



Fostering Academic Integrity Policy and Procedures

1.0 Rationale

This policy & procedure embodies 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 applies to all students enrolled in programs delivered by Acknowledge Education (Stott's College) and International College of Hotel Management (ICHM), 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 supports 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 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 The Role of AE and ICHM

- 4.1.1 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.
- 4.1.2 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.
- 4.1.3 The Colleges oppose and will not tolerate violations of academic integrity and actively work to monitor, detect, prevent, and record all threats to academic integrity.
- 4.1.4 The Colleges will treat all occasions of academic misconduct seriously and respond to incidents per this policy and the associated procedures.
- 4.1.5 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.

4.2 The Role of Students

All students hold the responsibility to:

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

4.3 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.

4.4 Detecting Breaches of Academic Misconduct

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

- (a) Plagiarism
- (b) Collusion
- (c) Contract Cheating
- (d) Cheating
- (e) Recycling
- (f) Fabricating information or sources
- (g) Falsification
- (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) Using digital technology 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.

4.5 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.

4.5.1 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.

4.5.2 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).

4.5.3 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.

4.6 Identifying and Responding to Academic Integrity Breaches

- 4.6.1 The responsibility for identifying suspected breaches of academic integrity sits with all teaching staff assessing or grading submitted work.
- 4.6.2 Teaching staff will apply principles of fairness and transparency when identifying breaches of academic integrity.
- 4.6.3 All students whose work is suspected of breaches of academic integrity will be informed, and their work will not be graded.
- 4.6.4 Teaching staff are required to investigate suspected cases of breaches of academic integrity to determine if the breach meets or exceeds the Tier 1 and Tier 2 threshold as detailed in the relevant Academic Integrity Procedure.
- 4.6.5 When Tier 3 breaches, as detailed in the relevant Academic Integrity Procedure, are determined by the Academic Integrity Officer, the case will be referred to the relevant academic team member for review and possible penalisation.

5.0 Procedure

5.1 Detection of Breaches of Academic Integrity

5.1.1 Breaches of Academic Integrity

5.1.1.1 The teaching staff/exam invigilators will carry out the initial detection of breaches of academic integrity. (Assessment marking to be completed within 10 business days. AIO to be notified as the Academic Integrity Registry and RTO need to be updated)

5.1.1.2 When TURNITIN similarity scores are returned, teaching staff will review the student's work to determine if there is a reasonable explanation for the abnormal TURNITIN score. The following points indicate where a high TURNITIN score may indicate a false positive:

- When a student has used any technical or scientific terminology required for the assessment.
- When a student has used assessment task text that is required as part of the assessment, such as case studies or lengthy questions.
- When an assessment requires the inclusion of a wordy coversheet.
- When a student has included as part of their assessment reference lists that align to the work of other students' submissions.

TURNITIN score does not necessarily indicate a violation of academic integrity but rather a false positive due to the nature of the assessment or the inclusion of required materials.

Teachers should review the assessment and consider these factors before making any conclusions about academic integrity violations.

5.1.1.3 When a student submits an unexpectedly high-quality work that is unlikely to be their own teaching staff will:

- Review the student's academic history to determine whether there is a pattern of submitting high-quality work or whether this is an isolated incident.
- Speak with the student and check their understanding of the assessment task and the process undertaken to complete it.
- Consult with Course Coordinators/Senior Lecturers to obtain a second opinion and seek advice on how to proceed.

5.1.1.4 When a student's work returns a red flag icon in TURNITIN, teaching staff will:

- Investigate the red flag to determine if students have used white text or other methods to falsify the TURNITIN reading or work count limits.
- When deliberate use of techniques that aim to provide a false TURNITIN reading are detected, the teaching staff will escalate as a Tier 2 breach.

It is important that teaching staff handle the investigation with sensitivity and

professionalism and ensure that the student is treated fairly throughout the process.

If there is severe evidence of a violation of academic integrity teaching staff check the student’s understanding of the submission content, then escalate the case to tier 2 or tier 3 breach of academic integrity. Students who have been identified for academic misconduct during prior occasions could also fall into tier 2 (repeat offenders of tier 1) or tier 3, breach of academic integrity.

5.2 Identifying Levels of Breaches of Academic Integrity

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 50%):** 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) **Using digital technologies in a way that compromises the integrity of the work as original to the author**
- (e) **This would be first time offenders.**

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.

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 50% | Turnitin or other tools show low-level matching | If similarity is at 50% 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. |

Misuse of Digital Technology

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

5.2.2 Moderate Breach (Tier 2)

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

- (a) 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.
- (b) 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 overt intention to cheat or deceive, this will be considered a major breach (Tier 2).
- (c) 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, will be a tier 2 breach of academic integrity.
- (e) High level of Plagiarism: When a student's work shows high level of similarity to a

website, journal article, book, or other external sources, as identified by TURNITIN or other means.

- (f) 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.
- (g) Repeat offenders of tier 1: Students who have been identified for Academic misconduct during prior occasions at tier 1 (maximum up to three times)

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

Referencing Issues (No Attempt / Fabricated / Irrelevant)

| Criteria | Indicators (Yes/No) | Decision Guidance |
|--|--|---|
| No genuine attempt to reference | No citations, no reference list, or only token references | If no attempt is visible, classify as Tier 2. |
| References are fabricated | Non-existent sources, Fake quotations, Fake references, incorrect URLs, invented authors | Fabrication is automatically Tier 2 |
| References are irrelevant or deliberately misleading | Sources do not match content, appear inserted to “look academic” | 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 | Turnitin highlights multiple sections across the assessment | 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. | If intent is educational rather than deceptive, Tier 2. |

Collusion

| Criteria | Indicators (Yes/No) | Decision Guidance |
|---|---|--|
| High similarity to another student’s work | Turnitin 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. |
|--|--|--|

Self-Plagiarism / Recycling

| Criteria | Indicators (Yes/No) | Decision Guidance |
|---|---|----------------------|
| Similarity to student's own previous work | Turnitin matches prior submissions | Automatically Tier 2 |
| Reuse compromises assessment integrity | Recycled content replaces required new work | Consider Tier 2. |

Repeat Offenders

| Criteria | Indicators (Yes/No) | Decision Guidance |
|--|---------------------|---|
| Student has prior academic misconduct record | Previous Tier 1 | Repeat behaviour elevates severity to Tier 2. (Maximum up to three times) |

5.2.3 Major Breach (Tier 3)

Forms of activities that constitute Tier 3 levels of Academic Misconduct include:

- (a) **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. For example, if an assessment is completed to a standard that is beyond the student's abilities, language level or performances, 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 the 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.
- (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 tier 3 Academic misconduct case of Tier 2 (maximum up to three times).

Contract Cheating

| Criteria | Indicators (Yes/No) | Decision Guidance |
|--|---|---|
| Work exceeds 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 content | Lack of understanding of submitted work | Strong evidence of contract cheating. |

Cheating (During Exams, Tests, or Assessments)

| Criteria | Indicators (Yes/No) | Decision Guidance |
|---|--|----------------------------------|
| Student copied answers or solutions | Observed by invigilator, CCTV, or digital monitoring | Automatically Tier 3. |
| Student accessed unauthorised materials | Notes, devices, websites, messaging apps | Tier 3 due to deliberate intent. |
| 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, lab findings | Fabrication is automatically Tier 3. |
| Student altered documents | Changing dates, signatures, or official records | Intentional deception Tier 3. |
| Fabrication materially affects academic judgement | Assessment cannot be trusted | Tier 3 without exception. |

Falsification

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

5.3 Responding to Breaches of Academic Integrity

5.3.1 Minor Breach (Tier 1)

When a minor breach is identified the following response will be undertaken:

- (a) Teaching staff grade the assessment and marking to be completed within 10 business days. Academic Integrity team to be notified as Academic Integrity Register and RTO register need to be updated. Document constructive feedback on the assessment in Moodle, and deduct marks as deemed suitable for the breach (per the assessment rubric).
- (b) When the work is deemed not assessable due to the breaches as identified, the teaching staff may need to issue a non-passing grade, as per the assessment rubric.
- (c) If teaching staff are unsure if a breach has occurred or the level of the breach, they are advised to seek advice from course coordinators or senior teaching staff.

Responding to Tier 1

For Tier 1 breaches:

Teaching Staff/ Markers

- Provide **constructive feedback** and apply any **mark deductions** directly in Moodle.
- Notify the **Academic Integrity team of the list of students and the feedback provided**, as the academic misconduct register and the RTO register need to be updated.

| Breach Level | Types of Breaches | Penalty Examples recommended by markers |
|-------------------------|--|--|
| Tier 1 – Minor Breaches | Unsatisfactory Referencing, Minor Paraphrasing Issues, Low Level of Plagiarism, Misuse of digital technology | <p>The following is a summary of the penalties that may be applied:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • 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. <p>Then</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Recommend that the student be directed to academic skills support, referencing workshops, or online integrity modules. and/or • Clear warning statement provided to student as comments on the Academic Misconduct. <p><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></p> |

- Academic Integrity team will update the register and the work-flow.

5.3.2 Moderate Breach (Tier 2)

When a moderate breach is identified the following response will be undertaken:

- (a) Teaching staff grade the assessment with marking to be completed within 10 business days. With comment and notifies the Course Coordinator.

- (b) The Course Coordinator investigates the case, which may include interviewing the student, reviewing the assessment/s and feedback provided, and reviewing any previous breaches of academic integrity occasions.
- (c) The Course Coordinator assesses the breach and determines which Tier level the breach equates with (Course Coordinator to complete process within 5 business days).
- (d) When the breach equates to a Tier 1 breach, the case is referred back to the teaching staff with permission to process the breach in accordance with section 5.3.1 of this procedure.
- (e) When the breach is classified as a Tier 3 breach, the Academic Integrity Officer will process the breach in accordance with clause 5.3.3 of this procedure.
- (f) 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 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

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.

Responding to Tier 2

For Tier 2 breaches, the process is a little more detailed:

Teaching Staff/ Markers

1. Mark the assessment within 10 business days, including detailed comments.
2. Provide annotated examples showing where the breach occurred to support transparency.
3. Provide a recommendation for the appropriate penalty as in the table.
4. **Notify the Course Coordinator.**

| Breach Level | Types of Breaches | Penalty Examples recommended by markers |
|---|--|--|
| <p>Tier 2 – Moderate Breaches</p> <p>Much of the assessment is affected (e.g., moderate paraphrasing issues across multiple sections, fabricated or irrelevant references, or clear evidence of collusion).</p> | <p>Referencing Issues (No Attempt / Fabricated / Irrelevant)</p> <p>Weak Paraphrasing (Moderate Amount Across the Assessment)</p> <p>Collusion</p> <p>Self Plagiarism / Recycling</p> <p>Tier 1 Repeat Offenders</p> | <p>The following is a summary of the penalties that may be applied:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Suggest whether a resubmission with capped grade. or 2. Zero marks in relation to a group of components of a piece of assessment that is the subject of academic misconduct. or 3. 20% - 30% mark reduction off the assessment weightage. With the marking rubric clearly indicating the reasons for mark deduction. or 4. 0% for the assessment and <p>Then</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 5. That the student be directed to academic skills support, referencing workshops, or online integrity modules. and/or 6. Clear warning statement provided to students as comments on the Academic Misconduct. <p>Your submission has been identified as containing a Tier 2 academic integrity breach. A penalty has been applied, and you are required to meet with the Academic Support Officer and take steps to improve your academic practice, as further breaches may result in more serious consequences</p> |

The **Course Coordinators & Unit Coordinators** investigates. This may include:

1. Review the student's prior performance and demonstrated understanding of referencing and paraphrasing expectations.
2. Review the assessment and check the marker's recommendation.
3. Check whether the student has previous Tier 1 or Tier 2 breaches. If repeat Tier 2, apply escalation to T3. If it is **Tier 3**, the Course Coordinator provides comments and recommendations, completes the **Academic Misconduct Report Form** and escalates the case to the AIO.

4. If it is **Tier 1**, the case is returned to the teaching staff to process as a Tier 1 breach.
5. Interviewing the student if required.
6. Make a decision – Finalise the penalty
7. The Course Coordinator/Unit Coordinator determines the correct tier: If it is **Tier 2**, then:
 - i. Apply the appropriate outcome
 - ii. Notify the AIO to update the RTO and Academic Misconduct Registers
 - iii. Notify student of the outcome with the warning statement
8. AIO team will update the register and the work-flow.

5.3.3 Academic Misconduct (Tier 3)

When a case of academic misconduct is identified the following response will be undertaken:

- (a) Teaching staff grade the assessment with marking to be completed within 10 business days. They need to fill the AM report form and notify the Academic Integrity Officer.
- (b) 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.
- (c) Where the AIO determines the referral to be a Tier 2 or Tier 1 breach, the AIO will refer the case to the appropriate person.
- (d) 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.

The penalties imposed will be either:

- Permission to resubmit with 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.
 - No resubmission but being penalised with relevant mark deductions. Mark deductions should be higher than previous penalty to serve as a strong warning to students to discourage future academic misconduct.
 - A grade of zero awarded to repeat offenders of Tier 3 for two times or more.
 - Zero marks awarded for the unit.
 - Zero grade awarded and the case escalated to the Dean for consideration of expulsion and CoE Cancellation with extreme repeat AM offenders
- (e) The student and teaching staff 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 RTO Manager.
- (f) The AIO records the Academic Misconduct on Academic Integrity Registry and RTO Manager as an intervention.

Responding to Tier 3

For Tier 3 breaches:

Teaching Staff/ Markers

1. Mark the assessment within 10 business days, including detailed comments.
2. Provide annotated examples showing where the breach occurred to support transparency.
3. Provide a recommendation for the appropriate penalty as in the table.
4. Complete the Academic Misconduct Report Form and notify the Academic Integrity Officer.

| Breach Level | Types of Breaches | Penalty Examples recommended |
|-------------------------|--|--|
| Tier 3 – Major Breaches | Contract Cheating Cheating Fabrication Falsification Repeat Offender | <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Suggest whether 0% for the assessment or 0% for the unit should be implemented with the marking rubric clearly indicating the reasons for mark deduction. and 2. Recommend that the student be directed to academic skills support, referencing workshops, or online integrity modules. |

The **AIO** investigates and determines the nature of the misconduct. This may include:

1. Reviewing the student's prior performance and demonstrated understanding of referencing and paraphrasing expectations.
2. Apply escalation if the student is a repeat offender, as required by policy.
 - If the AIO decides it is actually Tier 1 or Tier 2, the case is referred to the appropriate person. (in case of Tier 2 Course Coordinator; Tier 1 marker)
 - If it is confirmed as **Tier 3**, the AIO will:
 - Gather and assess evidence
 - Determine the severity
 - Provide recommendations to the **Director of Teaching and Learning and Academic Integrity Team Lead**.

Director of Teaching and Learning

- **Director of Teaching and Learning** will make the final decision with the **Academic Integrity Team Lead**.
 - Inform the student of the outcome with the warning statement and severity
3. Academic Integrity team will update the register and the work-flow.

5.4 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.

6.0 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.
- Ensure appropriate governance and oversight of academic integrity matters.

Director of Learning and Teaching

- Responsible for reviewing and updating the policy and procedures according to the policy review period or where necessary.

Teaching Staff / Assessors

- Identify suspected breaches of academic integrity when assessing student work.

- Investigate and identify if suspected case meets or breaches Tier 1.
- Apply fairness and transparency when investigating potential breaches.
- Speak with students where work quality or authorship is questioned.
- Escalate suspected breaches and notify appropriate staff accordingly.
- Provide feedback and apply penalties for Tier 1 breaches where appropriate.

Course Coordinator/ Unit Coordinator

- Investigate suspected Tier 2 breaches of academic integrity.
- 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 the case be record in 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.

7.0 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. |
| Using Digital Technology (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. |

8.0 Related Documents

| |
|---|
| Document Name |
| 1.1.1 Admissions Policy for Overseas Students (HE and VET) |
| 1.1.2 Admissions Procedure for Overseas Students (HE and VET) |
| 1.3.1 Student Orientation Policy |
| 1.4.1 Student Assessment and Awarding of Grades Higher Education Courses Policy |
| 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 & Procedures |
| Document Number | 5.2.1 |
| Audience | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Staff <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Students <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Public |
| Category | Institutional Quality Assurance |
| Subcategory | Academic and Research Integrity |
| Approved By | Academic Board |
| Initial Approval Date | 20 April 2022 |
| Date of Last Approval | 17 March 2026 |
| Next Review Date | 17 March 2028 |
| Policy Advisor | Director of Teaching & Learning |
| Contact | Quality Assurance Regulator.compliance@ae.edu.au |

10.0 Change Log

| Document change and review log Date | Version | By | Notes |
|---|---------|-----|--|
| <p>On 12/03/2026 the following policy and procedure documents were consolidated into this combined policy and procedure:</p> <p>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.</p> | | | |
| 10/01/2026 | 1.0 | DTL | <p>Updates to tier 2 & 3 definitions. Updates to identify and respond to breaches.</p> <p>Procedure was amended to provide clarity to markers and academic staff, including academic integrity officers. Levels, tiers and repeat offenders.</p> |