

Academic Integrity Policy

Purpose	This policy addresses AITC's approach to academic integrity.
Location	The policy is maintained on ownCloud
Responsible executive	Academic Dean
Responsible office	Academic Dean's Office
Contact officer	TBA
Effective date	29 June 2020
Review date	TBA
Modification history	Version 1.2
Related documents	AITC Student Feedback Policy AITC Student Feedback Procedure AITC Monitoring Review and Improvement Procedure AITC Examinations Policy and Procedure AITC Student Progression, Exclusion and Graduation Policy AITC Education Plan AITC Student Code of Conduct Policy AITC Staff Code of Conduct Policy
Authority	Approved by Academic Board

1. Purpose

AITC academic integrity principles include, honesty, and a respect for knowledge, truth and ethical practices. These principles are at the core of all academic endeavour in teaching, learning and research. Dishonest practices contravene academic values, compromise and devalue the quality of learning and the credibility of the award. This policy is intended to reinforce the importance of integrity and honesty in the Australian Institute of Technology and Commerce (AITC) academic environment.

2. Scope

This policy applies to all Students and Staff of the AITC.

3. Definitions

- 3.1 **Academic integrity** is defined as: 'a commitment, even in the face of adversity, to six fundamental values: honesty, trust, fairness, respect, responsibility, and courage'. From these values flow principles of behaviour that enable academic communities to translate ideals to action' (International Centre for Academic Integrity, 2014).
- 3.2 For the purposes of the Higher Education Standards Framework (Threshold Standards) 2021 (HES Framework), academic integrity involves preventative action that is taken to mitigate foreseeable risks to academic and research integrity including misrepresentation, fabrication, cheating, plagiarism and misuse of intellectual property, and to prevent recurrences of breaches.
- 3.3 **Research integrity** can also be defined in terms of the credibility of its findings as 'the trustworthiness of research due to the soundness of its methods and the honesty and accuracy of its presentation' (Singapore Statement on Research Integrity, 2010).

- 3.4 **Academic plagiarism** is a form of academic misconduct that involves making a false representation to gain an unjust advantage. It can include:
- Falsification of data.
 - Using a substitute person to undertake, in full or part, an examination or other assessment.
 - Reusing one's own work, or part thereof, that has been submitted previously and counted towards another course without permission from the relevant Course Coordinator.
 - Making contact or colluding with another person, contrary to instructions, during an examination or other assessment item.
 - Bringing material or device(s) into an examination or other assessment item other than such as may be specified for that assessment item.
 - Making use of computer software or other material and device(s) during an examination or other assessment item other than such as may be specified for that assessment item.
 - Contract cheating or having another writer compete for tender to produce an essay or assignment and then submitting the work as one's own.
- 3.5 **Plagiarism** is the presentation of the thoughts or works of another as one's own. Without limiting the generality of this definition, it may include:
- Copying or paraphrasing material from any source without due acknowledgment.
 - Using another person's ideas without due acknowledgment.
 - Collusion or working with others without permission and presenting the resulting work as though it was completed independently.
 - Artificial Intelligence, as it continues to develop, presents challenges and opportunities. In various forms, such as Expert Systems and Word Processing, it has been around for many years. Parallel processing of data is a common underlying computational feature, but there is an intellectual distinction between accessing something to assist with presentation, and accessing a tool which can seem to compile or contribute to content. In the latter case, the misuse or abuse of AI such as ChatGPT or any other AI tool has to be treated like any other form of plagiarism. It must be unambiguously attributed and utilised with minimum brevity. Like any other outside source of ideas, it may not be used as a substitute for critical thinking or original ideas.
 - All summative assignments are submitted to the Institute's Learning Management System, Moodle, in which Turnitin reports on similarity. Examiners will contact Students with an outlier similarity percentage. Students may then be processed under Section 7 (Actions and Penalties) of this policy which deals with penalties for any form of plagiarism. If in doubt, Students should contact their Lecturer or Tutor, even if they have been careful in attribution, because AI makes mistakes, and some AI can be undetectable, even by Turnitin. Ultimately, Students are responsible for the accuracy of the content of their academic submissions, just as Teachers are and must acknowledge sources other than their own. Both Teachers and Students must honour the Course and Unit Learning Outcomes and AITC Policies.

3.6 **Academic misconduct** includes but is not limited to conduct that involves plagiarism and any other dishonest conduct by a Student to gain academic or general advantage; or conduct that otherwise contravenes the provisions of AITC's academic rules, policies, procedures and/or guidelines. Dishonesty in the preparation or presentation of any assessable work is regarded as student academic misconduct. Academic misconduct includes, but is not limited to:

- a) Cheating: behaving deceitfully or dishonestly in examinations, in the preparation of assessable items and during in-class tests.
- b) Fabrication: intentional and unauthorised falsification or invention of any information or citation in an academic exercise.
- c) Intentionally or recklessly facilitating academic dishonesty by other Students.
- d) Providing an assessment item, or providing access to an assessment item to others, either directly or indirectly, in circumstances where it is reasonably foreseeable that it will be used dishonestly.
- e) Deceitful behaviour by which it is sought to gain some unfair or dishonest advantage either for yourself or for another person.
- f) Misleading ascription of authorship (including claiming authorship of parts of a group assignment prepared by other Students).
- g) Misrepresentation: misrepresenting data or information incorrectly, improperly or falsely including unreferenced information gained through the use of Artificial Intelligence.
- h) Behaving in any way that limits the academic opportunities of other Students by improperly.
- i) Impeding their work or their access to educational resources.
- j) Re-using one's own work without appropriate acknowledgement.
- k) Using unauthorised equipment or material in an assessment item.
- l) Using another person to undertake an examination or assessment item in your name.

4. Principles

4.1 AITC will adopt the following principles in its academic and research integrity practices:

- a) Intellectual honesty in proposing, performing, and reporting research and all assessment activities.
- b) Accuracy in representing contributions to assessments, research proposals and reports.
- c) Fairness in peer review.
- d) Collegiality in scientific interactions, including communications and sharing of resources.

-
- e) Transparency in conflicts of interest or potential conflicts of interest.
 - f) Protection of human subjects in the conduct of research.
 - g) Humane care of animals in the conduct of research.
 - h) Adherence to the mutual responsibilities between investigators and research participants (National Research Council of the National Academies, 2002).

5. Roles & Responsibilities

- 5.1 All Staff and Students must ensure that they understand and comply with legal restrictions and obligations (e.g. copyright) relating to Academic Integrity.
- 5.2 AITC has a responsibility to:
 - a) Promote the values of Academic Integrity.
 - b) Provide Students and Staff with resources to ensure that Students are supported to develop the skills required to uphold the values of Academic Integrity in all academic endeavours.
- 5.3 The academic management team has a responsibility to provide Staff with knowledge, skills and resources that will assist them in supporting academic integrity through teaching and research, and in supporting Students to acquire and demonstrate the values of academic integrity.
- 5.4 Unit Coordinators have a responsibility to design assessment tasks and study loads in such a way that supports academic integrity and minimises opportunities for plagiarism and other forms of academic misconduct.
- 5.5 In accordance with the Staff Code of Conduct, Academic Staff have a responsibility to:
 - a) Be familiar with Academic Integrity requirements at AITC and continuously contribute to upholding a culture of Academic Integrity (this includes but is not limited to the appropriate conduct of lectures, tutorials and revision classes).
 - b) Ensure that confidential materials and information, such as examination questions and assessment marking guides, are handled with the upmost care and confidentiality at all times.
 - c) Inform all Students of acknowledgement practices that are appropriate for their fields of study and provide clear examples of what is acceptable.
 - d) Clearly explain academic expectations and what constitutes plagiarism or other forms of academic misconduct to Students.
 - e) Provide clear instructions in plain English and avoid using wording or terms that may be misunderstood by Students with a non-English speaking background.
 - f) Follow the assessment design requirements as outlined in the relevant policies to promote Academic Integrity.

-
- g) Set appropriate conditions for group work and make clear the distinction between group work and individual work.
 - h) Cultivate in Students a climate of respect for authorship and for acknowledging the source of ideas.
 - i) Actively seek to detect plagiarism and identify and act whenever plagiarism or other forms of academic misconduct is suspected.
 - j) Be aware of indicators that may assist in the identification of breaches of Academic Integrity.
 - k) Carry out or request investigations of student academic misconduct in accordance with this policy.

5.6 Students have a responsibility to:

- a) Submit only work which properly acknowledges the ideas, designs, words or works of others in what is otherwise their own original work.
- b) Avoid lending or otherwise providing original work to others for any reason other than where work is provided to another Student in the course of collaboration in connection with group work assessment, and subject to any requirements imposed on Students in connection with such collaboration.
- c) Have a clear understanding of the conditions of assessment, including assessment task requirements, appropriate source acknowledgement practices, and marking criteria.
- d) Provide, when requested (and where the item of work has been prepared using electronic means), an electronic copy of any work to Academic Staff involved in marking the work.
- e) Be clear about the acknowledgement practices that are appropriate for their field of study.
- f) Be aware of the collective responsibility of proper source acknowledgement within group assignments and be able to support their claims of authorship in a group assignment.
- g) Encourage other Students to uphold the values of academic integrity and discourage other Students from plagiarising or carrying out other forms of academic misconduct.

5.7 The Course Coordinator has a responsibility to carry out investigations of student academic misconduct in accordance with the Policy and report to the Academic Board through the Academic Dean.

6. Prevention and Detection of Plagiarism and Other Forms of Academic Misconduct

- 6.1 AITC will take steps to detect plagiarism and other forms of academic misconduct. These may include manual searches of resources, as well as the use of electronic text matching software (e.g. Turnitin) to compare work submitted for assessment against electronic text on the publicly accessible internet, in published works, on commercial databases, and in Student previously submitted assignments.

- 6.2 **Artificial Intelligence (AI).** Any abuse of artificial intelligence is a breach of academic integrity (ai). The rise of AI technology has brought about a significant shift in how companies and legal entities operate, and the widespread use of AI products has also brought tremendous challenges to academic integrity. Acknowledging that not all AI can be detected is crucial, especially concerning its implications for summative assessment in higher education. Understanding the varying detectability of AI use informs strategies for ensuring academic honesty and fair evaluation processes. One of the main ethical (ai) concerns, especially those related to plagiarism and other aspects of academic integrity, becomes the salient point after including AI. Privacy and security issues are paramount in AI technologies, necessitating robust measures to safeguard sensitive information and ensure public trust. In academic and professional fields, distinguishing between human-generated and AI-generated content is vital for maintaining integrity and value. This distinction is typically achieved through digital watermarking and content-tracking technologies. They emphasise that Students need to be literate AI users in their major fields. As a result, crafting ethical principles and best practices for AI applications becomes a significant issue. The guidelines established will ensure that the work is transparent and of high quality, ensuring that AI remains consistent with academic and professional standards.
- 6.3 In the academic setting, there are various assessment methods: formative assignments, summative assignments, and summative examinations, each requiring different approaches to maintain integrity when incorporating AI. Some ideas are canvassed in Table 1, so that Students can use AI and realise when not to use it.

Table 1: Assessment and AI

TYPE	ASSESSMENT	AI USAGE	ACADEMIC INTEGRITY TOOLS
Formative Assignments	Open-book, at-home	AI can be used to assist in exploring concepts and generating drafts. Students should integrate their insights to ensure depth of understanding.	Regular feedback sessions; comparison of Student submissions over time to monitor style and content consistency.
Summative Assignments	Closed-book, invigilated	AI is used in preliminary research stages under monitored settings. The final submission must reflect the Student's synthesis and original thinking.	Plagiarism detection software (e.g., Turnitin); manual content review against course materials; confusion of technical terms with their everyday meaning; e.g., "group" in mathematics.
Summative Examinations	Traditional closed-book under supervision	AI-driven simulations or problem-solving tasks within controlled environments to test real-time application of knowledge.	Proctoring software for online exams; style and keyword analysis to detect inconsistencies in Student writing. Oral testing of a random sample of Students.

7. Actions and Penalties

7.1 If an allegation of student academic misconduct is made, the Course Coordinator will investigate the matter by:

- a) Advising the Student in writing of the referral.
- b) Issuing the Student with a notice to show cause in relation to the allegation with advice that failure to respond within 10 days may result in confirmation of the allegation and imposition of a penalty.
- c) Examining the material with reference to the academic integrity policy.
- d) Using any electronic text-matching software (i.e., Turnitin) or other methods of detecting dishonesty made available by AITC.
- e) Considering any evidence or representations deemed necessary to undertake an assessment of the matter.

7.2 If any form of student academic misconduct is found to have occurred, a range of actions may be taken, or penalties imposed:

- a) Remedial action such as counselling or training on proper academic conventions and techniques and/or allowing the Student to re-attempt the assessment item without loss of marks.
- b) Allowing the Student to re-attempt the assessment item with a capped mark.
- c) Allowing the Student to complete a new piece of work with a capped mark.
- d) Excluding any parts resulting from dishonest practices and referring the assessment item for remarking appropriate to the work completed.
- e) Awarding no marks for the assessment item.
- f) Awarding a fail grade in a course or courses.
- g) Imposing a suspension, with or without conditions, for a specified period.
- h) Imposing an exclusion, with or without conditions, for a specified period, after which the Student will be required to apply for re-admission to AITC.
- i) Expelling the Student from AITC.

Students under investigation for student academic misconduct will not be eligible to graduate until the matter is resolved.

7.3 An alleged breach of this policy conducted by Academic Staff may amount to a breach of the Staff Code of Conduct and will be dealt with accordingly.

8. Education Integrity Decision-Making and Penalties

A framework (See Appendix A) developed by the University of Sydney highlights considerations and provides examples of types of academic integrity breaches and the indicative outcomes. This table may be used by AITC to inform decisions regarding academic integrity breaches. (<https://www.sydney.edu.au/policies/showdoc.aspx?recnum=PDOC2018/476&RendNum=0>)

(Accessed 29 September 2025)

9. Recording Outcomes

- 9.1 Once a determination has been made a misconduct matter, the Course Coordinator will document the decision and relevant conditions of an imposed penalty.
- 9.2 The Student will be informed in writing of the decision.
- 9.3 The Student Administration and Enrolment Staff will be informed of this for the purposes of appropriately recording the misconduct on the Student's academic record and/or amending the Student's enrolment.

10. Appeal Process

- 10.1 An appeal against a determination in a Student misconduct matter can be lodged by the Student if there is:
 - a) Evidence of a breach of this policy or general principles of procedural fairness.
 - b) The suggestion that the decision was affected by a conflict of interest or personal bias.
 - c) New information that could not reasonably have been provided prior to the hearing and it is probable that this information would have affected the decision.
- 10.2 An appeal on the grounds of penalty alone will not be considered.
- 10.3 An appeal against a determination made by the Course Coordinator may be made in writing to the Academic Dean within 20 days of Notice of the Decision and the grounds for appeal must be clearly set out.
- 10.4 Upon receipt of the Appeal, the Academic Dean (AD) shall undertake a preliminary review to determine the validity of the appeal. Once determined, and within 10 days of receiving the Appeal, the AD may:
 - a) Dismiss the Appeal if not valid.
 - b) Decide in relation to the Appeal.
 - c) Refer the Appeal to the Academic Board for determination.

Australian Institute of Technology & Commerce Pty Ltd

ABN 47 634 668 214 CRICOS Code: 03996D

Head Office: Level 6, 8 Quay Street, Haymarket NSW 2000

Website: www.aitc.nsw.edu.au Email: info@aitc.nsw.edu.au

Phone: 02 9211 4958



-
- 10.5 The Appeal Decision (made by the AD or the Academic Board) is final and there is no further avenue of appeal within AITC. However, the Student has the right to further appeal outside AITC (please see the Student Grievance Mediation Policy for information on external mediators).
 - 10.6 In making a decision in relation to the Appeal, the original decision may be confirmed, varied or set aside.
 - 10.7 The Student will be informed in writing of the Appeal's Decision outlining reasons for the decision.
 - 10.8 Relevant Staff within AITC will be informed of the Appeal's Decision and appropriate records will be made.

11. Appendices

Appendix A: Education Integrity Decision-Making and Penalties framework

CRITERIA	NO BREACH	MINOR BREACH	MAJOR BREACH	POTENTIAL MISCONDUCT
<p>Stage of candidature</p> <p>The student's stage of candidature and level of study required for the unit.</p>	<p>Early stage of candidature (e.g., an undergraduate or postgraduate student in their first semester).</p>	<p>Usually applied for early- to mid-stage of candidature (e.g. an undergraduate student in their first year of study or postgraduate student with their first semester).</p>	<p>Usually mid- to late-stage of candidature but can be applied for serious conduct that occurs in a student's first year of study.</p>	<p>Any stage of candidature.</p>
<p>Academic integrity record</p> <p>Prior educational interventions or findings should be considered to understand the student's knowledge of academic integrity requirements.</p>	<p>No prior findings and/or formal development requirements on record.</p>	<p>No prior findings and/or formal development requirements on record.</p>	<p>May have prior findings and/or formal development requirements on record.</p> <p>Note: A further minor breach may constitute a major breach unless the conduct occurred before the student was informed of the initial breach.</p>	<p>May have prior findings on record.</p>
<p>Type and extent of the breach</p> <p>Assess the nature and severity of the breach with consideration of the affected components and proportionate impact to the student's submission (see examples below).</p> <p>Consideration of the assessment weighting to determine the impact to the student's ability to successfully complete the unit of study.</p>	<p>Minimal unattributed content and limited to a very small number of instances.</p> <p>No penalty applied but corrective feedback may be necessary.</p>	<p>Minor instances of poor academic practice which may reasonably be attributed to inadvertence or a failure to fully understand referencing requirements or acceptable academic practice.</p> <p>Educationally focussed outcome which may include a minor mark reduction or remedial action. The application of a penalty should not significantly impact the student's ability to pass the unit of study.</p>	<p>Instances of inappropriate academic practice which involve:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> subsequent failure to understand referencing requirements; or show persistent or reckless disregard for appropriate academic practice; or involve a moderate or high volume of unattributed content <p>Penalty determined based on the severity of the conduct. The assessment weighting may be considered in determining the appropriate penalty relative to the reported conduct.</p>	<p>Conduct which may constitute academic misconduct, including serious or repeated academic integrity breaches.</p> <p>The assessment weighting does not impact the decision to refer the matter to the Registrar.</p>
<p>Decision maker</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Unit of Study Coordinators (minor plagiarism or recycling) Educational Integrity Coordinator or nominated academic 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Unit of Study Coordinators (minor plagiarism or recycling) Educational Integrity Coordinator or nominated academic 	<p>Educational Integrity Coordinators or nominated academics.</p> <p>Note: A major breach outcome can only be applied after an allegation has been issued and the decision maker has considered any submissions made in response.</p>	<p>Registrar</p>

ALLEGATION TYPE	NATURE OF BREACH	EXPERIENCE OF THE STUDENT	FINDING	INDICATIVE OUTCOME
<p>Minor plagiarism</p> <p>– arising from failure to understand referencing requirements or inadvertence</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Plagiarised material is minimal and limited to a very small number of instances. Genuine attempt to acknowledge sources, possibly with imprecision in use of referencing conventions. Corrective feedback sufficient. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Any stage of candidature. No prior findings and/or formal development requirements on record. 	No breach	<p>Unit coordinator, Educational Integrity Coordinator or nominated academic:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> No penalty Work to be marked on merit Corrective feedback provided
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Plagiarised material is of low to moderate volume. Genuine attempt to acknowledge sources, possibly with imprecision in use of referencing conventions. Examples include: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> (a) not including quotation marks around, or otherwise appropriately identifying, a direct quotation; (b) incorrect referencing; (c) poor paraphrasing; (d) incorrect direct quotation. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Early- to mid-stage of candidature. No prior findings and/or formal development requirements on record. 	Minor breach	<p>Unit coordinator, Educational Integrity Coordinator or nominated academic:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Mandatory development activity (Avoiding Plagiarism Module) Mark reduction up to 15% of the total available marks for low weighted assessment or 5-10% for moderate to high weighted assessment.
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Significant portion of unreferenced or poorly paraphrased work. An attempt to acknowledge sources, possibly with imprecision in use of referencing conventions. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Any stage of candidature, though students in their first year may be treated as minor if no prior finding on record. May or may not have prior findings and/or formal development requirements on record. 	Major breach	<p>Unit coordinator:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Refer for review <p>Educational Integrity Coordinator or nominated academic:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Mark reduction up to 40% of the total available marks May also direct the student to undertake development activity (Avoiding Plagiarism Module)
<p>Plagiarism – arising from dishonesty or negligence</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Low volume of plagiarised material, with insufficient attempt to paraphrase and/or acknowledge all sources. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Early- to mid-stage of candidature. No prior findings and/or formal development requirements on record. 	Minor breach	<p>Unit coordinator:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Refer for review <p>Educational Integrity Coordinator or nominated academic:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Mandatory development activity (Avoiding Plagiarism Module) Mark reduction up to 40% of the total available marks

Australian Institute of Technology & Commerce Pty Ltd

ABN 47 634 668 214 CRICOS Code: 03996D

Head Office: Level 6, 8 Quay Street, Haymarket NSW 2000

Website: www.aitc.nsw.edu.au Email: info@aitc.nsw.edu.au

Phone: 02 9211 4958



ALLEGATION TYPE	NATURE OF BREACH	EXPERIENCE OF THE STUDENT	FINDING	INDICATIVE OUTCOME
<p>Plagiarism</p> <p>– arising from dishonesty (continued from previous page)</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Moderate to high volume of plagiarised material, for example a significant portion of unreferenced or poorly paraphrased work. Limited or no attempt to paraphrase or acknowledge source material appropriately or accurately, demonstrating reckless disregard for academic standards. Citing sources which have not been read without acknowledging the secondary source from which the information has been obtained. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Any stage of candidature. May or may not have prior findings and/or formal development requirements on record. 	Major breach	<p><i>Unit coordinator:</i></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Refer for review <p><i>Educational Integrity Coordinator or nominated academic:</i></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> No prior finding: Fail low weighted assessment (0%) or mark reduction between 25 - 50% of the total available marks for moderate to high weighted assessment Prior finding: Fail item of assessment (0%) May also direct the student to undertake development activity (Avoiding Plagiarism Module)
<p>Recycling</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Recycled material is relevant to task, minimal and limited to a small number of instances. Genuine, but insufficient attempt to paraphrase from, or no acknowledgement of, the previously submitted work. Cautionary feedback sufficient. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Any stage of candidature. No prior findings and/or formal development requirements on record. 	No breach	<p><i>Unit coordinator, Educational Integrity Coordinator or nominated academic:</i></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> No penalty Work to be marked on merit Corrective feedback provided
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Recycled material is relevant and of low or moderate volume without acknowledgement of prior use. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Any stage of candidature. No prior findings on record. 	Minor breach	<p><i>Unit coordinator, Educational Integrity Coordinator or nominated academic:</i></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Mandatory development activity (can incl. Academic Honesty Education Module) Mark reduction up to 15% of the total available marks for low weighted assessment or 5-10% for moderate to high weighted assessment
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Recycled material is unacknowledged and of moderate or high volume. The extent of recycling may demonstrate limited or no engagement with the assessment task and/or learning outcomes specific to the unit of study. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Any stage of candidature. May or may not have prior findings on record. 	Major breach	<p><i>Unit coordinator:</i></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Refer for review <p><i>Educational Integrity Coordinator or nominated academic:</i></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> No prior finding: Specified maximum mark of 50% or appropriate mark reduction for moderate to high weighted assessment Prior (equivalent) finding: Fail item of assessment (0%) May also direct the student to undertake development activity (can incl. Academic Honesty Education Module)

Australian Institute of Technology & Commerce Pty Ltd

ABN 47 634 668 214 CRICOS Code: 03996D

Head Office: Level 6, 8 Quay Street, Haymarket NSW 2000

Website: www.aitc.nsw.edu.au Email: info@aitc.nsw.edu.au

Phone: 02 9211 4958



ALLEGATION TYPE	NATURE OF BREACH	EXPERIENCE OF THE STUDENT	FINDING	INDICATIVE OUTCOME
Collusion (i.e. working with another student or group of students in completing assessment tasks or copying the work of another student)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> The task is a formative task or of low weighting relative to the overall assessment. Students have worked together but have genuinely misunderstood the limits of acceptable collaboration. Provision of work (donor student) was inappropriate but done in good faith. Collusion results in minor similarities between submissions, with evidence of their individual contribution to the submitted work. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Early stage of candidature. No prior findings on record. 	Minor breach	<p><i>Unit coordinator:</i></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Refer for review <p><i>Educational Integrity Coordinator or nominated academic:</i></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Donor: No penalty Recipient: Mark reduction for the affected component, generally up to 40% of the total available marks May direct the students to undertake development activity (Academic Honesty Education Module)
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Student has copied work from another student or students have worked together in completing an individual task. Evidence of illegitimate cooperation is obvious. Collusion results in substantial similar submissions (e.g. can include large portions of identical matched text or instances where the submitted work follows the same structure, key points and references, potentially reworked to avoid detection). 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Any stage of candidature. May or may not have prior findings and/or formal development requirements on record. 	Major breach	<p><i>Unit coordinator:</i></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Refer for review <p><i>Educational Integrity Coordinator or nominated academic:</i></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> No prior finding: Fail item of low weighted assessment (0%) or appropriate mark reduction for moderate to high weighted assessment Prior finding: Fail unit of study (0% - 49%)
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Systematic and/or sophisticated attempt to conceal extent of cooperation, which may span multiple units of study. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Any stage of candidature May have prior (equivalent) finding or multiple findings on record. 	Potential misconduct	<p><i>Educational Integrity Coordinator or nominated academic:</i></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Refer to Registrar
Contract cheating, including the submission of work that has been completed by, or with contribution from, a third party. It also includes the engagement of a third party or accepting an engagement from another student to complete or contribute to an assessment	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> The work contains a low to moderate amount of material plagiarised or paraphrased from the work of another student, for example a paper taken from a document sharing platform, but which is counterbalanced by sufficient evidence of substantial contribution of original content by the student submitting the work. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Any stage of candidature. May have prior (equivalent) finding on record. 	Major breach	<p><i>Educational Integrity Coordinator or nominated academic:</i></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> No prior finding: Fail item of low weighted assessment (0%) or appropriate mark reduction for moderate to high weighted assessment Prior finding: Fail for unit of study (0 - 49%) May also direct the student to undertake development activity (Academic Honesty Education Module)

Australian Institute of Technology & Commerce Pty Ltd

ABN 47 634 668 214 CRICOS Code: 03996D

Head Office: Level 6, 8 Quay Street, Haymarket NSW 2000

Website: www.aitc.nsw.edu.au Email: info@aitc.nsw.edu.au

Phone: 02 9211 4958



ALLEGATION TYPE	NATURE OF BREACH	EXPERIENCE OF THE STUDENT	FINDING	INDICATIVE OUTCOME
Fabricating data, information or sources	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Submitted work is relevant, contains no plagiarised content, and includes only single instance of inaccurate attribution to an unverifiable or non-existent source. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Any stage of candidature. No prior findings on record 	Minor breach	<p><i>Educational Integrity Coordinator or nominated academic:</i></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Specified mark reduction of 5% or 10% of the total available marks May also direct the student to undertake development activity (can incl. Academic Honesty Education Module)
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Evidence of systematic or deliberate attempt to mislead the examiner, either by concealing: (a) the extent and/or quality of the empirical or scholarly research or (b) the actual sources of paraphrased or plagiarised material. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Any stage of candidature. May or may not have prior findings on record. 	Major breach	<p><i>Educational Integrity Coordinator or nominated academic:</i></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> No prior finding: Fail item of low weighted assessment (0%) or appropriate mark reduction for moderate to high weighted assessment Prior finding: Fail unit of study (0% - 49%)
		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Multiple findings on record 	Potential misconduct	<p><i>Educational Integrity Coordinator or nominated academic:</i></p> <p>Refer to Registrar</p>
Inappropriate publication or upload of an assessment, University teaching or course material to a file-sharing or online platform	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> A single instance of upload of own assignment to a document sharing platform. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Any stage of candidature. No prior findings on record. 	No breach	<p><i>Educational Integrity Coordinator or nominated academic:</i></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> No penalty Warning as appropriate
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Publishing confidential questions from an exam, quiz or assessment to an online platform. Uploading multiple assignments to a document sharing platform. Evidence that material was uploaded to obtain solutions. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Any stage of candidature. 	Major breach	<p><i>Educational Integrity Coordinator or nominated academic:</i></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> No prior finding: Fail low weighted assessment (0%) or appropriate mark reduction for moderate to high weighted assessment
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Evidence of systematic or calculated provision of an assignment or answers. Multiple uploads of University teaching or course materials. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Any stage of candidature. 	Potential misconduct	<p><i>Educational Integrity Coordinator or nominated academic:</i></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Refer to Registrar