

Academic Integrity Policy and Procedure

Last Modified:	14/06/2023
Review Date:	1/06/2025
Business Owner:	Provost
Approval Authority:	Academic Board

1. PURPOSE

Te Whare Wānaka o Aoraki Lincoln University (hereafter the University) is committed to academic excellence and high standards of ethical behaviour as the cornerstones of excellent scholarship. The University requires all staff and students to act honestly, ethically and with integrity within the University community. A strong emphasis on the academic integrity of staff and students is a quality assurance mechanism that safeguards the standard of the university's qualifications.

The purpose of the Academic Integrity Policy and Procedure is to:

- Outline the University's commitment to high standards of academic integrity
- State the University's position on academic dishonesty and poor academic practice
- Ensure all matters of academic dishonesty are dealt with fairly and efficiently
- Provide an overview of how the University prevents, detects, and manages cases of academic dishonesty and poor academic practice.

2. DEFINITIONS

Academic dishonesty: acts of dishonest behaviour intended to advantage oneself or others in assessment and other academic work, i.e., there is an intention to deceive.

Academic Integrity: principle by which University staff and students act honestly, fairly, ethically and with respect for each other in teaching, learning, research and administration. For general principles, refer to [The Fundamental Values of Academic Integrity](#).

Cheating: to act dishonestly or unfairly in order to gain an advantage, including the possession of forbidden material (e.g., notes) or communication devices during an assessment activity.

Collusion: submission of work performed in whole or in part with another person/s but submitted as if it had been completed by the named author alone (or joint authors if a group item of work). This also includes submission of work derived from work previously submitted by another student.

Double-dipping: submitting work previously submitted to successfully obtain credit or meet programme requirements in a course or concurrently being used to seek credit in another

course.

Fabrication of data: knowingly presenting data which is not obtained through experimentation or research.

Ghost-writing: the use of a third party (with or without payment) to prepare all or part of an item of work submitted for assessment. This also includes (a) unauthorized use of AI programmes to complete assessment and (b) the procuring of another person to complete a test or exam.

Plagiarism: the presentation of work that has been produced by somebody else as if it is one's own work.

Poor academic practice: an unintended breach of instructions, carelessness, neglect or similar.

Proctor: an officer of the University appointed by the Vice Chancellor, who has disciplinary functions. The University Proctor shall be responsible in the first instance for the investigation and resolution of complaints about breaches of discipline and the imposition of penalties. Refer to the [Student Discipline Regulations](#).

3. PRINCIPLES

1. Lincoln University is committed to maintaining the highest standards of academic integrity and to providing staff and students with resources and assistance to meet these standards.
2. Academic dishonesty and poor academic practice are not tolerated under any circumstances.
3. Originality detection software such as Turnitin should, where possible, be used to assist in the maintenance of academic integrity.
4. Staff members who suspect academic dishonesty or poor academic practice must deal with it in accordance with the procedure below.
5. Where academic dishonesty or poor academic practice is suspected, the accused person must be given an opportunity to explain their actions. They may be supported by a support person.
6. Students and staff will be informed of any accusation of academic dishonesty against them and will be provided with relevant supporting information, including the evidence on which the suspicion is based. The accused will be allowed sufficient time to consider this information before they are asked to respond to it.
7. Accused students will be dealt with under this Policy and Procedure and the Student Discipline Regulations. Accused staff will be dealt with under the Discipline Policy and Procedure.
8. Evidence of previous academic dishonesty must not be used to determine guilt but may be used to determine the penalty if guilt is established.

Academic Integrity Policy and Procedure

Lincoln University is an Open Access university. This policy is licensed under [CC-BY 3.0 NZ](#)



4. UNIVERSITY RESPONSIBILITIES

1. Via the Lincoln University Student Code of Conduct, available on the LEARN page, students will have access to information about correct conduct in University assessment activities and the processes and penalties for dealing with misconduct. These documents are: Academic Integrity Policy and Procedure; Student Discipline Regulations; Lincoln University Calendar – Section F: Academic Integrity; Proctor Schedule of Penalties for Misconduct; Universal Course Regulations; Formal Exam Rules; Code of Conduct – Field Trips, Tours and other External Activities; Academic Appeals Policy and Procedure; Student Complaints Policy and Procedure.
2. Via Learning, Teaching and Library (LTL), all staff and students will be provided with, or have access to, information about academic integrity, which will include guidelines and descriptions about what is acceptable or unacceptable in their course or discipline.
3. Via LTL, all staff and students will be provided with, or have access to, instructions on the academic conventions or referencing styles relevant to their course or discipline.

5. STAFF RESPONSIBILITIES

In order to minimise the possibility of academic dishonesty or poor academic practice, it is expected that:

1. Staff will provide appropriate role models by acting with academic integrity in their own work.
2. Academic and other staff will assist students to understand the principle of academic integrity within their discipline, and students will be given opportunities to demonstrate and practise their understanding of it during the course of their studies.
3. Academic staff will set appropriate guidelines for group work and make clear the distinction between group work and individual work.
4. Academic staff will work with LTL to minimise the opportunities for academic dishonesty by taking an active approach to assessment and programme design.
5. All staff, including relevant administrative staff, will respond to allegations of academic dishonesty in a professional and consistent manner using the procedure outlined below. Course Examiners will advise all teaching staff, including tutors and markers, of Lincoln University policy with respect to managing academic dishonesty. In dealing with all such matters, a high level of confidentiality must be maintained.

6. STUDENT RESPONSIBILITIES

Students are expected to act with academic integrity. In order to minimise the likelihood of academic dishonesty, students will:

1. Read and apply the Lincoln University Student Code of Conduct and all policies, procedures and resources linked to it.
2. Learn and apply the academic conventions and referencing styles relevant to their course or discipline.

Academic Integrity Policy and Procedure

Lincoln University is an Open Access university. This policy is licensed under [CC-BY 3.0 NZ](https://creativecommons.org/licenses/by/3.0/nz/)



3. Inform themselves about conditions relating to all forms of assessment, especially those relating to group work and examinations.
4. Submit only work that is their own original work and that properly acknowledges the work of others by referencing and clear identification of quotations.
5. Not submit work previously submitted to meet the requirements of another assessment for the same course or another course. Doing so is double-dipping.
6. Not knowingly allow access to their work by other students except where this is specifically required for group work.
7. Not access the work of other students except where this is specifically required for group work.

7. STANDARD OF PROOF

The person considering an allegation of academic dishonesty must be satisfied beyond all reasonable doubt. If this standard is not satisfied, the matter may still be viewed as one of poor academic practice. Staff are encouraged to consult the Proctor on the principles and processes for dealing with matters of academic integrity, especially when they are uncertain about dishonest intent.

8. MAINTAINING RECORDS

Secure and confidential records of offences of academic dishonesty and notifications of poor academic practice (Level 1 below) will be maintained by the Proctor.

9. PROCEDURES: Student Assessment

These procedures set out the University's framework for the management of academic dishonesty and poor academic practice in student assessment. The procedures aim to ensure that these matters are dealt with fairly and efficiently.

Where a matter of academic dishonesty or poor academic practice concerns a staff member, refer to the Disciplinary Policy and Procedure.

There are four types of student behaviour in relation to academic dishonesty and poor academic practice:

- Type 1 No Dishonest Intent – Poor Academic Practice
- Type 2 Dishonest Intent – Academic Dishonesty
- Type 3 Serious or Repeated Academic Dishonesty
- Type 4 Examination Offence

Accused students will be dealt with under this Policy and Procedure and the Student Discipline Regulations. Accused staff will be dealt with under the Discipline Policy and Procedure.

TYPE 1: NO DISHONEST INTENT – Poor Academic Practice

No dishonest intent includes innocent or careless presentation of another person's work as their own, without appropriate acknowledgement of the source. Where poor academic practice occurs as a result of ignorance of academic norms such as referencing, and where it is believed no dishonesty was intended, Course Examiners will handle such incidents themselves, but must provide a 'notification' of the case to the Proctor.

The procedure is as follows:

- The Course Examiner, without notifying the student, will contact the Proctor with the name and ID number of the student to confirm whether this is a first or subsequent offence. If it is a first offence the Course Examiner will handle the matter as below. If it is a second or subsequent offence, the Proctor will take responsibility in consultation with the Course Examiner.
- Where a student is ignorant of academic norms such as referencing, the appropriate response is educative and handled by the Course Examiner.
- The nature of any poor academic practice and any penalty to be imposed because of it must be clearly detailed in assessment feedback to the student. The Course Examiner should also contact the student by separate email notifying them of the issue and the proposed penalty.
- Course Examiners may refer students to Learning, Teaching and Library (LTL) for help with referencing and academic norms. LTL can also provide advice for academics on how to set assignments which promote academic integrity and minimize academic dishonesty.
- As discussed in Appendix One, the Course Examiner may decide: to take no further action; warn the student; apply a mark penalty; or require the student to rewrite and resubmit a piece of work. In the last instance, in fairness to other students, a mark penalty will be applied.
- When imposing the penalty, the Course Examiner will advise the student of their right to appeal to the Head of Department. The appeal must be in writing, stating the reason for the appeal and be submitted within five working days of notification. Exceptions to the five-day limitation within which an appeal must be submitted, will be granted by the Head of Department in exceptional circumstances which are beyond the student's control.
- The student will be informed that the incident will be recorded in the Proctor database.
- The Course Examiner will send a notification to the Proctor detailing the penalty imposed. The Proctor will enter these details in a secure database but take no further action.

TYPE 2: DISHONEST INTENT

Dishonest intent includes instances where the Course Examiner is confident that the student has deliberately presented plagiarized work; double dipped; fabricated data; colluded; procured a ghost writer; or engaged in another form of academic dishonesty. Most such first offences of academic dishonesty are dealt with by the Course Examiner. However, any matter involving ghost writing, including unauthorised use of AI, must be referred directly to the Proctor. Any student aggrieved by a decision made by the Course Examiner may appeal to the Head of Department.

Academic Integrity Policy and Procedure

Lincoln University is an Open Access university. This policy is licensed under [CC-BY 3.0 NZ](https://creativecommons.org/licenses/by/3.0/nz/)



The procedure is as follows:

- The Course Examiner, without notifying the student, will contact the Proctor with the name and ID number of the student to confirm whether this is a first or subsequent offence. If it is a first offence the Course Examiner will handle the matter as below. If it is a second or subsequent offence, the Proctor will take responsibility in consultation with the Course Examiner.
- The Course Examiner will contact the student to arrange an interview time and inform them that they may bring a support person to the meeting.
- In order to ensure there is a record (audit trail), the Course Examiner is advised to contact the student by email requiring them to attend an interview on a set date, or, if the initial contact is in person, to confirm the appointment by email. The student should be notified that failure to attend an interview or arrange a satisfactory alternative time by the date given, will entitle the Course Examiner to apply a mark penalty to the assessment and to treat the non-attendance as a serious offence of academic dishonesty which may entail referral to the Proctor. The interview with the Course Examiner will provide the student with an opportunity to explain the incident.
- If the student does not appear by the set date and does not provide reasonable explanation to justify rescheduling the meeting, the Course Examiner will apply a mark penalty and refer the student to the Proctor.
- If the Course Examiner is concerned that a serious offence (Type 3) has been committed, then they will refer the student directly to the Proctor.
- The Course Examiner will treat as a serious offence any work which they are satisfied may be the result of dishonest intent.
- If, after interviewing the student, the Course Examiner considers that there was no dishonest intent (Type 2) or poor academic practice (Type 1), then no offence has occurred.

In the case of the incident being treated as an offence, the Course Examiner will:

- Impose a penalty which may be a mark penalty (with or without resubmission for a capped mark).
- Advise the student that the offence will be recorded on the Proctor database.
- Advise the student of their right to appeal to the Head of Department, and also advise the student that if a second or subsequent offence is recorded, the student will be required to attend an interview with the Proctor.
- In all incidents handled by the Course Examiner without referral to the Proctor, any appeal is made to the Head of Department (who, at any stage, may seek advice from the Proctor). The appeal must be in writing, include the reason for the appeal and be submitted within five working days of the date on which the penalty is made known.

TYPE 3: SERIOUS OFFENCE OR REPEATED ACADEMIC DISHONESTY

Serious offences may include cheating in any form of assessment, use of ghost writers, fabrication of data and repeat offences of academic dishonesty or poor academic practice, as well as failing to attend appointments with Course Examiners. Serious offences are deemed to be a breach of discipline and all such incidents are reported to the Proctor. The student is subject to the terms of the Student Discipline Regulations and has recourse to the appeals provisions outlined therein.

Where the Course Examiner is uncertain as to the severity of the alleged offence, they should consult the Proctor to determine under whose jurisdiction the matter sits.

The procedure is as follows:

- The Course Examiner, without notifying the student, will contact the Proctor with the name and ID number of the student to confirm whether this is a first or subsequent offence. If it is a first offence the Proctor may ask the Course Examiner to handle the matter. In most instances, the Proctor will take responsibility in consultation with the Course Examiner.
- The Proctor will conduct such investigation as may be necessary.
- The Proctor can direct that a student's marks are withheld until a conclusion has been reached about an alleged academic offence. Failure to attend an interview with a Proctor may result in a penalty for non-compliance with University regulations.
- Particularly in cases where there is good reason to believe that the work presented was not completed by the student, the Proctor, in conjunction with the Course Examiner, may subject the student to further oral or written examination in order to determine the authenticity of the work.
- Penalties may include denial of all or partial credit for an item of assessment or a course; the awarding of an F grade for a course; a fine; community service; or other penalties.
- If evidence of academic misconduct emerges subsequent to the confirmation and release of final course marks, the Proctor may still investigate the matter. If misconduct is proven, the Proctor, in consultation with the Course Examiner, may reduce the previously released course mark or impose an F (fail) grade for the course. This process may occur at any time prior to the award of a qualification (conferment of qualification being evidence by issue of a parchment to the graduate) to which the course contributes. After the award of the qualification, only the University Council can withdraw a qualification from a graduate and remove them from the list of graduates.
- Cases involving the possible suspension or exclusion of a student are referred by the Proctor to the Vice Chancellor.
- Appeals against decisions of the Proctor are made to the Disciplinary Committee as per the Student Discipline Regulations.

TYPE 4: TEST OR EXAMINATION OFFENCE

Any academic dishonesty that occurs during a form test or examination is deemed to be a breach of discipline and the Student Discipline Regulations shall be applied. Breaches of regulations and cheating in tests and examinations are reported directly to the Proctor.

10. LINKS WITH OTHER POLICY / PROCEDURE / RESOURCES

- Regulation F: Academic Integrity, Lincoln University Calendar
- Student Discipline Regulations
- Academic Appeals Policy and Procedure
- Student Complaints Policy and Procedure
- Lincoln University Student Code of Conduct
- Discipline Policy and Procedure (staff)



APPENDIX ONE: GRADES AND GRADE PENALTIES

It is recognized that cases of poor academic practice may have specific differences from each other related to the circumstances of the student or the type of assessment. The following are guidelines to assist Course Examiners. If doubt remains about the most appropriate grade and penalty, Course Examiners should consult the Proctor.

General principles

When determining penalties for poor academic practice, Course Examiners should consider the following:

- At the beginning of a course, the Course Examiner should be confident that all students have been alerted to information about academic integrity, sources of assistance, and the penalties for academic dishonesty.
- It is expected that students taking courses at 200, 300 and postgraduate levels will be more familiar with principles of academic integrity than first year students taking courses at 100 level. This expectation also applies to any non-first year student enrolled in a 100 level course.

Poor academic practice

Even if the Course Examiner is satisfied that there was no dishonest intent by the student, there should be some mark penalty to distinguish from the majority of students who did not engage in poor academic practice. For example, a Course Examiner may reduce the grade, the magnitude of the deduction being dependent on the extent of the breach.

Dishonest intent

If the student admits to dishonest intent, or is found guilty on the weight of evidence, the most suitable penalty is a mark of zero for the assessment. This mark is unambiguous and avoids the risk of equity issues and inconsistency that may result from the alternatives outlined below.

However, before awarding zero, the Course Examiner may wish to consider the following:

- The weighting of the assessment: awarding a mark of zero for a 30 or 40% assessment may effectively result in the student failing the course. While this may be a justified penalty in some instances of academic dishonesty, Course Examiners may wish to consider the alternatives outlined below.
- For assessments that may be composed of distinct sections or components and where only some of them reveal dishonest intent, it may be appropriate to award zero to these and mark the others on their academic merit or lack thereof rather than awarding zero to the whole assessment.

Mark deduction

Particularly in circumstances where zero will likely lead to the student failing the course, the Course Examiner may determine that a substantial mark deduction is a more appropriate penalty.

- This penalty should be substantial – at least two full grades.

Resubmission with a capped mark

Particularly in circumstances where zero will likely lead to the student failing the course, it may be appropriate to allow the student to resubmit an assessment on the same or another topic. However, this can also raise equity issues in that other students who did not complete assessment with dishonest

intent would also be very grateful to have more time to refine and resubmit their assessment. Therefore:

- Any resubmission should be subject to a capped mark – i.e., if the student resubmits an acceptable assessment, they will receive a mark no higher than C-/50 or similar for the assessment.
- Any student given the opportunity for resubmission with a capped mark should be informed of the maximum achievable mark before resubmission.

Declining to mark an assessment

In circumstances of very serious academic dishonesty, and where an assessment is a mandatory requirement for a course, a Course Examiner may decline to mark an assessment. As the student will thus be unable to complete a mandatory requirement for the course, they will receive an F (fail) final grade for that course. Course Examiners should discuss this option with the Proctor.

Denying credit

For repeat offences of academic dishonesty and for those occurring during a formally invigilated test or exam, the Proctor may award an F (fail) grade for the course.