

Procedure: Academic Integrity

The purpose of this procedure document is to provide guidance to staff on monitoring academic integrity and detecting and investigating suspected academic misconduct.

PROCEDURES

The following procedures are covered within this document:

- Identifying academic misconduct
- Types of plagiarism
- Prevention
- Detection
- Suspected breaches of academic integrity

TERMINOLOGY

Academic integrity refers to behaviour that demonstrates ethical and honest study and assessment practice.

Academic misconduct refers to an action taken by a student and/or staff that results in the submission of assessment evidence that indicates it is not the student's own work. Academic misconduct may also be referred to as academic fraud/dishonesty, academic breaches, cheating or plagiarism.

Plagiarism - the process of copying another person's work and claiming it as their own and/or not acknowledging the original author or source of the evidence through accepted referencing conventions.

IDENTIFYING ACADEMIC MISCONDUCT

Actions classed as academic misconduct

- Plagiarism of any nature. Submitting work copied, closely paraphrased, or disguised (through minor word changes or format alterations) from information sources without acknowledging the source of the material
- To use/provide resources during an assessment prohibited under the assessment's conditions
- Unauthorised access to 'assessor only' resources such as assessment schedules and marking guides
- To take an assessment out of the training/class area without the permission of the responsible teaching staff member
- To fabricate data, evidence, or results
- To make a false declaration of authenticity in relation to submitted assessment evidence
- To communicate, or attempt to communicate, with other students during assessments, tests or examinations which are written under conditions which forbid communication with others
- To engage in any other behaviour forbidden under the relevant assessment or examination conditions
- To submit work already completed and submitted as part of another programme or course component without teaching staff approval
- To not correctly attribute the author or creator of the work using approved referencing conventions when using another's idea or words
- To use AI to complete an assessment without acknowledging its use and the extent of its use
- To complete a group assessment (two or more students) and submit work without making significant individual contribution to the submitted assignment
- To collude with other students to produce work that is submitted as individual work without acknowledging any collaboration
- To purchase, or otherwise obtain and submit another's work or pass off another's ideas as their own
- To impersonate someone else and produce the work for another
- To arrange for another to take one's own place in an assessment

- To allow assessment work to be copied by another student
- To allow own work to be handed in by another student as if it were the other student's work
- To deliberately destroy another's assessment work

TYPES OF PLAGIARISM

Washing

This is a new form of plagiarism in which a student uses Google Translate to translate their assessment into another language and then back again into English. This process involves automatically substituted generated synonyms and phrases and creating an ostensibly "new" document.

If washing is admitted or proven, this form of academic integrity breach is automatically treated as academic misconduct, as it demonstrates an intention to deceive.

Academic File-sharing

Academic file-sharing occurs when students or graduates make any aspect of their study and assessment materials available to others. It differs from Contract Cheating (see 2.3 below) as it rarely involves the exchange of money, although a barter/swap model may be in place.

In some instances, academic file-sharing may not be a breach of academic integrity (e.g. a student sharing lecture notes with another student who was absent from the class). However, sharing assessed material without the prior knowledge and consent of the course Tutor is a breach of academic integrity, as it allows for both plagiarism and collusion.

Students sometimes choose to share their study materials and assessments (with each other or online) altruistically, and as a contribution to community-building, without being aware that this may create both intellectual property and academic integrity breach issues.

Students may use crowdsourced services such as StuDocu, CourseHero, ThinkSwap, Student VIP, and Chegg.com to share files. These services provide brief disclaimers on the importance of academic integrity, but nonetheless encourage students to share material without a full understanding of the implications of sharing their assessments in an environment that enables and potentially encourages others to breach academic integrity by reusing their work.

Ways to prevent academic file-sharing

To help prevent unauthorised academic file-sharing, Tutors should:

- Explicitly and directly communicate to students in each course what the expectations are regarding the sharing of academic files, and that these expectations continue after the course is completed;
- Ensure that an adequate and useful number of assessment examples are provided for student reference and engagement in an approved and productive manner; and
- Conduct searches on file-sharing sites for assessed material relating to their units of study if they suspect students may have been accessing past assessments.

Contract cheating

Contract cheating involves the procurement of an assignment or piece of research from another party, sometimes but not always an academic cheating service. This may be facilitated by a fellow student, friend or purchased on a website. Other forms of contract cheating include paying another person to sit an exam in the student's place.

Contract cheating does not always involve payment. Any procurement of a document with the intention of presenting it as the student's own work, whether money is involved or not, may be contract cheating.

How to detect contract cheating

Contract cheating can be detected by pattern recognition software as well as expert analysis by the academic of the student's work as a whole, taking into account student contribution to class.

Purchased assessments are also often characterised by being vague, not responsive to or only tangentially responsive to the topic, and using words, phrases, structures or norms inconsistent with the New Zealand vernacular.

The presentation of several or many substantially similar assessment pieces within one course may also indicate that assessments have been purchased.

To help prevent contract cheating, academic staff should:

- a. Discuss the values of academic integrity, student responsibilities and possible consequences for breaches during their course delivery;
- b. Embed unique descriptors and instructor data into assessment specifications, then create Google alerts to track the terms on known academic cheating sites;
- c. Regularly upload assessment specifications into Turnitin to provide match sources for contract cheating requests;
- d. Incorporate discipline relevant case studies that explore the problematic nature of contract cheating;
- e. Use well invigilated examinations. For online examinations that are required to be time-bound and fact-based for professional accreditation purposes, online invigilation methods may be available to satisfy the requirement.

Assessment design to prevent contract cheating

Contract cheating may be reduced through careful course design. Academic Staff designing assessments should consider:

- a. Using unique assessments that incorporate information from class discussions or lecture material;
- b. Revising assessment topics for each student cohort;
- c. Using carefully designed group assessments so students cannot split up assessments into individual components;
- d. Linking tests with coursework assessments (i.e. reflecting on an assessment under test conditions);
- e. Especially at higher levels assess the learning process, requiring students to show critical evidence of their learning process. Assessment proposals, drafts, annotated bibliographies, and other critical reflections would be appropriate

Where contract cheating is suspected or admitted by students, the matter must be referred for investigation. Yoobee, via the Quality Office will inform NZQA of any information provided by the student regarding an academic cheating service. The provision of such services is now a crime and will be pursued by NZQA in its regulatory capacity.

Examination and test cheating

Examination and test cheating can involve:

- a. Copying the work of another candidate in an in-person test or exam;
- b. Using unauthorised answers, reference material, notes, or devices containing these; or
- c. Requesting or permitting another person to take a student's place (impersonate them) at a test or examination;

In-person examination and test integrity are primarily ensured by the presence of an invigilator or the Tutor setting the test, who have responsibility for administering, monitoring, and collecting papers.

For online tests, consideration should be given to examination and test design that calls for more discursive answers and less purely factual recall testing. Assessments that primarily test knowledge recall or have a single correct answer, such as multiple choice questions, make cheating easier and more likely where face to face invigilation is not possible.

Academic staff setting assessments may wish to:

- a. Where appropriate, reduce or minimise the use of multiple choice tests as a primary method of assessment;
- b. Where tests are retained, consider moving to an open-book model where the assessment tests skills and the application of knowledge rather than the retention of facts;
- c. Where a closed-book, time-limited test or examination is required to satisfy course or professional accreditation requirements, use time-restricted locked test sites which may be combined with randomised videoconference-based observation of candidates or other tools; and/or
- d. Support written tests with short viva examinations via videoconference of selected candidates.

Collusion

Collusion involves the copying or uncredited collaboration of material between students of course materials (that is, the work of multiple people credited only by a single author).

Collaboration that is required or approved as part of the course and assessment design is not collusion. Students engaging in group discussions, completing group assignments together, or convening study groups, are not colluding, and are not liable to penalties under the Academic Integrity Policy.

How to detect collusion

Collusion can be detected in a number of ways relevant to the nature of the work being undertaken, including:

- a. The use of pattern recognition software such as Urkund Originality Check for written assessment or research materials;
- b. The expert identification by assessor of substantially overlapping or identical assessment responses from two or more students in a course;
- c. Moderator or peer reviewer noting of substantially overlapping or identical material in submitted assessments.

PREVENTION

General prevention measures are outlined below, this is also followed by specific procedures for the four sample assessment types listed:

- A student handbook is available online and is given to each student either on enrolment or on day one of their course. It is made clear in the handbook that plagiarism is considered a 'major or expulsion behaviour' which could result in the student's removal from their programme. This is also outlined verbally during the first week of the programme and its component courses.
- All Tutors are trained in classroom management including creating a safe assessment environment. Within their first year of employment, if they have no previous tertiary teaching experience, Tutors are required to complete the NZ Certificate in Adult and Tertiary Training Level 4 which includes conducting an assessment in a fair, safe and appropriate manner.
- As Yoobee class sizes are generally small, with on average not more than 25 students. Tutors have a heightened awareness of students' abilities and are therefore generally able to detect attempted academic misconduct.
- Academic writing is included in the Introduction to many programmes which includes a focus on academic referencing including APA referencing.

Classroom (written) assessments

- Students should be separated either on different desks or at either end of a desk.
- A Tutor should be in the room to invigilate any tests and move around the class observing students and any marking etc.
- Material not required for the test/assessment should be removed from desks.
- For closed book assessments all personal belongings including mobile phones, smart watches will be removed to the front of the room and switched to silent mode.
- Students are not allowed to talk to each other during the written assessment and will leave the room when the assessment is complete.
- Students are made aware that "the assessment must be the students own work"; this will be noted on the front of each assessment.

Online/computer lab

- Online assessment should ensure, that the questions are random and selected from a question pool, so it is unlikely that students in the same proximity will be on the same question.
- Students are not permitted to use the internet or e-mail while completing assessments (unless specifically needed for the assessment).

Roleplays

- The practicality of these assessments largely precludes cheating.
- However, they should be refreshed if the same role plays are used on multiple occasions
- Where practical and appropriate the above measures are followed.

Assignments

- At the beginning of each course students are taken through the expectations of the component assignments and are educated in writing essays, projects, case studies etc. and referencing.
- Assignments should normally have a clearly specified time frame from being set, to being handed in (i.e. in x number of weeks).
- Students should be informed that Tutors retain a copy of past assignments so if similarities are suspected the origin can be traced.
- All assessments contain an attestation statement which students must be aware of.
- Assessments should be designed so that the scope of most of the assignments is such that fraud (through subject selection and focus) would not be easy.
- Tutors are responsible for assessing copyright issues as a criterion in all assessments.

DETECTION

During classroom and computer-based assessments the Tutors should look out for any suspicious behaviour and make sure they move around the classroom regularly.

With the exception of fully on-line courses, it is normal practice that the Tutor who taught the course marks the component assessments, and they will thus have an understanding of the level of each student learning and can look out for unusual or out of expected capability answers.

For fully online courses where assessments are marked by assessors the specialist facilitating online Tutor should be consulted regarding any suspected breaches of academic integrity.

Turnitin

As appropriate, students should be encouraged to use Turnitin to verify the absence of plagiarism in their work prior to submission. If the level of match is 20% or less the work should be submitted. If there is a match of 21% or more the work should be amended and run through Turnitin again prior to submission.

- Students can submit a piece of assessment through Turnitin a maximum of two times for any assessment.
- If a piece of work has not been submitted through Turnitin a Tutor who suspects plagiarism or a breach of academic integrity may run the assessment through Turnitin to verify, or otherwise, their concerns.

Authentication

Tutors should undertake on-going monitoring of the work being produced by students during class in order to observe areas of special ability or weakness. Tutors should hold regular discussions with students to assist with authentication of student work.

Off-site work such as that undertaken through placements or internships is monitored through logging processes that requires the student to record what was produced, time taken, resources used, consultation undertaken, and then have the record signed by their supervisor.

For group projects, each student will be required to document the nature and extent of their contribution with guidance from their Tutor/lecturer, in accordance with the processes and specifications detailed in the project brief. Group members are required to establish, document and monitor project contracts and management of their group project plans and report on their individual contribution to the project as part of the assessment process.

SUSPECTED BREACHES OF ACADEMIC INTEGRITY

Suspected breaches of academic integrity will be investigated on a case-by-case basis in line with the Academic Integrity Policy.

Any suspected academic misconduct should be quickly brought to the attention of the Team Leader, Faculty Lead and Campus Manager, in order to follow the correct process.

Most 'investigations' relating to classroom-based assessment or tests or practical observations can be completed at classroom level the Tutor watching the assessment. If a Tutor witnesses a student attempting to look at someone else's work, they should fill in an incident form and bring it up immediately with the Team Leader and send a copy of the incident form to the Faculty Lead. The Faculty Lead will determine, following consultation, any action to be taken.

Yoobee policies (which the students are made aware of through the student handbook) permit the investigation of e.g. student e-mails, authorship of work etc. which may relate to academic misconduct.

Plagiarism or other Academic Misconduct

Where an academic staff suspects that work has been plagiarised by the student submitting it for assessment, the Tutor should set out their concerns in writing so that there is a clear audit trail prior to seeking a verbal explanation from the student. They should also inform and discuss the suspected breach with the Team Leader and also notify the Faculty Lead

Investigation by the Tutor may include the use of text matching software such as Turnitin and interviews with relevant staff and the student(s).

If as a result of the preliminary investigation it is determined that the intention of the learner was unintended no further investigative action will be taken but the report will be held on the student's file in SELMA. It should also be notified to the register of academic misconduct held by the Quality Team. As appropriate the student will also be directed to Educative processes to ensure they have a full understanding of academic integrity issues.

If as a result of the preliminary investigation it is determined that more detailed investigation should take place the Faculty Lead should direct that this should be undertaken by a designated Team Leader or an experienced member of academic staff that they have designated to consider cases of academic misconduct in their Faculty. There should normally be an academic member of staff, which may, if appropriate, be a Team Leader, designated to undertake investigations on each campus as appropriate.

The student should be informed in writing of the concern and that the matter will be formally investigated. The persons who can investigate academic misconduct are The student will also be advised of the date, time and format of any meeting and that they may bring a support person to the meeting.

The designated member of staff will consider the evidence provided by the Tutor and will interview the student. Another member of staff not involved with the case should also attend the meeting. Notes from this discussion must be recorded and placed in the student's file.

Evidence may include:

- a. original assessment item/s submitted by the student
- b. assessment task outline
- c. Turnitin Similarity report
- d. Turnitin Authorship report
- e. screenshots (e.g., social media, direct messaging, emails)
- f. official documents (e.g., medical certificates, academic transcript, placement reports)
- g. photocopies, photos, or video of any relevant materials
- h. photos or video of unauthorised materials taken into an exam/test
- i. photos or video of the student, if there is concern about the identity of the student sitting a test
- j. timelines of suspicious activity

Where a breach of academic integrity is found to have occurred, the Faculty Lead. In conjunction with the designated Team Leader/ member of academic staff, will follow the steps outlined in the Academic Integrity Policy.

The designated member of staff, in discussion with the Faculty Lead, will determine the penalty to be applied in accordance with the level of breach as indicated on tables 1 and 2 below. The level of sanction will also be determined by whether this is a new or more experienced student and if it is a first or subsequent offence. Sanctions can be educative or punitive.

In determining if an educative response is appropriate the Faculty Lead, in conjunction with the Team Leader/ designated member of staff should consider:

- a. Other work submitted within the courses and/or programme by the student;
- b. The student's stage within their programme (i.e. first-year students may have less understanding of academic

- integrity and citation requirements than later-year students);
- c. Whether the student has received any academic integrity training
- d. The nature and level of the breach (i.e. reproducing an entire chapter of a text would be more serious than reproducing a paragraph);
- e. Whether the student has been involved in an academic integrity breach previously (staff should consult students' notes in SELMA to ascertain this)

A sanction, or punitive response, is appropriate for serious breaches of academic integrity such as:

- intentional plagiarism,
- contract cheating,
- repeated and intentional file sharing,
- washing
- bribery
- falsification of information, and
- exam or test cheating.

Serious plagiarism compromises the assessment process and involves:

- copied or appropriated work formed with the clear intention to deceive an assessor,
- premeditated cheating or other forms of misrepresentation. The effect of serious plagiarism is to compromise the assessment process
- second, third or repeated breaches of academic integrity

Sanctions in response to plagiarism are indicated in tables 1 and 2 and also detailed in the Student Disciplinary Policy and may include:

- a. reduced marks for an assessment;
- b. Zero marks for the assessment task;
- c. Resubmission of the assessment;
- d. Zero marks for the course;
- e. Suspension from the programme;
- f. Exclusion from the programme.

In determining how to respond to a breach of academic integrity, the Faculty Lead, in conjunction with the designated Team Leader/academic member of staff dealing with academic misconduct (and Campus Manager where appropriate) should consider:

- a. The nature of the breach;
- b. The extent of the breach;
- c. The experience level of the student;
- d. Any relevant past behaviour of the student; and
- e. Where it can be determined, the intent of the student.

The student will receive formal notification of the results of the allegation and the imposition of any corrective action in accordance with the Academic Integrity Policy.

If the student is dissatisfied with the determination made, they have a right to appeal to the relevant Board of Studies.

Faculty Lead has discretion to decide whether a verbal or written warning is appropriate depending on the severity of the breach and the penalties to be applied.

In the case of a written warning a further breach of academic integrity may lead to indefinite suspension of the student in accordance with the student disciplinary procedures.

For programmes that allow resubmission, where plagiarism has occurred the student will be required to resubmit that piece of work for assessment before it will be counted towards the qualification.

The following two tables provide some guidance regarding the decision available for each level of breach.

Table 1 Level of Breach

Level of Breach	Description	Potential Sanction
i. No breach	No breach has been determined or there is no compelling evidence of academic misconduct.	None but student directed to educative responses e.g.: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Verbal or written feedback to the student ▪ Referring the students to a Learning Success Coordinator ▪ Improvements in scholarship through better citation of sources or ▪ Academic integrity video
ii. Minor breach:	The student failed to meet the expectations of academic integrity and/or. it is a first offence. <i>Minor misconduct will be primarily treated in an educative manner. A minor breach determination must include corrective action(s). For example, through training or counselling, or resubmitting, or awarding a reduced grade).</i>	Student to engage in educative responses which may include: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Providing verbal or written feedback to the student; ▪ Providing the opportunity to resubmit the assessment (if this opportunity is given, the maximum mark that may be achieved on resubmission is 50% Pass or a competent grade); ▪ Deducting marks allocated for referencing, with explanation of the reasons; ▪ Referring the student to a Learning Success Coordinator; ▪ Providing the student with examples of plagiarised and non-plagiarised texts to assist them in understanding the difference. Potential sanctions include: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Reduced grade for the assessment • Resubmitting the assessment
iii. Major breach:	There was a continuing and/or serious attempt to seek an unfair advantage by the student and/or; The student has one or more previous substantiated breaches. <i>Major misconduct will result in corrective action and a penalty. For example, including disciplinary action, reduction in marks or failure of the assessment. Refer to the Student Disciplinary and Academic Progress procedures.</i>	In addition to any educative responses sanctions may include: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Awarding a failing grade ▪ Issuing a warning letter ▪ Suspension from Study

Table 2 Academic Integrity Breach Response Chart

	Extent	Student's experience and behavior	Intent (if determined)	Response	Authority
Plagiarism	<p>Small proportion of the assessment exercise: e.g. a few paragraphs, graphics, segment of computer source code.</p> <p>Moderate proportion of the assessment exercise (e.g. a number of paragraphs, graphics).</p> <p>A moderately significant part of the assessment exercise (e.g. results section).</p> <p>Moderate misappropriation of ideas or artistic work.</p>	<p>A new student or has not previously attempted this type of assessment.</p> <p>No past history of academic integrity breaches.</p>	Appears accidental or a genuine misunderstanding .	Educative is appropriate. The student should be offered the opportunity to understand the breach and rectify it.	Can be dealt with by academic staff member.
	<p>Moderate proportion of the assessment exercise (e.g. a number of paragraphs, graphics).</p> <p>A moderately significant part of the assessment exercise (e.g. results section).</p> <p>Moderate misappropriation of ideas or artistic work.</p>	<p>Moderately experienced student level 6 or higher, and / or student has completed academic integrity training.</p> <p>No past history of academic integrity breaches.</p>	Appears to be an error of carelessness or recklessness, rather than intent to deceive.	Misconduct, but lower penalties may apply e.g. resubmission of assessment or reduced grade for assessment.	Can be dealt with by the Faculty Lead in conjunction with the Team Leader/designated academic staff member dealing with academic misconduct

	Large or very significant proportion of the assessment exercise. Minimal or no original work or ideas.	Moderately to very experienced student, and / or student has completed academic integrity training. May have past history of academic integrity breaches.	Evidence to show actions were deliberate and planned.	Misconduct. Full range of penalties apply.	Refer to Faculty Lead and Campus Manager for management under Student Disciplinary Policy
Collusion	Students engaged in formal or informal group work submit work as individual components. Students work together to create shared assessment answers that are substantially similar.	A new student or has not previously attempted this type of assessment. No past history of academic integrity breaches.	Appears accidental or a genuine misunderstanding .	Educative is appropriate. The student/s should be offered the opportunity to understand the breach and rectify it.	Can be dealt with by academic staff member.
	Students work together to create shared assessment answers that are substantially similar in environments where they have been instructed that individual responses are required.	Moderately experienced students, level 5 and higher and / or students have completed academic integrity training. No past history of academic integrity breaches.	Appears to be an error of carelessness or recklessness, rather than intent to deceive.	Misconduct, but lower penalties may apply e.g. resubmit work or reduced grade	Can be dealt with by designated Team Leader/ academic staff member dealing with academic misconduct.

	Students knowingly collude to improve assessment outcomes in contravention of clearly explained rules of assessment.	Moderately to very experienced students at level 6 or higher, and / or students have completed academic integrity training. May or may not have past history of academic integrity breaches.	Evidence to show actions were deliberate and planned.	Misconduct. Full range of penalties apply.	Refer to Faculty Lead and Campus Manager for management under the Student Disciplinary Policy and Procedure
File sharing	Willingly sharing work with another student, including via file-sharing services.	A new student, who has not been given clear information about file-sharing. No past history of academic integrity breaches.	Appears to have acted based on a genuine misunderstanding .	Educative is appropriate. The student should be offered the opportunity to understand the breach and rectify it (including by removing the files immediately).	Can be dealt with by designated Team Leader/ academic staff member dealing with academic misconduct and notified to Faculty Lead.
	Willingly sharing work with another student, including via file-sharing services.	Moderately to very experienced student, and / or student has completed academic integrity training. No past history of academic integrity breaches	Appears to not appreciate the severity of the action, but no intent to cheat is shown.	Misconduct, but lower penalties may apply e.g. resubmit work, reduced grade	Can be dealt with by designated Team Leader/ academic staff member dealing with academic misconduct in consultation with the Faculty Lead

Contract cheating	Purchased assessment items from any source for reference and paraphrasing.	Any experience or programme level. May or may not have past history of academic integrity breaches	The act of purchasing demonstrates intention.	Misconduct. Full range of penalties apply.	Refer to Faculty Lead and Campus Manager for management under the Student Disciplinary Policy and Procedure.
	Willingly sharing files for the purposes of assisting another student to cheat in an assessment.	Any experience level and any programme level. May have past history of academic integrity breaches.	Evidence to show actions were deliberate and planned.	Misconduct. Full range of penalties apply.	Refer to Faculty Lead and Campus Manager for management under the Student Disciplinary Policy and Procedure
Reusing own academic work	Reusing a portion of a previous assessment task in partial satisfaction of a new assessment task, without self- citation.	Any experience or programme level. No past history of academic integrity breaches.	Appears to have acted based on a genuine misunderstanding .	Educative is appropriate. The student should be offered the opportunity to understand the breach and rectify it.	Can be dealt with by academic staff member.
	Reusing an entire previous assessment task in satisfaction of a new assessment task, without self-citation.	Any experience or programme level. May have past history of academic integrity	Appears to not appreciate the severity of the action, but no intent to cheat is shown.	Misconduct, but lower penalties may apply e.g. resubmit assessment or reduced	Can be dealt with by designated Team Leader/ academic staff member dealing with academic misconduct.
	Purchased assessment items from any source for presentation unaltered as their own work.	Any experience or programme level. May or may not have past history of academic integrity breaches.	The act of purchasing demonstrates intention.	Misconduct. Serious penalties apply.	Refer to Faculty Lead and Campus Manager for management under the Student Disciplinary Policy and Procedure

Test/Exam breaches	Possession of unauthorised materials in the test/exam venue or during an online examination.	Newer student. No past history of academic integrity breaches.	Appears to have acted based on a genuine misunderstanding .	Misconduct, but lower penalties may apply or penalties may be waived.	Can be dealt with by designated Team Leader/academic staff member dealing with academic misconduct.
	Cheating on tests /examinations.	Any experience or programme level.	Evidence to show actions were deliberate and planned.	Misconduct. Full range of penalties apply.	Refer to Faculty Lead and Campus Manager for management under the Student Disciplinary Policy and Procedure
Washing	A portion or all of an assessment "washed" to disguise its substantial similarity to another piece of work.	Any experience or programme level.	The act of washing demonstrates the intention to deceive.	Misconduct. Full range of penalties apply.	Refer to Faculty Lead and Campus Manager for management under the Student Disciplinary Policy and Procedure
Bribery	Offered any inducement (financial or other) in exchange for a result.	Any experience or programme level. May or may not have past history of academic integrity breaches.	The act of offering the bribe demonstrates intention to corrupt the result.	Misconduct. Serious penalties apply.	Refer to Faculty Lead and Campus Manager under the Student Disciplinary Policy and Procedure.
	Third party (i.e. a parent) offered any inducement (financial or other) in exchange for a student's result.	Any experience or programme level.	Student appears to have been unaware of or opposed to the third party's actions.	If the student can demonstrate they were genuinely unaware of the bribery attempt, action may be suspended.	Refer to Faculty Lead and Campus Manager for management under the Student Disciplinary Policy and Procedure

RELATED POLICIES, PROCEDURES AND DOCUMENTS

POLICY Academic integrity **POLICY** Student disciplinary **PROCEDURE** Student Disciplinary

STAFF GUIDE Academic misconduct flowchart

APPENDIX A: STUDENT AND STAFF GUIDELINES GENERATIVE ARTIFICIAL INTELLIGENCE TOOLS

Student Guidelines for using text generating tools in assessments

The values associated with academic integrity are associated with presenting authentic work and acknowledging the work of others.

Students now have access to digital tools that can support their writing, learning, work, essay scaffolding, creativity and idea generation. Examples of some of these tools are ChatGPT, GPT, DALL-E, Stable Diffusion, Midjourney, GitHub and Copilot. In your studies with Yoobee Colleges some assessment tasks explicitly ask you to use such tools, whereas some other assessment tasks will explicitly ask you to not use them. If your Tutor supports you using these digital tools, you are welcome to do so but you must clearly acknowledge this in your submitted assessment.

The following guidelines are provided to help you to negotiate using these tools as part of your learning. These digital tools can be a useful learning resource; however, they have been shown to also produce incorrect, false or unhelpful information. We encourage you to critically think about the way you will/will not utilise such tools in your learning, and about how your usage can contribute to the development of your capabilities and skills.

Fabrication and falsification

Tools such as ChatGPT tend to produce incorrect information and fake citations, fake quotes, references to fake authors and fake 'facts.' As such, these tools tend to produce inaccurate outputs. It is your responsibility to confirm the accuracy and validity of the content you submit for assessment, including references and quotes. It's what we would think of, in Academic Integrity terms, as avoiding fabrication and falsification. Secondly, image generation models can occasionally come up with highly offensive products. As such, you will be responsible for any inaccurate, biased, offensive, or otherwise unethical content you submit regardless of whether it originally comes from you or the tool you use. Your assessment is your responsibility, and as such you must critically consider all content submitted for assessment carefully.

Acknowledgement

If you use generated text in your assessments (use AI to write in response to prompts), you need to acknowledge its contribution clearly in your submitted work. Without acknowledgment, your submission may be seen as a form of contract cheating leading to academic misconduct, where parts of the assessment / assignment are written by text generating software. You can avoid this in the following ways:

- a. by using quotations to identify reproduced text
- b. highlighting the sections of AI text you have not edited
- c. acknowledging your source (to do this, identify the tool and include a reference as per VU referencing style guides).

You will be penalized for using a tool without acknowledgement. Therefore we advise you to list the tools you have used appropriately. Yoobee Colleges' policy on plagiarism applies to any uncited or improperly cited use of work by others, or submission of work by others, including AI generated responses, as your own.

- a. Academic Integrity Policy can be found here – see [Academic Integrity Policy](#) (URL Link)

A tool such as ChatGPT is a disruptor, and with any disruption, we will be updating related guides for staff and students to make it clear how such tools are part of the pedagogy and assessment. We aim to establish a collaborative approach to teaching and learning as these tools continue to

emerge and you develop the digital literacy needed to drive your career and engagement in society at large.

We would also like to bring your attention to potential risks. Although the base level is currently free, tools such as ChatGPT are already charging users for 'advanced' access. Please note, there is concern that scammers may use this cost to their advantage, leaving you at risk of downloading malware or paying on-going fees. We also expect to see encryption keys, and watermarks emerge throughout the year to flag text generated with ChatGPT, although you as the writer are unaware of the presence of such markings. The makers of ChatGPT are also creating software to detect writing done by AI. In order to be successful in your studies, it is therefore crucial that you can identify those parts of your assessments assisted by AI, and those which are purely your own work.

Staff Guidelines associated with text generating software

As a staff member, both you and your students have access to tools with the capability of generating comprehensive answers to complex questions using tools such as ChatGPT, GPT, DALL-E, Stable Diffusion, Midjourney, GitHub and

Copilot. Yoobee Colleges' position on such tools is one of no intention to ban students or staff from using the software. What follows is current guidelines around these tools. We will be updating related guides for staff and students to make it clear how these tools are to be acknowledged in the production of student work for assessment as further information evolves.

Assessment

Academic integrity concerns ethics and values, along with the assurance of student learning and quality teaching. In the student guidelines, we have indicated that some assessment tasks may explicitly ask students to use a tool such as ChatGPT, while other assessment instructions will explicitly require them not to. As a staff member with your Faculty Lead will decide the use of these tools for assessment tasks, and the expectation is that you will communicate this to students via assessment briefs and in class. You are welcome to use such tools, to support your teaching and learning, including using these as a way of becoming more familiar with an unfamiliar topic, support the initial writing of rubrics, and indicative questions.

Ethics and Values

We view academic integrity as a process that includes both ethics and values, alongside the assurance of student learning and as such see these tools as a useful learning resource, but we also need you to make students aware that they may also provide responses that are incorrect, false or unhelpful. As such, we encourage you to provide clear and concise language instructions around these tools, for all students, being aware of the needs of non-native English speakers and international students.

We aim to ensure consistency across Yoobee Colleges in expectations for use of these tools in assessment tasks, and explicitly address plagiarism and academic integrity concerns related to use of these tools through current policy, including educative processes.

Within the tertiary sector working groups are being established to explore these tools, and their impacts and implications for tertiary education. These tools can be used for more than just learning, but also for work and other purposes, and as such will be considered across a variety of contexts. Updates will be provided to staff as information becomes available.