

Fostering Academic Integrity Policy and Procedures

This policy applies to Acknowledge Education and the International College of Hotel Management (ICHM).

1.0 Rationale

This policy and procedure embody Acknowledge Education's (AE) and International College of Hotel Management's (ICHM) (together referred to as the Colleges) dedication to fostering and promoting academic integrity. It affirms the College's strong stance against any violations of academic integrity and outlines the fundamental principles guiding the College's approach to fostering students' ability to uphold standards of academic integrity.

2.0 Scope

This Policy and Procedure apply to all students enrolled in programs delivered by the Colleges including students under the age of 18. It also applies to all staff involved in the design, development, delivery, and assessment of academic work and assessments. This Policy and Procedure support the maintenance of academic integrity and ensures that academic work and assessment practices are conducted in accordance with institutional and regulatory requirements.

3.0 Regulator Context

The principal Standard concerned with academic integrity is in Part A, Section 5.2 of the Higher Education Standards Framework (HESF) on Academic and Research Integrity, which sets out four broad requirements for a provider: in summary:

- to have policies that promote and uphold academic and research integrity and policies and procedures which address allegations of misconduct
- to take action to mitigate foreseeable risks to academic and research integrity
- to provide students and staff with guidance and training on what constitutes academic or research misconduct and the development of good practices in maintaining academic and research integrity, and
- to ensure that academic and research integrity are maintained in arrangements with any other party involved in the provision of higher education.

Section 4.2 a provider to have a research policy framework that is designed to achieve resolution of allegations of misconduct in research, among other matters (HESF Standard 4.2.1).

Under Section 6.2-6.3 of the HESF the governing body of a provider is required to ensure that the occurrence and nature of misconduct and breaches of academic or research integrity are



monitored, and that action is taken to address underlying causes (Standard 6.2.1j). Academic Governance makes it clear that academic bodies of the provider are responsible for maintaining oversight of academic and research integrity, including the monitoring of potential risks (Standard 6.3.2d).

4.0 Policy

4.1.1. The Role of AE and ICHM

The Colleges reinforce a unified commitment to academic integrity as the cornerstone of scholarly excellence, ethical conduct, and quality assurance. This commitment is reflected in the creation and sharing of knowledge, the expectation of honest academic behaviour from all students and staff, and the active monitoring and prevention of integrity breaches.

The Colleges treat all forms of misconduct seriously and provide clear guidance, training, and supportive practices to ensure that the entire community understands its responsibilities and upholds the highest standards of academic honesty.

- The Colleges are committed to producing, transmitting, and utilising knowledge through various forms of scholarship, such as teaching, research, and other means. The Colleges view academic excellence and integrity as the foundation of scholastic achievement and quality assurance.
- The Colleges believe that maintaining academic integrity requires individuals to demonstrate scrupulous ethical behaviour and seeks to develop and maintain a culture fostered by all staff and students that values academic honesty.
- The Colleges will treat all occasions of academic misconduct seriously and respond to incidents per this policy and the associated procedures.
- The Colleges are committed to providing students and staff with guidance and training on what constitutes academic misconduct and how to foster good practices in maintaining academic integrity.

4.1.2 The Role of Students

All students hold the responsibility to:

- (a) Adhere to this policy and its procedures.
- (b) Conduct themselves honestly and with integrity in all academic affairs.
- (c) Avoid committing or colluding with others in committing plagiarism or violating academic integrity guidelines.
- (d) Promptly provide the College with all pertinent information concerning any allegation or finding of an academic integrity violation.
- (e) Comply with penalties imposed for academic misconduct findings.



4.1.3. Supporting Students to Achieve Academic Integrity

To foster academic integrity, the Colleges will ensure the following:

- (a) Policies and procedures are made available that clearly document what is expected from students and how allegations of breaches of academic integrity expectations will be handled.
- (b) All students are required to successfully complete the mandatory Academic Integrity Module in their first trimester
- (c) That students have access to education regarding all aspects of academic writing throughout their enrolment.
- (d) Procedures for detecting and reporting any suspected occasions of academic misconduct are clearly written and available for staff and students.
- (e) AE will record all occasions and outcomes of academic misconduct investigation on the student's profile.

4.1.4. Detecting Breaches of Academic Misconduct

Occasions of academic misconduct include (but are not limited to):

- (a) Plagiarism: Presenting another person's words, ideas, or work as one's own without proper acknowledgement.
- (b) Collusion: Unauthorised collaboration between students resulting in work that is not independently produced.
- (c) Contract Cheating: Submitting work that has been completed, in full or part, by someone else while misrepresenting it as one's own
- (d) Cheating: Gaining an unfair academic advantage through dishonest behaviour in assessments or exams.
- (e) Recycling: Re-submitting one's own previously assessed work without permission or disclosure.
- (f) Fabricating information or sources: Inventing data, sources, results, or information and presenting them as genuine.
- (g) Falsification: Manipulating or altering data, documents, or information so they no longer reflect the original truth.
- (h) Making available (in any way, including physically, sharing via online platforms or websites) any part of the whole of a completed or partially completed assessment.
- (i) Use of Gen AI in a way that compromises the integrity of the work as original to the author. That is, using artificial intelligence (e.g., Chat GPT, Grammarly AI, etc.) or paraphrasing/translating software (e.g., Quill Bot, Grammarly Rephrase, etc.) to generate exact content that is copied into assessment responses.

4.1.5. Fostering Student Collaboration

The Colleges recognise the importance of developing students' ability to work collaboratively and with teams. The following points outline permissible actions in completing assessments.

4.1.5.1 Permissible Collaboration

- (a) Preparing, discussing and writing jointly prepared work (such as group- assigned assessment tasks).
- (b) Discussing course content and class discussions with others to further understand the concepts and applications of the unit.
- (c) Participating in informal study groups that discuss the content of the unit but do not discuss assessment tasks (except any information provided about the assessment available on the learning management platform).
- (d) Working with others to improve academic writing techniques, provided the content shared does not relate to any assessment tasks.
- (e) Using time to consult with teaching staff about the content of unit/s and obtaining clarification or feedback for the completion of assessment tasks.

4.1.5.2 Permissible Assistance for Individual Work

Acceptable collaboration with students or outside stakeholders includes:

- (a) Engaging in assistance to understand unit's content and plan to complete assessments with AE or ICHM academic support staff.
- (b) Using an editor or proof-reader such as Editor function in Microsoft Word Program provided the application or the person does not change the meaning of the text undergoing proofing/copy-editing. Areas of editing may include advice on structure, spelling, grammar and use of voice and tone.
- (c) Where students use assistance to complete assessments, acknowledgement of the assistance must be detailed after the reference section or at the end of the submitted task. For example, use of AI to generate ideas must include the platform used, the search requests made and the answers generated by AI (copying answers from AI and/or using AI to paraphrase are not permitted).

4.1.5.3 Permissible Recycling

- (a) When a student uses their previous work in a current or prior course or unit, it will not be considered recycling if the teaching staff approves the submission before it is formally submitted, and the previous work is acknowledged.
- (b) Students repeating a unit of study must receive permission from the teaching staff member of the unit of study before submitting any part of the previous assessment.



5.0 Academic Integrity Breach Procedure to Identify, Review/ Apply Penalty

5.1 Detection of Breaches of Academic Integrity

5.1.1 Breaches of Academic Integrity

5.1.1.1 Responsibilities of Teaching Staff/ Markers

- (a) The **teaching staff/ marker** will grade and provide statements on the assessment /exams
- (b) The following sample statements may be used where an academic breach is suspected. These are sample statements only and do not represent an exhaustive list of statements that may be used.
 - **Unsatisfactory referencing:** Your submission shows an attempt to reference, but the citations and/or reference list are incomplete or incorrectly formatted. Please review the required referencing style and ensure all sources are acknowledged accurately in future assessments.
 - **Minor paraphrasing issues:** Some sections of your work are too close to the original source. You must express ideas in your own academic voice and include correct citations.
 - **Low-level plagiarism:** Your work contains low-level similarity to external sources, indicating incomplete paraphrasing or missing citations. This is treated as a minor breach. Please apply the feedback to strengthen your academic writing and source use.
 - **Unethical use of Gen AI:** Parts of your submission appear to rely on AI, paraphrasing, or translation tools in a way that compromises the originality of your work. You must ensure all content is generated by you and aligns with the assessment conditions.
 - **Moderate paraphrasing:** A moderate amount of text in your assessment matches external sources. This indicates weak paraphrasing and limited academic writing skills. Although there is no evidence of deliberate deception, the extent of similarity exceeds what is acceptable. You must develop stronger paraphrasing skills and ensure all ideas are expressed in your own words with correct citations.
 - **Collusion:** Your work shows a high level of similarity to another student's submission. This indicates collusion. All assessments must be completed independently unless group work is explicitly permitted. You must ensure your future work is original and not shared with or derived from another student.
 - **Self-plagiarism breaches:** Your submission contains substantial similarity to work you previously submitted in another unit or an earlier attempt. Reusing



your own work without permission is considered self-plagiarism. You must produce original work for every assessment unless explicitly allowed by the assessment instructions.

- **High-level plagiarism:** Your assessment shows a high level of similarity to external sources (websites, articles, books, or other materials). This level of copying exceeds acceptable academic practice.
- **Unauthorised sharing of work:** Evidence indicates that your completed or partially completed assessment has been made available to others. Sharing assessment materials in any form is a serious breach and contributes to academic misconduct.
- **Contract cheating:** The work appears non-original assessment submission. This behaviour undermines assessment integrity and will be formally reported for further action.
- **Cheating:** Evidence indicates that you engaged in cheating during an assessment task (e.g., copying answers, accessing unauthorised materials, or receiving assistance).
- **Fabrication:** Your submission contains fabricated data, information, results, or documentation. Presenting invented material is a deliberate act of deception.
- **Falsification:** Your work includes falsified or altered information, records, or documentation. Manipulating data or forging evidence is a serious academic integrity violation
 - (a) Provide the list of alleged offenders to the course coordinator
 - (b) Course Coordinators will further investigate to determine the level of breach

5.1.1.2 Responsibilities of Course Coordinators

- (a) Check student information from the past to identify their offence history.
- (b) Apply penalty and statement as per the Tier provided on the tables below.
- (c) Send information of the student's academic integrity breach and the penalty to the Academic Integrity Officers / Team Lead to update the registers

5.1.1.3 Responsibilities of Academic Integrity Officers / Team Lead

- (a) Notify the students
- (b) Update the Academic Integrity registry and RTOM.

5.2. Identifying Levels of Breaches of Academic Integrity - (For Course Coordinators and Academic Integrity Officers)

5.2.1 Minor Breach (Tier 1)

Forms of activities that constitute Tier 1 breaches of academic integrity include:

- (a) Unsatisfactory Referencing: When a student has attempted to reference but has not included sufficient in-text citations and/or referenced sources, or has used an incorrect referencing format, or where citations and references used do not correspond.
- (b) Minor Paraphrasing Issues: When TURNITIN has highlighted a small amount of text in localised section(s) of the assessment where paraphrasing can be more difficult (e.g., when paraphrasing the statistical findings of a journal article).
- (c) Low level of Plagiarism (less than 30%): When a student's work shows low level of similarity to a website, journal article, book, or other external sources, as identified by TURNITIN or other means.
- (d) Unethical use of Gen AI : Part of your submission appear to rely on AI, paraphrasing, or translation tools in a way that compromises the originality of your work. You must ensure all content is generated by you and aligns with the assessment conditions.
- (e) This would be first offence for the student.

The tables below help determine whether a case meets the threshold for a **Tier 1 breach**. They focus on intent, scale, and impact on academic standards.

5.2.1.1 Review, investigate and apply penalty for Tier 1

These are only samples of penalties and not limited to penalties that can be included.

Unsatisfactory Referencing

Criteria	Indicators (Yes/No)	Decision Guidance
Evidence of attempt to reference	Student has included some citations or a reference list, even if incomplete or incorrect	Consider Tier 1.
Errors are technical, not deceptive	Mistakes relate to formatting, missing details, mismatched citations, or inconsistent style	If errors appear unintentional and minor, classify as Tier 1.

Minor Paraphrasing Issues

Criteria	Indicators (Yes/No)	Decision Guidance
Small, localised sections flagged	Turnitin highlights short passages rather than large blocks	If localised, Tier 1



Low Level of Plagiarism

Criteria	Indicators (Yes/No)	Decision Guidance
Similarity is below 30%	Turnitin or other tools show low-level matching	If similarity is at 30% or less and not deliberate, Tier 1.
Similarity suggests poor academic skills, not misconduct	Patchwriting, incomplete paraphrasing, missing citations	If intent appears educational, not deceptive, Tier 1.
Matching is from common sources	Websites, textbooks, journal articles	If matching is from contract cheating sites or purchased work, escalate immediately.

Unethical Use of Gen AI

Criteria	Indicators (Yes/No)	Decision Guidance
Work does not reflect student's own academic skill level	Hallucinated references, hallucinated quotations, American idiom, lack of reference to subject materials.	Consider Tier 2.

5.2.1.2 Response to Minor Breach (Tier 1) – Course Coordinator along with Unit coordinators as relevant

- (a) Course Coordinator to further investigate and determine the appropriate misconduct tier, provide feedback, and apply a penalty.
- (b) The course coordinator is to notify the Academic Integrity team to update the Academic Integrity Register, and RTO register needs to be updated.



Breach Level	Types of Breaches	Penalty Examples recommended
Tier 1 – Minor Breaches	Unsatisfactory Referencing, Minor Paraphrasing Issues, Low Level of Plagiarism, Misuse of digital technology	The following is a summary of the penalties that may be applied: 10%- 20% mark reduction off the assessment weightage. With the marking rubric clearly indicating the reasons for mark deduction. or - Zero marks in relation to a specific component of a piece of assessment that is the subject of academic misconduct. Then - Recommend that the student be directed to academic skills support, referencing workshops, or online integrity modules. and/or - A clear warning statement is provided to students regarding Academic Misconduct. <i>“Your submission has been identified as containing a Tier 1 academic integrity breach. A minor penalty has been applied. You are expected to review the Academic Integrity Policy and ensure future work follows proper academic practice, as repeated breaches may lead to more serious consequences.”</i>

5.2.1.3 Responsibility to Minor Breach (Tier 1) – AIO

- Notify the students
- Update the Academic Integrity registry and RTOM.

5.2.2 Moderate Breach (Tier 2)

Forms of activities that constitute Tier 2 moderate breaches of academic integrity include:

- Referencing Issues: The student has not attempted to provide any references or has provided scant references, has fabricated references, or deliberately included references to irrelevant material.
- Weak Paraphrasing: When TURNITIN has highlighted a moderate amount of text throughout the assessment, but the assessor judges that this is due to low academic skill, inexperience, or lack of understanding rather than an evident intention to cheat or deceive, this will be considered a moderate breach (Tier 2).
- Collusion: Where a student's work shows a high similarity to another student's work, as identified by TURNITIN or other means.



- (d) Self-Plagiarism/Recycling: When Turnitin indicates similarity to an assessment that the student completed in the past, this will be considered a major breach. When a student who has erroneously uploaded an assessment to the wrong unit and subsequently submitted their assessment to the correct unit, which returns a high Turnitin score, it will be a tier 2 breach of academic integrity.
- (e) High level of Plagiarism: When a student's work shows a high level of similarity to a website, journal article, book, or other external sources, as identified by Turnitin or other means. Making available (in any way, including physically, sharing via online platforms or websites) any part or the whole of a completed or partially completed assessment.
- (f) Repeat offenders of tier 1: Students who have been identified for Academic misconduct during prior occasions at tier 1 (maximum up to three times)
- (g) Unethical use of Gen AI Parts of your submission appear to rely on AI, paraphrasing, or translation tools in a way that compromises the originality of your work. You must ensure you generate all content and aligns with the assessment conditions.

Tier 2 breaches indicate more serious academic integrity concerns than Tier 1. They typically involve greater scale, clearer impact on academic standards, or behaviours that suggest negligence, disregard, or emerging intent, but not full-scale deliberate cheating.

The tables below help determine whether a case meets the threshold for a **Tier 2 breach**. They focus on intent, scale, and impact on academic standards.

5.2.2.1 Review, investigate and apply a penalty for Tier 2

Referencing Issues (No Attempt / Fabricated / Irrelevant)

Criteria	Indicators (Yes/No)	Decision Guidance
No attempt to references	Student provides no in-text citations or reference list; sources are entirely absent.	If no attempt is visible, classify as Tier 2.
Fabricated references	Citations or sources do not exist, cannot be verified, or appear invented.	Fabrication is automatically Tier 2
References are irrelevant or deliberately misleading	Sources do not relate to the topic, are misused, or are inserted to appear compliant.	If deliberate misdirection is evident, Tier 2

Weak Paraphrasing (Moderate Amount Across the Assessment)

Criteria	Indicators (Yes/No)	Decision Guidance
Moderate amount of text flagged	Highlights multiple sections across the assessment for paraphrasing	If widespread but due to low skill, Tier 2.



Issue reflects academic skill gaps in certain parts, not the intent.	Patchwriting, poor paraphrasing, copying and pasting content.	When behaviours indicate learning needs rather than deception Tier 2.
--	---	---

Collusion

Criteria	Indicators (Yes/No)	Decision Guidance
High similarity to another student's work	Similarity indicator or manual comparison shows shared structure, wording, or ideas	If similarity is substantial, classify as Tier 2.
Evidence suggests shared work	Students may have worked too closely or shared drafts. Students exchanged files	If similarity is high, classify as tier 2. If outsourcing or purchased work is suspected, escalate to Tier 3.

Unethical Use of Gen AI (Multiple Sections)

Criteria	Indicators (Yes/No)	Decision Guidance
Work does not reflect the student's own academic skill level	Submission shows sudden, unexplained shifts in writing style, vocabulary, structure, or academic reasoning in multiple sections of the assessment	Consider Tier 2.

Repeat Offenders

Criteria	Indicators (Yes/No)	Decision Guidance
Students have a prior academic misconduct record	Previous Tier 1	Repeat behaviour elevates severity to Tier 2. (Maximum up to three times)

5.2.2.2 Responding to Moderate Breach (Tier 2) – Course Coordinator

- The Course Coordinator further investigates. The investigation may include interviewing the student, reviewing the assessment/s and feedback provided, and reviewing any previous breaches of academic integrity.
- The Course Coordinator determines which Tier level the breach equates with (Course Coordinator to complete process within 5 business days)
- When the breach is classified as a Tier 3 breach, notify the Academic Integrity Officer, as the Academic Integrity Officer will review the breach.
- When the breach equates to a Tier 1 breach, the course coordinator will assess the intent and severity of the breach and will process the breach.



- (e) When the breach equates to a Tier 2 breach, the course coordinator will assess the intent and severity of the breach and apply one of the following outcomes:
- Relevant mark deduction. This means any amount of work that has been copied and pasted must be deducted from the given grade.
 - Zero grade for serious repeat AM offenders who have committed multiple instances of academic misconduct (maximum up to two times in Tier 2) and have been supported academically and warned previously, as recorded in RTOM.
 - Repeat offenders of more than three Tier 2 AM cases will be escalated to Tier 3
- (f) The Course coordinator will inform the AIO of the outcome and request the case to be recorded in the Academic Misconduct register and the RTO register.

Breach Level	Types of Breaches	Penalty Examples recommended
Tier 2 – Moderate Breaches Much of the assessment is affected (e.g., moderate paraphrasing issues across multiple sections, fabricated or irrelevant references, or clear evidence of collusion).	Referencing Issues (No Attempt / Fabricated / Irrelevant) Weak Paraphrasing (Moderate Amount Across the Assessment) Collusion Self-Plagiarism / Recycling Tier 1 Repeat Offenders	The following is a summary of the penalties that may be applied: • Suggest whether a resubmission with a capped grade. or • Zero marks in relation to a group of components of a piece of assessment that is the subject of academic misconduct. or • 20%- 30% mark reduction off the assessment weightage. With the marking rubric clearly indicating the reasons for mark deduction. or • 0% for the assessment and Then • That the student be directed to academic skills support, referencing workshops, or online integrity modules. and/or • A clear warning statement is provided to students regarding Academic Misconduct. <i>Your submission has been identified as containing a Tier 2 academic integrity breach. A penalty has been applied, and you are required to meet the Academic Support Officer and take steps to improve your academic practice, as further breaches may result in more serious consequences.</i>

5.2.2.3 Responsibility to Moderate Breach (Tier 2) – AIO

- (a) Notify the students



(b) Update the Academic Integrity registry and RTOM.

5.2.3 Major Breach (Tier 3)

Forms of activities that constitute Tier 3 levels of Academic Misconduct include but not limited to:

- (a) Contract Cheating: The process of outsourcing academic assignments or exams to third parties, partly or wholly, whether paid or unpaid, to gain an academic advantage. For example, if an assessment is completed to a standard that is beyond the student's abilities, language level or performance, etc.
- (b) Cheating: When students are discovered copying answers, ideas, or solutions from another person's work during exams, assignments, or projects.
- (c) Fabrication: Where a student deliberately and unethical act of altering or fabricates documents or research data, results, records, or any other academic information with the intent to deceive others.
- (d) Falsification: Manipulating, changing, or omitting data or results so that the research or academic work does not accurately reflect the original observations or sources, or forging existing information or documentation (i.e forged Medical Certificate).
- (e) Repeat offender of Tier 2: Students who have a Tier 3 Academic misconduct case of Tier 2 (maximum up to three times).
- (f) Unethical use of Gen AI: The whole assessment submission appears to rely on AI, paraphrasing, or translation tools in a way that compromises the originality of your work. You must ensure all content is generated by you and aligns with the assessment conditions.

5.2.3.1 Review, investigate and apply a penalty for Tier 3

Contract Cheating

Criteria	Indicators (Yes/No)	Decision Guidance
Work exceeds the student's known ability or language level	Sudden, unexplained improvement; advanced terminology; inconsistent writing style	Strong indicator of outsourcing Tier 3.
Evidence of third-party involvement	Purchased work, tutoring services, completing tasks, ghost-writing	Automatically Tier 3.
Student denies authorship but cannot explain the content	Lack of understanding of the submitted work	Strong evidence of contract cheating.

Cheating (During Exams, Tests, or Assessments)

Criteria	Indicators (Yes/No)	Decision Guidance
The student copied answers or	Observed by an invigilator, CCTV, or	Automatically Tier 3.



solutions	digital monitoring	
The student accessed unauthorised materials	Notes, devices, websites, messaging apps	Tier 3 due to deliberate intent.
The student collaborated during an exam	Whispering, sharing answers, using shared documents	Clear cheating Tier 3.

Fabrication

Criteria	Indicators (Yes/No)	Decision Guidance
Student invented data, results, or information	Data sets, interview transcripts, survey results, and lab findings	Fabrication is automatically Tier 3.
Student altered documents	Changing dates, signatures, or official records	Intentional deception Tier 3.
Fabrication materially affects academic judgment	Assessment cannot be trusted	Tier 3 without exception.

Falsification

Criteria	Indicators (Yes/No)	Decision Guidance
The student forged documentation	Fake medical certificates, altered letters, falsified evidence	Forgery is a severe breach, Tier 3.
Falsification misrepresents academic performance	Misleading staff or processes	Tier 3 due to intent to deceive.

Repeat Offenders

Criteria	Indicators (Yes/No)	Decision Guidance
The student has prior academic misconduct record	Previous Tier 2 (3 cases of repeat AM Cases.	Repeat behaviour elevates severity to Tier 3.

Unethical Use of Gen AI (Full Assessment)

Criteria	Indicators (Yes/No)	Decision Guidance
Work does not reflect the student's own academic skill level	Submission shows sudden, unexplained shifts in writing style, vocabulary, structure, or academic reasoning in the whole assessment	Consider Tier 3.

5.2.3.2 Responsibility of Course Coordinator – Tier 3 Breach

(a) The course coordinator completes the Academic Misconduct Report Form and



escalates the case to the AIO.

When a case of academic misconduct is identified as tier 3, the following response will be undertaken by the following.

Breach Level	Types of Breaches	Penalty Examples recommended
Tier 3 – Major Breaches	Contract Cheating Cheating Fabrication Falsification Repeat Offender	Suggest whether 0% for the assessment or 0% for the unit should be implemented, with the marking rubric clearly indicating the reasons for the mark deduction.

5.2.3.3 Responsibility of AIO – Tier 3 Breach

- (a) The Academic Integrity Officer will investigate and define the alleged academic misconduct. This could include contract cheating, data fabrication, falsification, collusion, cheating or any other form of academic dishonesty
- (b) Where the AIO determines the referral to be a Tier 2 or Tier 1 breach, the AIO will refer the case to the Course Coordinator.
- (c) Where the AIO determines that a Tier 3 case of academic misconduct has occurred, the AIO will:
 - Inform the student: The student should be informed of the alleged academic misconduct and provided with the opportunity to respond to the allegations. This should be done in writing and in a timely manner. The student should be informed of the possible consequences of academic misconduct and the process that will be followed.
 - Gather evidence: The evidence should be gathered to support the allegation. This could include the student's work, witness statements, and other relevant documentation. It is important to ensure that the evidence is reliable, relevant, and admissible.
 - Assess the evidence: The evidence should be assessed to determine whether it supports the allegation of academic misconduct. The assessment should be done objectively and based on the available evidence.
 - Determine the severity of academic misconduct: The severity of the academic misconduct should be determined based on the available evidence. Severity will determine the consequences that will be imposed.



5.2.3.4 Responsibility of Director of Teaching Learning/Delegate- Tier 3 Breach

- (a) Director of Teaching and Learning/ delegate who will make the final decision.
- (b) Inform the student of the outcome with the warning statement and severity
- (c) The penalties imposed will be either:
 - i. Permission to resubmit with a deduction of 60% from the given grade if the student admits the offence, promises not to repeat, and this is their first time and in their first trimester.
 - ii. No resubmission but being penalised with relevant mark deductions. Mark deductions should be higher than the previous penalty to serve as a strong warning to students to discourage future academic misconduct.
 - iii. A grade of zero is awarded to repeat offenders of Tier 3 for two times or more.
 - iv. Zero marks awarded for the unit, and the case escalated to the Dean for consideration of expulsion and CoE Cancellation with extreme repeat AM offenders.
- (d) The student, teaching staff and course coordinator who made the referral will be informed in writing of the decision and the reasons for the decision. The student will be informed using the email function through the RTO Manager.
- (e) The AIO records the Academic Misconduct on the Academic Integrity Registry and RTO Manager as an intervention.

6.0 Appealing Decisions Regarding Academic Misconduct

Students may appeal an academic decision, such as a grade or a disciplinary action, by following the procedures outlined in the complaints and appeals policy within 5 working days of the decision. The appeal will not be processed if the appeal is made after the allowed time.

7.0 Roles and Responsibilities

Academic Board

- Responsible for review and approval of the Academic Integrity policy and procedures.
- Monitor higher education academic misconduct reports and outcomes along with the support of the Teaching and Learning Committee.
- Ensure governance and oversight of academic integrity matters.



Teaching Staff / Assessors

- Mark assessment
- If suspected breach, copy and paste statements from the procedure listed under the Teacher's Responsibility section.
- Provide the list of alleged offenders to the Course Coordinator.
- DO NOT investigate.

Course Coordinator with the support of the Unit Coordinator

- Investigate suspected Tier 1 and Tier 2 breaches of academic integrity and report Tier 3 cases to AIO.
- Interview students and review evidence where required.
- Determine the appropriate breach level and outcome.
- Apply penalties where applicable.
- Notify the Academic Integrity Officer of outcomes and request that the case be recorded in the RTO Manager.

Academic Integrity Officer (AIO)

- Investigate suspected Tier 3 academic misconduct cases.
- Gather and assess evidence related to allegations.
- Inform students of allegations and allow them to respond.
- Determine severity and recommend penalties.
- Record outcomes in the Academic Integrity Register and RTO Manager.

Students

- Conduct themselves honestly and with integrity in all academic work.
- Avoid plagiarism, cheating, collusion, or other breaches of academic integrity.
- Provide relevant information during investigations of academic misconduct.
- Comply with any penalties imposed for misconduct.
- Follow all requirements outlined in the policy and procedures.

8.0 Related Documents

Document Name:

1.1.1 Admissions and Enrolment Policy and Procedure

1.3.1 Student Orientation Policy

1.4.1 Student Assessment and Grade Management Policy and Procedure

2.3.4 Student Health and Wellbeing Strategy

3.2.3 Teaching Staff Engagement and Assessment Procedure

7.2.1 Sales Material Integrity and Compliance Policy



9.0 Document Information

Document Name	Fostering Academic Integrity: Higher Education Policy & Procedure
Document Number	5.2.1
Audience	☒ Staff ☒ Students ☒ Public
Category	Institutional Quality Assurance
Subcategory	Academic and Research Integrity
Approved by	Academic Board
Approved Date	20 April 2022
Last date of approval:	17 March 2026
Next Review Date	26 August 2027 (review in progress) (2 years from last date of approval)
Responsible Officer	Provost
Document Advisor	Director of Teaching and Learning
Contact	Quality Assurance



10.0 Change Log

Document change and review log Date	Version	By	Notes
On 12/03/2026 the following policy and procedure documents were consolidated into this combined policy and procedure: 5.2.1 Fostering Academic Integrity Policy 5.2.2 Fostering Academic Integrity Higher Education Procedure ICHM Academic & Research Integrity For full change log details please refer to the archived documents.			
17/03/2026	1.0	DTL	Updates to tier 2 & 3 definitions. Updates to identify and respond to breaches. Procedure was amended to provide clarity to markers and academic staff, including academic integrity officers. Levels, tiers and repeat offenders.
18/05/2026	2	Provost/DTL	Updates to tier 1, 2 & 3 definitions. Updates to identify and respond to breaches with responsibilities Procedure was amended to provide clarity to markers and academic staff, including academic integrity officers. Levels, tiers and repeat offenders. Process flow diagram for clarity.

Appendix 1- Definitions

Term	Definition
Academic Misconduct	Refers to a breach of academic integrity. Cheating, plagiarism, and fabrication or falsification of data are examples of such breaches. (TEQSA Guidance Note: Academic Integrity, 2023).
Academic Excellence	The high standard of scholarly achievement in teaching, research, and learning.
Academic Integrity	Academic Integrity is the honest presentation of academic work through acknowledgment of the work of others while developing new insights, knowledge, and ideas. It includes values such as honesty, maintaining academic standards, and avoiding cheating and plagiarism.
Plagiarism	Plagiarism is the action or practice of taking and submitting or presenting another person's thoughts, writings or other work as though it is your own work.
Fabricating Information or Sources	Deliberate and unethical act of altering or fabricating documents or research data, results, records, or any other academic information with the intent to deceive others.
Recycling	The act of reusing one's own previously submitted work in another context or course without appropriate citation or permission.
Falsification	Manipulating, changing, or omitting data or results so that the research or academic work does not accurately reflect the original observations or sources, or forging existing information or documentation.
Cheating	The attempt to deliberately circumvent examination or assessment rules or regulations. Cheating means to act dishonestly or unfairly to gain an advantage or to assist another student in gaining an advantage.
Contract Cheating	The process of outsourcing academic assignments or exams to third parties, partly or wholly, whether paid or unpaid, in order to gain an academic advantage.
Collusion	A form of academic misconduct where two or more students work together to submit work meant to be completed individually, or where a student allows another to copy their work or submit work substantially similar to their own. Collusion may also occur when a student receives unauthorised assistance from another person, such as a tutor or a family member, in completing their academic work.
Making Available (specifically in the context provided)	Distributing or sharing academic materials, whether complete or incomplete, through various means, including online platforms.



Term	Definition
Unethical Use of Gen AI (in the given context)	Utilising electronic tools, platforms, or software to produce or enhance academic work in a way that can undermine its originality.
Permissible Collaboration	Approved methods and ways students can work together on academic assignments, under the given guidelines and constraints.
Assessor /Teaching staff	Is the academic staff member responsible for an assessment and the recording, usually in measurable terms such as a grade, of the academic work of a student or students.
Permissible Assistance	Approved methods of obtaining help or support for academic assignments without violating academic integrity.
Permissible Recycling	The conditions under which students can reuse their previous work with appropriate permissions and acknowledgment.
Turnitin	Turnitin is an online text matching software designed to promote academic integrity and prevent plagiarism. It compares submitted student work against a database of academic sources, internet sources, and previously submitted student work to identify instances of potential plagiarism or academic misconduct.

Appendix 2- Process Flow Diagram

ACADEMIC INTEGRITY BREACH PROCESS FLOW

