

TEACHING AND LEARNING INTEGRITY Standard Operating Procedures			
Title	Management of Poor Academic Writing (PAWP) and Academic Misconduct in Teaching and Learning practices		
SOP no	SOP _Academic Integrity for Teaching and Learning _1	Version	2
Date of approval	24 May 2023	Revision date	
Web address		Page no	

Responsible	Accountable	System	Consulted	Informed
For SOP: Registrar	Registrar	NA	DVC TL	Executive Deans

1. COMPILATION AND AUTHORITY

Action	Designated person	Date	Signature
Compiled by:	Prof Anné H. Verhoef & Dr Mariette Fourie	May 2023	
Checked and authorised by:	Quality Manager Academic Programmes Director: Quality Office	May 2023	
Reviewed and approved	Registrar: Prof Marlene Verhoef Deputy Vice-Chancellor: Prof Robert Balfour Legal Office: Mr Kobus Joubert		
Approved by:	Senate		
Incorporated into the NWU Academic Integrity Policy, 2021, as annexure	Registrar: Prof Marlene Verhoef		

2. DISTRIBUTION

Department/Unit	Name	Date	Signature
Faculties and Schools and Support Departments	Executive Deans Deputy Deans: Teaching and Learning		

3. DOCUMENT HISTORY

Date	Version no	Action
20 October 2022	1	Senate to take note and refer to faculties for input
24 May 2023	2	Senate to approve

4. PREAMBLE

The North-West University's *Policy on Academic Integrity* was updated in 2021 and it provides for clear guidance and directions on the topic of academic integrity in both teaching and learning and research.

The *Policy on Academic Integrity* requires faculty boards and academic units to establish processes and procedures for the effective implementation thereof, and to ensure adequate training of academic employees and students, agreement to codes of conduct, provision of information on the topic in study guides and faculty yearbooks and the reporting and record keeping of any reported misconduct.

Successful implementation of the Policy must ensure ongoing professional development initiatives in faculties, schools and support departments which can assist in the enhancement of academic integrity (AI). In the light of the impact of the COVID-19 pandemic on online teaching and learning and especially on assessment practices, a renewed educational focus on the dissemination of information and processes related to the Policy was urgently required. The need to develop Standard Operating Procedures (SOPs) was identified in this process.

The Teaching and Learning Integrity SOP is based on the *Policy on Academic Integrity* and intends to provide guidelines and procedures in the teaching and learning environment when and where poor academic writing practices (PAWP) and academic misconduct are suspected or alleged. The SOP must be interpreted and applied in a manner consistent with related policies such as the:

- Research Ethics Policy, 2018 and SOPs for Academic Integrity in Research, 2021.
- Intellectual Property Policy of the North-West University, 2021.
- Policy and Manual on Student Discipline, 2019.
- Behavioural Policy and Behavioural Manual for Employees, 2011.
- NWU Values Statement (2022) and the NWU Code of Ethics.
- Assessment Policy and the NWU A-rules.

5. ABBREVIATIONS AND/OR DEFINITIONS

To be read in conjunction with the extensive Glossary of Terms relating to Academic Integrity (Policy on Academic Integrity, 2P_2.4.3.2, 2021).

Abbreviation	Description
Academic Misconduct	Noncompliance and/or violations of good TL integrity practices by students in accordance with the NWU Policy on Academic Integrity. These include but are not limited to: PAWP, plagiarism, self-plagiarism, collaboration or collusion, falsification, fabrication, sabotage, impersonating, exam transgressions and cheating.
ALDA/ALDE	Academic Literacy Module as developed by the Academic Literacy subject group within the School of Languages.
AIITSA	Academic Integrity Information Technology System Application – a system devised for the management and recording of information regarding student transgressions, actions taken and outcomes

AI Policy	Academic Integrity Policy, 2021, of the NWU.
AIROC-P	Academic Integrity Remedial Online Course for PAWP that students should do on eFundi.
AIROC-1	Academic Integrity Remedial Online Course for Category 1 and 2 transgressions which students must do on eFundi.
Allegation	A report that represents an unproven assertion.
Alleged	The student accused of poor academic writing practices or Category 1-4 transgressions.
Cheating	Cheating involves unauthorised use of information, materials, devices, technology, sources, or practices in completing academic activities. These can include i) use of sources beyond those authorised by the instructor in writing papers, preparing reports, solving problems, or carrying out other assignments; ii) acquisition, without permission, of tests or other academic material belonging to a member of the university faculty or staff; iii) engagement in any behaviour specifically prohibited by a faculty member in the course syllabus or class discussion, iv) work presented by a student as their own that originated (was generated) by means of artificial intelligence (e.g., ChatGPT and paraphrasing tools).
Contract cheating	Contracting or outsourcing a third party to provide work, which is then used or submitted as part of a formal assessment as though it is the Registered Student's own work.
Collaboration or Collusion	Working with others and using the ideas or words of this joint work without acknowledgment, as though it is the Registered Student's own work, or allowing others to use the ideas or words of joint work without acknowledgment; working with others in completing assignments or assessments when it is not allowed.
CTL	Centre for Teaching and Learning
DD:T&L	Deputy Dean: Teaching and Learning
Disciplinary action	The formal departmental or institutional process of a disciplinary procedure taken against a student or staff member.
ED	Executive Dean
Fabrication	The Academic Integrity Policy defines fabrication as: Making up data or results and recording or reporting the fabricated material. In other words: Fabrication is the making up of results and recording it as if they were real. This type of academic misconduct involves creating unauthorized information in an academic document or activity. For instance, making up data instead of collecting it through an actual experiment, or creating a non-existent source of information are examples of fabrication.
Falsification	The Academic Integrity Policy defines falsification as: Manipulating research materials, equipment, or processes or changing or omitting data or results such that the research is not accurately represented in the research records. In other words: Falsification is the act of manipulating material, equipment, or processes, or altering, omitting, or suppressing data or results without valid justification. This includes the unauthorized modification of information in academic documents or activities.

	For instance, falsification may involve artificially changing data when it should be collected from an actual experiment or inventing a source of information that does not exist.
FAIC	Faculty Academic Integrity Committee
FAIRC	Faculty Academic Integrity Review Committee. This committee can review cases on procedural basis and/or on substantial basis. The case can be upheld, dismissed, or referred to SJS as another category of transgression if needed.
FAIW	Face-to-face Academic Integrity Workshop developed and presented by the Writing Centre.
Formal investigation	The process of a formal investigation into academic misconduct (e.g., fabrication, falsification, plagiarism) by the Registrar and people appointed by him/her to conduct the various phases of the investigation (See the NWU Policy on Academic integrity 2021).
Impersonating (or being impersonated)	In an examination or other assessment or arranging for someone to impersonate someone else by sitting their examination. This includes having another person show up to write a test or exam in your place (or being the person who writes the test in someone else's place), but it also includes having someone else (or an AI programme) write an online test for you (or taking an online test for someone else).
Misrepresentation	Presentation of data, results or other outputs or aspects of research, including documentation and participant consent, or presenting or recording such data, etc, as if they were real.
PAWP	Poor Academic Writing Practices. This is understood to involve poor citation practice in which evidence is obvious that (i) the researcher/student did not appreciate/apply the rules for academic writing in terms of accepted source integration techniques, or (ii) where the extent of copied material is considered to be of minor impact or slight copying.
Plagiarism	<p>The Academic Integrity Policy definition of plagiarism is:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1) The use without appropriate acknowledgement of another's ideas, hardcopy or electronic texts, images, computer programmes, sounds, designs, performance, or any form of creative work as one's own work, including activities such as appropriating the knowledge, insights, processes results, wording, or formulation of anybody else's (or an AI programme's) work. 2) Since the intention to deceive is a key notion in the understanding of plagiarism the findings in an investigation of plagiarism must be presented in a continuum ranging from "strong intention to deceive" (presenting the work as original and/or as the author's own) to "weak intention to deceive" (careless writing and/or improper referencing. 3) Unconscionable lifting of text. <p>In other words: Plagiarism is a type of cheating in which someone adopts another person's (or an AI programme's) ideas, words, design, art, music, etc., as his or her own without acknowledging the source, or, when necessary, obtaining permission from the author.</p>

	The term “plagiarism” includes but is not limited to the use, by paraphrase or direct quotation, of the published or unpublished work of another person (or an AI programme) without full and clear acknowledgment. Plagiarism also includes the unacknowledged use of materials prepared by another person or agency engaged in the selling of term papers or other academic materials.
PMP	Academic Literacy material on academic integrity, as well as continuous self-education material regarding writing practices, academic misconduct, and academic integrity, which is available on eFundi as the Preventative Measurements Package (PMP).
QE	Quality Enhancement
Review	A request lodged by an alleged after an assessment or investigation finding a potential breach in academic integrity to the Faculty Academic Integrity Review Committee.
Sabotage	Sabotage involves disrupting or destroying another person's work so that the other person cannot complete an academic activity successfully. For example, destroying another person's artwork, experiment, or design is considered sabotage. Failure to contribute as required to a team project can also be considered academic sabotage.
Self-plagiarism	The Academic Integrity Policy definition is: <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1) Self-plagiarism occurs when authors improperly re-use their own work, or sections of their own work presenting the work as new and original. 2) Self-plagiarism may infringe the copyright of others involved in the publication of the original work. In other words: Self-plagiarism is submitting the same piece, or part, of work for more than one course without the instructor's permission. You are not allowed to receive course credit for the same work twice. This means that a student can't use an essay from a course he/she took last semester/year in one of his/her current courses, even if the topic is the same.
SD	School Director
SJS	Student Judicial Services
Student Academic Record	Official and permanent academic record of a student.
Student Record Card	Internal record card of students that is used throughout his/her academic life at the NWU, but not recorded permanently.
Text-lifting	The submission contains portions of which the content is greatly similar and/or identical to that of existing original source(s); The content of other sources has been utilised and presented (passed-off) as the original work of the student; It undermines the academic integrity principles of submitting “original research products for assessment, examination and review” as well as “honest scholarship”.

6. PURPOSE OF THE TL INTEGRITY SOP

The TL Integrity SOP was developed to provide guidelines and procedures for the preservation of academic integrity in the teaching and learning environment, within the framework of

existing policies and procedures and to ensure clarity and consistency in terms of the governance of cases where the NWU's value statement is contravened. The following principles underpin this SOP:

- An educational approach.
- Procedural fairness.
- Natural justice.
- Due process.
- Integrity.
- Confidentiality ("need-to-know rule").
- Practicality (easy to implement and use).
- Proper data management and record keeping.

The SOP aims to guide the following stakeholders in all faculties on how to manage cases of noncompliance and/or violations of good TL integrity practices by students in accordance with the Policy on Academic Integrity:

- Executive Deans (ED).
- Deputy Deans of Teaching and Learning (DD: T&L).
- All employees involved with teaching and learning (T&L).
- Staff members of relevant support departments at the NWU:
 - Student Judicial Services (SJS),
 - Quality Enhancement (QE) office,
 - Centre for Teaching and Learning (CTL), and
 - NWU Writing Centres.

7. STRATEGY TO ADDRESS ACADEMIC INTEGRITY AT THE NWU

A strategy, based on a holistic approach regarding several critical aspects in the teaching and learning environment, was followed to drive academic integrity across all eight faculties. These are (i) institutional aspects (ii) engagement and the empowerment of the lecturers, as well as (iii) engagement and the empowerment of the students (Annexure A – CTL/UCDG 2021 Year-End Report). These aspects provided for the structural, cultural, and agential development of standard operating procedures (SOPs) Academic Integrity for Teaching and Learning that are applicable to students to ensure preventative measures on institutional level as well as a faculty-based educational approach. It further assisted in developing the processes required for promoting Academic Integrity at the NWU and to identify the role-players on faculty level (pre-transgression), as well as the NWU role-players for post-transgression processes and corrective education on a NWU disciplinary level (Annexure B – CoPAI, SOP, Final Draft, 31 May 2022). It is imperative that educational and remedial intentions be emphasised and applied throughout the implementation of the SOP. At the same time, the SOP should serve as an unambiguous and practical guideline for employees of the NWU with aligned structures and processes between role players in faculties and schools.

Acceptance of a Standardised Academic Integrity approach

- The approach followed in the development of this SOP was based on consideration of attributes, advantages, and disadvantages of a *Standardised Academic Integrity* approach versus a lecturer-based academic integrity approach. The decision to support one of the options was considered as crucial as it impacted on development of the SOP. For a comparative review of the two approaches please see Annexure B.

- The SOP was developed primarily following the *Standardised Academic Integrity* approach with elements of a lecturer-based approach incorporated.
- A *Standardised Academic Integrity* approach has the benefits of ensuring consistency in the application of the NWU Policy on Academic Integrity within schools and faculties, and across support departments, providing for efficacious training opportunities, ensuring improved quality control, and representation of faculty interest in Academic Integrity matters. The standardised approach also ensures that only matters related to suspected integrity transgressions are properly dealt with, that the procedural and administrative burden on individual lecturers is alleviated, and that transparency, objectivity, and procedural fairness are promoted. It furthermore assists in alleviating interpersonal conflict between lecturer and transgressing students, ensures standardised record keeping, and provides for a central point of contact between external role players, faculties, and schools. In addition, the proposed Faculty Academic Integrity Committee (FAIC) will act as the complainant on behalf of the faculty/school in the matter, and a single line of reporting to the faculty and school management is established ensuring coherence and consistency. Furthermore, the proposed Faculty Academic Integrity Review Committee (FAIRC) renders an oversight function to ensure that reported transgressions and FAIC decisions are dealt with in a fair and transparent manner.
- This *Standardised Academic Integrity* approach addresses various measures, actions and role players in the teaching and learning environment on institutional, school and faculty level to deal with alleged academic misconduct. At the same time, it also allows for addressing the various categories (Category 1 to 4) of alleged instances of plagiarism (Policy on Academic Integrity, 2021) and PAWP, and provides for clear guidance which procedures and processes deemed appropriate to investigate and manage these misbehaviours of students.

8. CATEGORIES OF ALLEGED INSTANCES OF PAWP AND ACADEMIC MISCONDUCT

With any alleged academic misconduct committed by a student, the lecturer (or FAIC and FAIRC as needed) should determine and decide what type of academic misconduct occurred with proper categorisation. The categories, from Poor Academic Writing Practices (PAWP) to Category 4, are characterised by increasing levels of severity or seriousness of the alleged transgression. PAWP is not yet a transgression, while Category 1 is less severe and Category 4 the most severe.

A possible transgression can be identified by the lecturer as PAWP (not an offense) or any other possible form of ACADEMIC MISCONDUCT (as a transgression). If a possible transgression is identified as academic misconduct, it will be referred to FAIC who must ensure it is categorised correctly so that the transgression can be dealt with immediately within the category's procedures. The process does not necessarily have to start at the PAWP category and then escalate to the different categories. The transgression is reported and dealt with depending on the type and category of the academic misconduct that is suspected by the lecturer and FAIC.

PAWP, in the context of academic misconduct, is normally related to issues regarding plagiarism (intentional and/or unintentional), but not necessarily restricted to it. As contained

in Annexure 3 of the *Policy on Academic Integrity* (2021) the first category of alleged instances of *plagiarism* is described as PAWP:

Poor academic writing practices (PAWP) is understood to involve possible collaboration or poor citation practices in which evidence is obvious that (i) the researcher/student did not appreciate the rules for academic writing or (ii) where the extent of the copied material is considered to be of minor impact or slight copying.

PAWP is not understood as an academic integrity offense but as an indication that the student needs more knowledge, training, and skills to write in an academically acceptable way with the needed source integration techniques: e.g., in-text citations, paraphrasing, proper quotations, and complete referencing list. This transgression is therefore not further categorised as a category 1 to 4 offense. This is only the case with academic misconduct offenses.

ACADEMIC MISCONDUCT in Teaching and Learning practices can involve plagiarism, fabrication, falsification, summative (examination) cheating, and any other unlawful and academic cheating that is in contravention of the *NWU Academic Integrity Policy* (e.g., as provided in the list above at point 5) and the NWU values. These types of academic misconduct can include but are not limited to: plagiarism, self-plagiarism, text-lifting, collaboration or collusion, falsification, fabrication, sabotage, impersonating, contract cheating, exam transgressions and cheating. In categorising these transgressions, the *Academic Integrity Policy* explicates the different categories for plagiarism, and this can serve as an example for other transgressions.

As contained in Annexure 3 of the *Policy on Academic Integrity* (2021) the various categories of alleged instances of *plagiarism* are:

Category 1: Understood as evidence that is in breach of the conventions of academic writing by presenting the material of others as the researcher's/students/s original work. For example: short blocks (may be as small as two continuing lines) of material (copied text) expressing ideas or concepts taken from the work of others without proper citation.

Category 2: Understood as committed when copied material represents a significant portion of the work. For example: significant or numerous blocks of material or text copied that express ideas or concepts taken from the work of others without proper referencing or adherence to conventions to utilise quotation marks.

Category 3: Also known as a repeat offence. If not in terms of a so-called repeat offence, the investigation needs to point to cheating. The investigation must determine the level of severity regarding instances of copied text or material. The offence is of such nature that a recommendation for possible disciplinary action is made.

Category 4: Committed in instances where a Category 3 offence is substantiated and in which the intent to deceive is clearly demonstrable, of which the sanction by the disciplinary committee may be expulsion of students or dismissal of employees. This offence might typically include some risks to the university.

The procedures for dealing with these transgressions within the specific categories (as described in point 10 below) require that a lecturer should first decide if the suspected transgression is a PAWP transgression or more serious as ACADEMIC MISCONDUCT. A PAWP transgression could mainly refer to poor citation practices associated with poor writing practices as described above. With academic misconduct, Category 1 and 2 transgressions are predominantly more serious plagiarism or other cases, while Category 3 and 4 will typically

be reserved for more serious cases of academic misconduct (like cheating, falsification, and fabrication), but also for severe cases of plagiarism. Category 3 also typically serves for repeat offenders of Category 1 or 2 transgressions. Category 3 and 4 cases will normally be referred to SJS for further investigation. More detail is given below in the discussion of each category.

9. FACULTY-BASED STRUCTURES

The *Standardised Academic Integrity* approach necessitates that each faculty should establish the following faculty-based structures: FAIC and FAIRC.

9.1 Faculty Academic Integrity Committee (FAIC)

Responsible	Accountable	System	Consulted	Informed
Executive Dean	DVC TL	NA	DD TL	DVC TL

All faculties should establish at least one Faculty Academic Integrity Committee (FAIC). Depending on the faculty context (size and shape), the extent of programmes, and the varying needs in faculties, more than one FAIC can be established. For example, school based FAICs could also be established.

FAIC(s) in each faculty should comply with the following:

- There should be a minimum of one FAIC per faculty with a minimum of three members per FAIC.
- There should be a Terms of Reference or revision of an existing committee's ToR adopted in the faculty for the FAIC(s).
- Members of the FAIC should be duly elected and appointed by the Faculty Board within the ToR and mandate.
- Membership should be representative of all sites of delivery (if applicable and possible) – with no less than one (1) member per campus where the faculty (or school) has a footprint (to ensure cross-campus collaboration and quality assurance).
- The chairperson should be a senior academic member (senior lecturer or higher).
- Membership is based on size of faculty (or school) staff component, student numbers, and programmes it serves to ensure efficiency of this committee.
- FAIC should be a sub-structure of the Faculty Board.
- The membership of this committee should be reflected in the Performance Agreement (e.g., 10% of KPA's as Community Engagement) of employees and the reporting line should be to the Faculty Board.

9.2 Faculty Academic Integrity Review Committee (FAIRC)

Responsible	Accountable	System	Consulted	Informed
Executive Dean	DVC TL	NA	DD TL	DVC TL

All faculties should establish a Faculty Academic Integrity Review Committee (FAIRC).

The following applies for FAIRC:

- Adoption of Terms of Reference or revision of an existing committee's ToR.

- This committee shall only constitute when reviews are required.
- This Committee should consist of a minimum of three senior academic staff members:
 - chaired by a member of the Faculty Management Committee, as designated by the Executive Dean,
 - a T&L Committee member should have representation on the FAIRC.
- FAIC members are not permitted to serve on the FAIRC or vice versa.
- FAIRC is a substructure of the Faculty Board, elected, or appointed by the Faculty Board and with clear terms of reference and mandate. The reporting line is to the Faculty Board.
- The membership of this committee should be reflected in the Performance Agreement of employees (e.g., 10% of KPA's as Community Engagement).

10. PROCEDURES

The *Standardised Academic Integrity* approach resulted in the involvement of various role players and utilisation of several faculty and institutional structures with the aim of the optimal implementation of the Policy. The following procedures were therefore developed to address the various categories of alleged instances of academic misconduct. These procedures include Poor Academic Writing Practices, Category 1, 2, 3 and 4 transgressions under the following headings:

- Preventative Measures
- Faculty Processes and Stakeholders
- Institutional disciplinary processes and role-players.

10.1 POOR ACADEMIC WRITING PRACTICES (PAWP)

10.1.1 Preventative Measures

Responsible	Accountable	System	Consulted	Informed
CTL (Institutional) Executive Dean (Faculty level)	DVC TL	NA	DD TL	DVC TL

Poor Academic Writing Practices are dealt with by following preventative measures on institutional and faculty level:

- Institutional Preventative Education regarding academic misconduct is provided through the academic literacy (ALDE) course to all students. This material, as well as continuous self-education material regarding writing practices, academic misconduct, and academic integrity, are available on eFundi as the Preventative Measurements Package (PMP) and is made accessible after the ALDE course.
- A link to the PMP on eFundi must be included in all study guides/MODs.
- Faculty-based educational programmes could be developed as needed and made available on eFundi to inform the specific faculty's students regarding their specific conventions regarding academic integrity, referencing, and referencing style. Provision should be made for formal and continuous self-education, which is faculty specific where needed and applicable, by the specific faculty.

10.1.2 Faculty level: Process and role players

The following should be implemented across, and with consideration of the entire student's life cycle, including all modules, programmes, and qualifications.

10.1.2.1 Identification, reporting, and remedial action of and with suspected transgressions

Responsible	Accountable	System	Consulted	Informed
Lecturer	School Director	AIITSA	FAIC	Student Lecturer

Lecture-based evaluation is taking place and the responsible lecturer (or marking assistant) should identify possible transgressions. The lecturer must consult with the FAIC if uncertainty exists regarding the transgression's classification (type) and or the severity thereof.

- A transgression can, for example, be reckoned as Category 1 to 4 by FAIC and not as PAWP necessarily, where the transgression should be dealt with according to the procedures provided for in the category.
- Where fabrication or falsification is suspected, the matter should not be dealt with under the provisions of the PAWP category, but the processes provided for in Category 3 and 4 must be adhered to.

In instances where Poor Academic Writing Practices (for the first four instances) are identified:

- a) The responsible lecturer should assess the extent of the suspected PAWP and decide if it can be reckoned as PAWP or a type of academic misconduct.
- b) The PAWP incident should be reported by the responsible lecturer on the Academic Integrity IT System Application (AIITSA) which will automatically
 - 1) issue a PAWP warning to the student, and
 - 2) instruct the student to complete the compulsory Academic Integrity Remedial Online Course for PAWP (AIROC-P) within seven (7) days from receiving notice.
 - 3) If the student has already received a PAWP warning and instruction within the last seven (7) days, he/she will not be expected to do another AIROC-P during this time.
- c) The responsible lecturer should correctively grade the assessment (e.g., as per rubric that allots 10-15% to Academic Integrity). Substantive and constructive feedback must be provided to the student regarding concerns and/or inconsistencies as needed. A recommendation should be made to the student to consult with the lecturer as needed.
- d) The completion of AIROC-P by the student on eFundi will be automatically captured on the AIITSA and kept on record.
- e) Failure to complete the AIROC-P for at least three times escalates this transgression to a Category 1 transgression due to *non-compliance*. AIITSA will notify the relevant student, lecturer, and FAIC about this transgression. The student will be automatically required by FAIC to do AIROC-1 as a remedial action for a Category 1 transgression (with the option to request a review of the decision).
- f) In instances where PAWP are reported for the fifth time, the matter will be automatically elevated to a Category 1 transgression due to *non-adherence*. AIITSA will notify the relevant student, lecturer, and FAIC about this transgression. The student will be

automatically required by FAIC to do FAIW (Face-to-face Academic Integrity Workshop) as a remedial action for a Category 1 transgression (with the option to request a review of the decision)..

Responsible	Accountable	System	Consulted	Informed
Student (AIROC complete)	Student	AIITSA	NA	Student Lecturer

10.1.2.2 Faculty Academic Integrity Committee (FAIC)

In instances where PAWP are identified no involvement of the FAIC is required (except when a student received a fifth PAWP referral). FAIC should only be consulted by the lecturer where uncertainty exists about the academic integrity evaluation of the assessment.

10.1.2.3 Faculty Academic Integrity Review Committee (FAIRC)

There is no faculty-based review process available for the PAWP process.

10.1.3 Institutional disciplinary level: Processes and Role-players

There should be no SJS involvement in this PAWP category. If a matter is deemed sufficiently serious to warrant referral to Student Judicial Services (SJS), the transgression category must be reconsidered. If the reconsideration confirms that the transgression can be categorised as PAWP, then again, no SJS referral should take place.

10.2 CATEGORY 1 AND 2

10.2.1 Preventative Measures

The same preventative measures (PMP) apply here as with the PAWP category.

10.2.2 Faculty level: Process and Role Players

The following should be implemented across, and with consideration of the entire student's life cycle, including all modules, programmes, and qualifications.

10.2.2.1 Identification and reporting of suspected transgressions

Responsible	Accountable	System	Consulted	Informed
Lecturer	FAIC	AIITSA	School director if needed	Student Lecturer

The responsible lecturer (or marking assistant) should:

- a) identify the possible transgression and report the matter to the FAIC on AIITSA within ten (10) days from submission of the suspected transgression,
- b) upload the assessment of the student in question (or provide a link to it),
- c) withheld the mark/grade until the remedial action is completed,
- d) wait for further instructions from FAIC.

The student will be informed of the referral of the matter by the lecturer to FAIC through AIITSA. The referral will be recorded by AIITSA. The student will receive further instructions from FAIC through AIITSA, as well as the option to ask for a review from FAIRC, depending on the decision of FAIC.

10.2.2.2 Faculty Academic Integrity Committee (FAIC)

Responsible	Accountable	System	Consulted	Informed
FAIC	Executive Dean	AIITSA	NA	NA

FAIC should evaluate the assessment submission to determine

- whether the suspicion/concern is valid,
- the extent of the transgression, and
- the potential category of transgression based on Annexure 3 of the AI Policy.

FAIC should consider previous transgression(s) on record and advise on appropriate or prescribed processes which should be followed. Upon confirmation of the suspicion or concern FAIC should:

- propose appropriate remedial action in consultation (as needed) with the relevant reporting lecturer, and/or the relevant subject group leader, and/or the director.
- Provide feedback to the referring lecturer within seven (7) days from date of referral.
- capture on AIITSA the outcome of the academic integrity evaluation, the prescribed remedial action and process and the outcome of the processes, upon adherence /non-adherence to the remedial process.

Where fabrication and falsification (and other more serious forms of academic misconduct) are reported it should not be dealt with by FAIC under Category 1 and/or 2 but referred to Category 3 and 4 processes as per Annexure 3 of the Policy.

Flowchart of the tasks and role of FAIC:

START: Chair of FAIC will receive referral from lecturer about possible academic misconduct by the student (email through AIITSA).

CHAIR must appoint an evaluator to evaluate the case. This must be done within 24 hours.

- Evaluator must be a member of FAIC. It can be the chair or the lecturer.
- Evaluator cannot be the lecturer who reported the incident (if the lecturer is part of FAIC).

EVALUATOR must first:

- Evaluate the validity of the alleged academic misconduct as reported by the lecturer (report of lecturer on AIITSA)
- Scrutinise the submitted assessment of the student (attached to lecturer's report or via the link provided)
- Keep previous transgression of the student in mind with evaluation of this case (AIITSA provide this record with report of the lecturer)

EVALUATOR must then DECIDE (with consultation with FAIC members if needed; and complete the online AIITSA report within 4 working days since his/her appointment as evaluator):

- 1) To CONFIRM the lecturer's finding, regarding
 - i. the type and category level of the transgression
 - ii. the category level but change the type of transgression.
 - iii. With these confirmations remedial actions will be implemented and the student (and lecturer) will be informed through AIITSA.
- 2) To DISMISS the lecturer's finding, and
 - i. the case is closed
 - ii. the student and lecturer will be informed through AIITSA.
- 3) To CHANGE the lecturer's finding of the transgression
 - i. to PAWP, or
 - ii. to a different category transgression (e.g., Category 3).
 - iii. Remedial actions to be implemented for PAWP or Category 1-2 transgression. Referral to SJS will follow with the change to a Category 3-4 offense. The student and lecturer will be informed through AIITSA.

CHAIR must confirm the finding of the evaluator on AIITSA.

10.2.2.3 Faculty-based remedial action with a first transgression

When a **first transgression** is reported by the lecturer, the following procedures should be followed by FAIC, the lecturer and the student:

- a) FAIC should confirm the transgression and issue a warning, and this must be recorded on AIITSA. This warning should contain the finding and a description of the transgression committed. It should also state that it constitutes a first transgression, and that remedial action is required. It must also inform the student of the option and procedure to request a review of FAIC's decision.
- b) FAIC should inform the student (through AIITSA) that a compulsory Academic Integrity Remedial Online Course on Level 1 (AIROC-1) should be completed (within 7 days from when notice is given) and proof of the completion of the course submitted to the FAIC (automatically through AIITSA).
 - i. If no previous AIROC-P was done by the student before, this needs to be completed as well.
 - ii. If the student is still busy with an AIROC-1 (he/she received notice within the last 7 days for another transgression), the student will be afforded the time to complete that AIROC-1 first. Only a warning will be issued to the student and the lecturer can cap the mark at 50% (as described at point e below).
- c) FAIC should add an official note to the Student Record Card (through AIITSA) regarding the transgression and the actions taken.
- d) Resubmission of student assignments should be afforded (within 7 days), but with the resubmission the student can only correct the transgression or inconsistencies (e.g., adding of references, rephrasing of lifted material) and not alter or improve substantive content.
- e) The mark allocated for the resubmitted work should not exceed 50% of the total assessment mark. In other words: The new mark must be capped at 50% of the assessment mark which implies that the highest attainable mark is 50%.

- f) The adjusted mark should only be released upon the completion of the remedial action required such as resubmission and proof of attendance of the AIROC-1.
- g) A mark of zero (0) is awarded if prescribed remedial action (resubmission and completion of AIROC-1) is not adhered to or where the necessary proof is not provided.

10.2.2.4 Faculty-based remedial action with a second transgression

On the reporting of a **second transgression**, the following procedures should be followed:

- a) FAIC should confirm the transgression and issue a warning, and this must be recorded on AIITSA. The warning should contain the finding and a description of the transgression committed. It should also state that it constitutes a second transgression, and that remedial action is required. It must also inform the student of the option and procedure to request a review of FAIC’s decision.
- b) FAIC should inform the student (through AIITSA) that a compulsory Face-to-face Academic Integrity Workshop (FAIW) should be completed at the Writing Centre (within 7 days from when warning is given), and proof of completion of FAIW should be submitted to FAIC (through AIITSA).
- c) FAIC should add an official note to the Student Record Card (through AIITSA) regarding the transgression and the actions taken.
- d) A mark of zero (0) to be awarded by the lecturer.

In instances where a third transgression is recorded no jurisdiction is allowed for FAIC to deal with this under Category 1 or 2 transgression and the matter must be escalated to a Category 3 process.

10.2.2.5. Faculty Academic Integrity Review Committee (FAIRC)

Responsible	Accountable	System	Consulted	Informed
FAIRC	Executive Dean	AIITSA	NA	NA

In instances where a first or second transgression review is required, a written request for such a review must be lodged (by the student) to the FAIRC within seven (7) days from the date when the warning was issued to the student. The motivation should be between 100 and 150 words in length and ignorance cannot be a motivation for review.

FAIRC should consider the written request for review within seven (7) days from the date on which the request was lodged. FAIRC should consider the following:

- the report by lecturer,
- the report by FAIC,
- adherence to procedural fairness,
- justification of remedial action imposed and
- the merit of the request.

FAIRC should decide if the case is upheld, dismissed, or to be referred to SJS as another category of transgression. The decision of FAIRC is final, and the outcome of the review

should be captured on AIITSA. There is no authority for reviews of third transgressions by FAIRC. With a third transgression the matter escalates to Category 3 transgression.

Flowchart of the tasks and role of FAIRC:

START: Chair of FAIRC will receive a review request from the student (email through AIITSA). CHAIR must appoint an evaluator to evaluate the case. This must be done within 3 working days.

- Evaluator must be a member of FAIRC. It can be the chair.
- Evaluator cannot be a FAIC member or the lecturer who reported the incident (if the lecturer is part of FAIRC).

EVALUATOR must first evaluate the motivation for the review request, and decide then to:

- 1) REJECT the motivation to review (e.g., ignorance given as motivation is not acceptable). The case is now referred back to FAIC and their findings stand. The student, lecturer and FAIC will be informed through AIITSA.
- 2) ACCEPT the motivation to review. The evaluator must now:
 - Evaluate the validity of the alleged academic misconduct as reported by FAIC (report of lecturer and FAIC on AIITSA)
 - Scrutinise the submitted assessment of the student (attached to lecturer's report or via the link provided)
 - Keep previous transgression of the student in mind with evaluation of this case (AIITSA provide this record with report of the lecturer)

EVALUATOR must then DECIDE (with consultation with FAIRC members if needed; and complete the online AIITSA report within 4 working days since his/her appointment as evaluator):

- 1) To CONFIRM the finding of FAIC, regarding
 - iv. the type and category level of the transgression
 - v. the category level but change the type of transgression.
 - vi. With these confirmations remedial actions will be implemented and the student, lecturer, and FAIC will be informed through AIITSA.
- 2) To DISMISS the finding of FAIC, and
 - i. the case is closed
 - ii. the student and lecturer will be informed through AIITSA.
- 3) To CHANGE the finding of FAIC of the transgression
 - i. to PAWP, or
 - ii. to a different category transgression (e.g., Category 3).
 - iii. Remedial actions to be implemented for PAWP or Category 1-2 transgression. Referral to SJS will follow with the change to a Category 3-4 offense. The student and lecturer will be informed through AIITSA.

CHAIR must confirm the finding of the evaluator on AIITSA.

10.2.3 Institutional disciplinary level: Processes and Role-players

10.2.3.1 Reporting to Student Judicial Services (SJS)

Where a third transgression is recorded the matter should be reported to SJS as per prescribed manner and documentation. The referral documentation should include a report

from the FAIC and if any, the FAIRC reports and evidentiary material (Turnitin report, sources, etc.). SJS should place blocks on applicable module marks until the outcome of the investigation is recorded.

10.2.3.2 Investigation by SJS

Following a reported incidence to SJS an impartial investigation should take place by SJS. It is the responsibility of SJS to determine the accountability of the matter and to provide feedback to FAIC and advise on the processes to be instituted.

10.2.3.3 Remedial action per relevant policy

Should SJS find the matter to be actionable, the disciplinary process as per policy on student Discipline and institutional Policy on Academic Integrity should be adhered to. The outcome of the investigation should be recorded on AIITSA by SJS.

Should SJS find that the matter is not actionable, the matter should be referred back to the FAIC with instructions on recommended actions or disposal by SJS. The outcome of these deliberations should be recorded on the AIITSA by SJS.

10.3 CATEGORY 3 AND 4

10.3.1 Preventative Measures

The same preventative measures (PMP) apply here as with the PAWP category.

10.3.2 Faculty level: Process and Role Players

The following should be implemented across, and with consideration of the entire student's life cycle, including all modules, programmes, and qualifications.

10.3.2.1 Identification and reporting of suspected transgressions

The responsible lecturer (or marking assistant) should:

- a) identify the possible transgression and report the matter to the FAIC on AIITSA within ten (10) days from submission of the suspected transgression,
- b) withheld the mark/grade until the remedial action is completed.

The student should be informed of the referral of the matter by the lecturer to the Committee through AIITSA. It will be recorded on AIITSA.

10.3.2.2 Faculty Academic Integrity Committee (FAIC)

In instances where Category 3 and 4 transgressions are reported, FAIC should:

- a) evaluate the transgression (e.g., assessment submission) to determine whether the suspicion or concern is valid, the extent of the transgression and the potential category of transgression based on Annexure 3 of the AI Policy.

- b) consider any previous Category 1 or 2 transgressions which are on record and sufficient proof of such transgressions should be available.
- c) consider other previous transgressions and the appropriate process to be followed, e.g., referral to SJS.
- d) issue a warning in relation to previously considered or reported matters where needed.
- e) refer the matter to SJS where fabrication, falsification, and summative examination cheating (or other serious academic misconduct instances) are recorded. In these cases, no previous transgression is required to refer it to SJS.
- f) provide feedback to the referring lecturer within seven (7) days from date of referral.

In instances where a Category 4 transgression is reported, specific considerations are applicable. FAIC should consider whether the matter is of such concern that it poses a severe risk to the University and will severely undermine the principles of academic integrity. In all cases where the concern is substantial, FAIC must advise and facilitate referral to SJS.

10.3.2.3 Faculty-based remedial action

There is no role for faculty-based remedial action where Category 3 and 4 transgressions are reported, and the matter should be reported to SJS by FAIC.

10.3.2.4 Faculty Academic Integrity Review Committee (FAIRC)

There is no role for faculty-based review authority where Category 3 and 4 transgressions are reported.

10.3.3 Institutional disciplinary level: Processes and Role-players

10.3.3.1 Reporting to Student Judicial Services (SJS)

Where a category 3 or 4 transgression is recorded the matter should be reported to SJS as per prescribed manner and documentation. The referral documentation should include a report from the FAIC and if any the FAIRC reports and evidentiary material (Turnitin report, sources, etc.). SJS should place blocks on applicable module marks until the outcome of the investigation is recorded.

10.3.3.2 Investigation by SJS

Following a reported incident to SJS, an impartial investigation should take place by SJS. It is the responsibility of SJS to determine the accountability of the matter and to provide feedback to FAIC and advise on the processes to be instituted.

The lecturer for the relevant module and/or the FAIC representative should be available to testify at a disciplinary hearing if so required.

Should SJS find the matter to be actionable, the disciplinary process as per policy on student Discipline and institutional Policy on Academic Integrity should be adhered to. The outcome of the investigation should be recorded on AIITSA and on the Student Academic Record by SJS.

Should SJS find that the matter is not actionable the matter should be referred to the FAIC with instructions on recommended actions or disposal. The outcome of these deliberations should be recorded on AIITSA by SJS.

11. REFERENCE DOCUMENTS

Sources used for definitions:

[Academic Dishonesty Definition and Types | Academic Integrity Tutorial | Northern Illinois University \(niu.edu\)](#)

[Definition of academic misconduct | Plagiarism and Academic Misconduct \(cam.ac.uk\)](#)

[Definitions of Academic Misconduct - Academic Integrity \(boisestate.edu\)](#)

[Types of Academic Misconduct | Students - Wilfrid Laurier University \(wlu.ca\)](#)

Other sources referred to:

[NWU Code of Ethics FINAL 1.1](#)

[Behavioural Manual Policy \(nwu.ac.za\)](#)

12. ADDENDA

NO	DOCUMENT NAME
Annexure A	CTL/UCDG 2021 Year-End Report
Annexure B	CoPAI, SOP, Final Draft, 31 May 2022 Proposed CoPAI SOP Final Draft July 2022 - Google Docs

13. RASCI NOTES

Some indication has been given in the text, e.g.:

Responsible	Accountable	System	Consulted	Informed
FAIC	Executive Dean	AIITSA	NA	NA

Other important RASCI notes (see full document at [RACI SOP CoPAI - Google Sheets](#)):

1. The registrar is responsible and accountable for the SOP as a part of the Academic Integrity Policy.
2. Responsibilities of students and lecturers are clearly elaborated on and explained under each category.
3. FAIC and FAIRC's role has also been clarified. The Executive Dean is accountable for these faculty committees.
4. The development of the PMP, AIROC-P and AIROC-1, is the responsibility of the Registrar (with consultation with the DVC TL). Maintenance of these will be the responsibility of CTL with the DVC TL as the accountable person.
5. The development of AIITSA is the responsibility of the Registrar. The operational support and management remain the responsibility of the Registrar which is also the accountable person.
6. The development of FAIW is the responsibility of the Registrar. The operational support and management will be the responsibility of the Writing Centre with the Director of the School of Language the accountable person.

7. The development of continuous professional development (CPD) (for training of staff for using the SOP), is the responsibility of the Registrar (with consultation with the DVC TL). Maintenance, presentation, and management of it will be the responsibility of CTL with the DVC TL as the accountable person.