the outcome of the decision in writing.

12.2 The original together with one copy will be forwarded to the Registrar’s office for dispatch. The Registrar will mail the original to the student.

12.3 CHC will retain confidential records relating to any misconduct for a period of at least five years, and allow parties to the complaint appropriate access to these records.

12.4 Should the penalty of any allegations of plagiarism have implications for enrolment or course progression, the Registrar will inform the appropriate staff and assist the student to take the appropriate action regarding their enrolment at CHC.

### POLICY SUPPORTING INFORMATION

Supporting Procedures and Guidelines:

**Section 1: The Notice**

Where a panel is convened by a Board of Studies or the Academic Board to hear a case of academic misconduct the student against whom the allegation is made will be notified in writing. The notice will:

1.1 describe the nature of the allegation;

1.2 state the time, date and place for the hearing, which must not be earlier that 10 days or more than six weeks after the date of the notice;

1.3 inform the student of their right to be accompanied by a third party or representative;

1.4 inform the student whether or not they may call witnesses. The student or their representative and the panel may question any witnesses although they may not
be compelled to answer any questions;

1.5 inform the student they may provide any written or oral submission. Such a submission is due on the date, time and at the location of the hearing; and

1.6 enclose a copy of this policy and the Student Grievance Procedures for the student’s information and copies of all relevant statements or submissions that the panel proposes to take into account in its decision.

Section 2. Recording the academic misconduct on the student’s file.

2.1 Where an allegation of academic misconduct against a student is proven, a record will be placed on the student’s file.

2.2 If the penalty for the academic misconduct is exclusion from CHC this will be recorded in the letter and will be recorded in the student’s enrolment status in CHC Manager and the information provided to other HEIs should the student attempt to enrol at another HEI.

Other Nil

Definitions and Acronyms: CHC – Christian Heritage College

POLICY FURTHER INFORMATION

Relevant Commonwealth/State Legislation

ACCOUNTABILITIES

Implementation: Deans

Compliance: Academic Board

Monitoring and Evaluation: Academic Board

Development/Review: Academic Board; Policy Standing Committee

Approval Authority: Academic Board

Interpretation & advice: Registrar’s Office

WHO SHOULD KNOW THIS POLICY?

Students
Deans
Academic Staff
Academic Administration Staff
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