



STUDENT ACADEMIC INTEGRITY POLICY AND PROCEDURE

1. Overview

- 1.1. Kingsford Institute of Higher Education ("the Institute") upholds the principle that academic integrity relies on the application of honesty in all scholarly endeavours. Therefore, the Institute expects its students will conduct themselves in their academic studies honestly and ethically and carefully acknowledge the work of others in all their educational activities.
- 1.2. This policy describes academic misconduct to students¹ and outlines the Institute's response to instances of academic misconduct that are detected, including responsibilities for monitoring and reporting incidents of academic misconduct.

2. Shared Responsibility for Academic Integrity

- 2.1. The pursuit of academic integrity is a shared responsibility among all the Institute's students and staff to:
 - a. demonstrate and uphold the Student Academic Integrity Policy;
 - b. act consistently with the provisions of the Academic Freedom, Integrity and Free Intellectual Enquiry Policy;
 - c. adhere to good academic practice and avoid practices that might be considered academic misconduct;
 - d. report any breaches or suspected breaches of academic integrity or misconduct.
- 2.2. It is the responsibility of the Institute to:
 - a. provide resources and support to students to develop their knowledge and skills in academic integrity;
 - b. provide resources and support to staff to assist them in providing appropriate academic integrity guidance and feedback to students;
 - c. provide appropriate mechanisms for all members of the Institute to report alleged breaches of academic integrity anonymously and confidentially.

3. Types of academic misconduct

- 3.1. Academic misconduct involves plagiarism, cheating, collusion, recycling or resubmitting work, contract cheating or impersonation, fabricating information, or any other conduct that deliberately or inadvertently claims ownership of an idea or concept without acknowledging the source of information. Such behaviours include any activity that negates the academic integrity of the student, another student or their work.
- 3.2. Plagiarism occurs when students fail to acknowledge the use of the ideas of others.
- 3.3. Specifically, it occurs when:
 - a. other people's work or ideas are paraphrased and presented without a reference;
 - b. other students' work is copied or partly copied;
 - c. the student offers other people's designs, code or images as theirs;
 - d. phrases and passages are used verbatim without quotation marks or a reference to the author or source;
 - e. lecture notes are reproduced without due acknowledgement.
- 3.4. Cheating occurs when a student seeks an unfair advantage in an examination or other written or practical work required to be submitted or completed for assessment. Students should note that this includes using generative artificial intelligence (e.g., ChatGPT) outside authorised guidelines.

¹ The expectation of academic integrity in relation to the Institute's staff is contained in the *Academic Freedom, Integrity and Free Intellectual Enquiry Policy*



- 3.5. Collusion (unauthorised collaboration) involves working with others without permission to produce work subsequently presented as work completed independently by the student. Collusion is a form of plagiarism. Students should not knowingly allow copying of their work.
- 3.6. Recycling or resubmitting already graded work is considered academic misconduct.
- 3.7. Contract cheating involves paying another person (or receiving payment) to complete a work that is not your own and submitting it as if you had completed it yourself. It includes paying someone (or receiving payment) to sit an exam, complete a report, write an essay or some other form of assessment. Uploading lecture slides, exam questions and example assignments to cheating services is also considered academic misconduct.
- 3.8. Fabricating information involves citing sources that do not exist or inventing sources of information that do not exist.

4. Notification to students

- 4.1. All student unit guides will explain the meaning of academic misconduct, give students clear instructions on whether they are permitted to work on an assignment jointly and provide clear guidelines relating to all aspects of group work.
- 4.2. The student unit guides will also provide adequate information to students about referencing requirements and academic conventions for using others' work, including advice on avoiding plagiarism and other forms of academic misconduct.
- 4.3. The student unit guides will refer students to this policy.

5. Prevention and detection of plagiarism

- 5.1. To prevent plagiarism, teaching staff are responsible for explaining to students both good scholarly practice and the concept of plagiarism.
- 5.2. The student unit guides will advise students about referencing requirements and academic conventions for the use of others' work as well as how to avoid plagiarism. Also, resources on referencing techniques are available through the Institute's Library. The Library will also host academic integrity workshops, which students are strongly encouraged to attend.
- 5.3. When marking assessments, teaching staff may detect possible plagiarism by observing changes in formatting within a paper, including a mixture of quotation marks; changes in writing style within a paper; suddenly improved writing style; a paper veering away from the topic; lack of recent reference sources or unusual or anachronistic references; and common phrases appearing in more than one paper.
- 5.4. If a teaching staff member believes plagiarism has occurred, they can search for a key phrase on a search engine (preferably enclosed in quotation marks).
- 5.5. If plagiarism of an Internet site seems to have occurred, it is advisable to print out the material in case the site is changed or removed.
- 5.6. Students must submit all papers in electronic format (through Turnitin) to be subject to electronic scanning to detect plagiarism.

6. Guidelines on the use of generative artificial intelligence

- 6.1. Generative artificial intelligence (AI) is an AI model capable of generating text, images, code, video, and audio. Large Language Models (LLMs) such as ChatGPT and Copilot produce text from large datasets in response to text prompts.
- 6.2. Using generative AI may be restricted or banned in some units or tasks. Alternatively, some units or tasks might encourage or require AI use. Unit outlines will specify the use of generative AI.
- 6.3. Students must use AI models ethically and responsibly, consistent with *QAF020 Student Assessment Policy and Procedure* and the current policy.



- 6.4. The ethical use of generative AI includes an obligation to adhere to the following guidelines regarding the use of generative AI in any unit or course:
- Students must check any output from generative AI against reliable sources of information and understand that they will be responsible for any errors or omissions in material generated by AI.
 - Students must identify AI models, tools or prompts appropriate for their discipline and acknowledge the use of AI in written assessments through footnotes or endnotes. If it is not possible to identify and cite the sources used in output from AI, this may result in an allegation of plagiarism and academic misconduct.
 - Students must be aware of the possibility of “hallucinated references” or the tendency of generative AI language models to make up references from constituent parts of actual references.
 - Students must acknowledge the use of generative AI language models in assessment tasks. They must describe how they used the tool and integrated the results into their work. Such descriptions may take the form of written acknowledgement within the text, a footnote or an endnote. In the case of code, such disclosures must take the form of a comment.
 - The unauthorised use of AI language models or paraphrasing tools constitutes cheating and may result in academic misconduct. Therefore, work submitted (including work generated by AI), and not cited or referenced, must be students’ original work.
 - Students need to be aware that using the output from AI models without appropriate acknowledgement may constitute academic misconduct. If unsure, students should confirm assessment requirements with teaching staff or seek advice on how to acknowledge the output from AI from academic support services, including the Library.
- 6.5. Students must further understand that using generative AI in all circumstances is not appropriate.
- 6.6. Furthermore, students should familiarise themselves with any relevant expectations or constraints on using generative AI related to their future professional accreditation and be aware that these may be updated.

7. Allegation of academic misconduct

- 7.1. Teaching staff must notify the Course Coordinator when they suspect academic misconduct. There must be firm evidence of academic misconduct before making an allegation.
- 7.2. The Course Coordinator will put the matter to the student(s) and allow them to respond to the allegation of academic misconduct. The student(s) must be called to a meeting where they are given details of the suspected academic misconduct and a chance to defend the allegation. The Course Coordinator should inform the student(s) of the penalties that may apply if academic misconduct is proven. In cases where it is impracticable for a student to attend such a meeting, the Course Coordinator must put particulars of the alleged academic misconduct to the student in writing. Further, the student should be asked to respond within ten working days of receiving the written communication.
- 7.3. The Course Coordinator must decide whether the allegation of academic misconduct is upheld or rejected and, if so, whether the academic misconduct was intentional or unintentional.
- 7.4. When deciding whether the alleged academic misconduct was unintentional, the Course Coordinator should consider several factors, such as:
- the student is in the first year of the course and has not received a prior warning;
 - the student is from an educational background where different norms apply for the acknowledgement of sources;

- c. negligible plagiarism;
 - d. the student has made an inadequate attempt at referencing.
- 7.5. An indication that alleged academic misconduct was intentional may be:
- a. that the students in the cohort received information on how to acknowledge extracts and quotations, and the student was present and received written information and knew that the use of material without acknowledgement was unacceptable;
 - b. that the student had received a prior warning about academic misconduct.

8. Penalties for academic misconduct

- 8.1. If an allegation of academic misconduct is investigated and upheld, the Course Coordinator must determine an appropriate penalty within ten working days of the. Each finding of academic misconduct is treated on its merits. Before deciding on the penalty, the Course Coordinator will refer to the central register to detect repeated infringements of academic misconduct (refer section 9.1).

8.2. Unintentional academic misconduct

- 8.2.1. Where the Course Coordinator determines that academic misconduct was not intentional, they may take one of the following possible actions:
- a. warn the student and mark the assessment item without penalty (deduction of marks); or
 - b. warn the student and mark the assessment item with a penalty; or
 - c. warn the student, request resubmission, and mark the assessment item with or without penalty.
- 8.2.2. The Course Coordinator must communicate written warnings and penalties to the student, recording them on the student's file. The student shall also be advised of their right to appeal the finding of academic misconduct and the penalty imposed.

8.3. Intentional academic misconduct

- 8.3.1. Before the Course Coordinator determines that the finding of academic misconduct was intentional, they must consider the student's response (if any) to the allegation. For example, suppose the student fails to respond to an allegation of intentional academic misconduct or cannot convince the Course Coordinator that the academic misconduct was unintentional. In that case, the Course Coordinator will determine the appropriate penalty for the finding of intentional academic misconduct, which may be one or more of the following:
- a. the student may be required to undertake additional or alternative assessment (the maximum mark possible being a Pass grade);
 - b. a grade of Fail may be recorded for the assessment item;
 - c. a grade of Fail may be recorded for the unit of study;
 - d. the student may be withdrawn from the course for a period of specified time;
 - e. the student may be excluded from the course and expelled from the Institute.
- 8.3.2. The most severe penalties (withdrawal or exclusion) are usually reserved for cases of repeated academic misconduct.
- 8.3.3. The basis on which the academic misconduct has been determined to be intentional and the penalty that has been determined must be communicated in writing to the student, and a copy must be kept on the student's file. The student shall also be advised of their right to appeal the finding of academic misconduct and the penalty imposed.

9. Further education

- 9.1. If academic misconduct is found, but the student is not expelled from the Institute, the student must receive professional development in techniques to promote academic integrity and avoid future academic misconduct.

10. Recording and reporting incidences of academic misconduct

- 10.1. All proven cases of academic misconduct are entered into a central register to allow for verification of repeated infringements. The Dean maintains this register.
- 10.2. All proven incidences of academic misconduct will be reported to the Teaching and Learning Committee for review and to determine if any corrective action is required to address systemic academic misconduct. In addition, the Learning and Teaching Committee will provide an annual report on academic misconduct to the Academic Board for review.

11. Review of decision

- 11.1. A student may request a review of a decision made under this policy. The grounds for a review are that the decision is inconsistent with this policy. Requests for a review must be made in writing and lodged with the Dean within ten working days of the student receiving written notification of the decision. The Dean will respond in writing to the request within twenty working days and may confirm or vary the decision. All decisions of the Dean relating to requests for the review of a decision made under this policy will be reported to the Learning and Teaching Committee.
- 11.2. If a student remains dissatisfied with the outcome of their request for a review, they may utilise the Institute's *Student Grievance Handling Policy and Procedure*.

1. Version history

Version	Approved by	Approval Date	Details
1.0	Academic Board	9 June 2023	Document creation and initial approval

Document owner: Dean