

Academic Integrity Policy and Procedure

Table of Contents

1. Policy Principles 3
2. Academic Integrity Support 3
3. Types of Academic Misconduct 4
4. Procedures and Penalties 6
5. Responsible and Ethical Use of AI 9
7. Appeals 10
8. Review and Evaluation 11
Version Control 12

Policy Statement	
Purpose	Glencoe Institute of Higher Education ('the Institute') *Academic Integrity Policy and Procedure* ('the Policy') outlines the principles and fundamentals of academic integrity and the Institute's measures to promote a culture of Academic honesty in all academic endeavours. The Policy also outlines the procedures and consequences of academic dishonesty or breaches of academic integrity.
Scope	This Policy applies to all staff and the students of the Institute.
Definitions	For definitions, please refer to the *Dictionary of Terms.*

1. Policy Principles

The Institute:

a) aligns with Commonwealth and Western Australian legislation, including the *Higher Education Standards Framework (Threshold Standards) 2021 (HESF 2021),* the *Tertiary Education Quality and Standards Agency Act 2011(TEQSA Act),* the *Education Services for Overseas Students Act 2000 (ESOS Act),* the *National Code of Practice for Providers of Education and Training to Overseas Students 2018 (National Code)*, and relevant Western Australian laws, to ensure lawful, safe, and accountable practices;
b) upholds a commitment to honesty, trust, fairness and respect in all academic activities;
c) is committed to an educational approach to academic integrity that provides students with the practical academic skills for their future professional work;
d) supports students to become aware of academic expectations and what constitutes academic integrity and misconduct, considering their level of educational experience and their social and cultural background;
e) requires students to submit independent and original work, with proper acknowledgment of others' ideas and work, avoiding any intentional or unintentional misrepresentation as their own;
f) encourages collaboration between students and staff to promote and maintain a culture of academic honesty and open communication about expectations and consequences;
g) regularly reviews and updates the policies and procedures to adapt to evolving academic challenges and ensures the ongoing effectiveness of academic integrity measures;
h) aligns with and adheres to academic integrity standards, recognising the importance of maintaining the reputation and credibility of the Institute.

2. Academic Integrity Support

a) Student Information

i. As part of the new student orientation program, students are required to complete an academic learning module addressing academic integrity;
ii. The Institute's expectations of honesty and academic integrity are explicitly outlined in all Subject Outlines and are accompanied by directions to available additional support resources;

iii. The procedural requirement for students to confirm their adherence to this Policy with each assessment submission will be managed through administrative processes to ensure effective procedural oversight and Policy clarity.

b) The Academic Integrity Module (AIM)

AIM is a non-award, mandatory training module that must be completed by all students at the Institute. Students are required to complete the Academic Integrity Module at the commencement of their study. To accommodate diverse student circumstances, particularly for new international students, flexibility in the completion timeline may be provided. This ensures equitable access and meaningful engagement with the module, supporting a strong foundation in academic integrity from the outset of their studies. Students are expected to achieve a mastery level of 100% in the AIM assessment, and may repeat the module as often as required to attain this. Students may repeat the module as many times as they need to achieve this mark. Failure to complete the module may result in students being unable to re-enrol in their course, view their exam results, grades, or transcripts, or to graduate.

c) Academic Support Classes

Students are encouraged to attend the academic support classes conducted by the Academic Success Coordinator. The Institute is committed to providing guidance to students on topics including but not limited to:

i. Referencing;
ii. Research and databases;
iii. Effective time management;
iv. Exam preparation strategies;
v. Writing skills;
vi. Presentation skills.

3. Types of Academic Misconduct

The Institute identifies the following a range of the behaviours as academic misconduct that includes but is not limited to:

a) Plagiarism

Plagiarism refers to the act of presenting work that is not one's own without giving proper credit to the original source through acknowledgment, citation, or referencing whether intentionally or accidentally. This includes using generative artificial intelligence (AI) tools like ChatGPT to produce or modify work that is then submitted as their own.

To address the increasing use of AI in academic contexts, the Institute is committed to promoting its ethical and transparent use. For written assessment submissions, the Institute uses a text matching software (Turnitin) that assists in the detection of plagiarism, including content generated or altered using AI tools. This helps to uphold academic integrity and maintain high standards in academic practice.

b) Recycling

Submitting previously submitted work for a current assignment without proper authorisation is considered recycling or resubmitting. This practice undermines the principles of academic integrity by neglecting the requirement for original and current efforts in academic assessments.

c) Fabricating information

Fabrication involves making up information for research-focused assessment tasks, such as experimental or interview data. It can also include inventing sources of data, evidence, or ideas by citing publications that are incorrect or that simply do not exist.

d) Collusion

Collusion refers to unauthorised collaboration or cooperation with others on assessments, as opposed to legitimate group assignments. Unauthorised cooperation encompasses activities such as jointly producing individual work, sharing answers, or allowing substantial contributions to one's own work without proper acknowledgment. This undermines the equitable evaluation of individual knowledge and skills within an educational context.

e) Exam Cheating

Exam cheating involves dishonest actions during examinations to gain an unfair advantage. This includes, but is not limited to, copying from another student, using unauthorised equipment and/or materials, or communicating with others during the exam. Such behaviour compromises the integrity of the examination process and undermines the assessment of individual knowledge and understanding.

f) Contract cheating or impersonation

Contract cheating is a type of illegal cheating. It involves getting someone else, including family members, to complete part or all of one's own work and then submitting the work as if one had completed it on their own. This can include asking someone else to sit an exam on one's behalf or having them write an essay, report, or some other kind of assignment, which is sometimes referred to as 'ghost-writing'.

Actions that support contract cheating services are also considered breaches of academic integrity. This includes students uploading teaching materials such as practice exams, lecture slides, assignment questions etc to the ghost-writing service website, uploading such documents to any other website to receive documents in exchange.

g) Testamur Fraud

Testamur fraud includes the falsification, misuse, or misrepresentation of academic certification documents issued by the Institute or any other education provider. This includes presenting fraudulent qualifications, altering official documents, or using certification not legitimately conferred.

Such conduct constitutes a serious breach of academic integrity and will be treated as Level 3 misconduct, subject to the highest level of disciplinary action under this Policy.

4. Procedures and Penalties

a) Level 1(Minor or Unintentional)

Unintentional misconduct(s) (e.g., negligible plagiarism by students normally in their first study period) are usually dealt with in an educative manner with a more constructive and instructional approach such as educating the students about academic integrity, guiding them on how to avoid such issues in the future, and helping them understand the importance of proper citation and avoiding plagiarism.

i. The following procedures apply if it is the first academic integrity related offence:

a. The academic staff may issue a warning to the student, after checking the Academic Misconduct Register to confirm that it is a first offence, and require a resubmission of the assessment item addressing their concerns;
b. The academic staff reports the academic misconduct to the Academic Success Coordinator;
c. The Academic Success Coordinator communicates the warning to the student by email, advising that no penalty has been given but that the warning has been added to the student's record;
d. The student is required to redo their assessment or alternate assessment and redo and complete the AIM;
e. The Academic Success Coordinator updates the Academic Misconduct Register without imposing any grade penalty.

b) Level 2 (Intentional)

Intentional misconduct, deliberate plagiarism and repeat Level 1 offences are dealt with appropriate disciplinary measures to uphold academic integrity and maintain a fair learning environment.

i. Factors considered when determining Level 2 misconduct normally include but are not limited to, the following:

a. A prior warning had been given;
b. Repeat Level 1 offence(s);
c. There is significant, intentional plagiarism evidenced by report by Turnitin demonstrating a high 'percentage similarity without referencing.

ii. The following procedures apply:

a. In addition to process outlined for Level 1 misconduct, the Academic Success Coordinator will send an email to the student inviting them to participate in an interview with the reporting academic staff and the Academic Success Coordinator to address concerns related to academic integrity;
b. The interview is typically scheduled to take place within 5 to 10 working days of the student being contacted; however, this timeframe may vary depending on individual circumstances. The student may be accompanied by a support person of their choosing;

c. Following the interview, the Academic Success Coordinator and the reporting academic staff will deliberate on the student's responses and determine whether the allegation of academic misconduct has been substantiated;
d. Within 24 hours of the interview, the Academic Success Coordinator will report the outcome to the relevant Discipline Coordinator and the Dean. This communication may include a recording of the interview, the evidence presented, the student's responses, and a summary of the discussions held between the Academic Success Coordinator and the academic staff.

iii. Level 2 academic integrity misconduct involves intentional breaches and requires a considered and proportionate response. Penalties are subject to the discretion of the Dean or their delegate, and one or more may be applied, to ensure fairness, uphold educational integrity, and maintain consistent standards across the Institute.

In line with the Institute's commitment to transparency and procedural fairness, the following apply:

a. Assessment penalties may include the student being denied the opportunity to resubmit the assessment, resulting in a 0% grade for the affected assessment task. Alternatively, resubmission may be permitted with a capped mark (e.g., a maximum of 50%) to reinforce academic standards while supporting learning outcomes;
b. Disciplinary actions will be formally recorded in the *Academic Misconduct Register* and the student's academic file;
c. Additional or multiple penalties may be applied, as deemed appropriate by the Dean or delegate, in line with the severity and context of the misconduct;
d. The decision-making process will initially be led by the Academic Success Coordinator, who will review the case, assess the evidence, and recommend appropriate penalties in accordance with the Policy. Dean-level involvement is required in the following circumstances:

    - When the recommended penalty includes a grade of 0% for the assessment task with no opportunity for resubmission;
    - When multiple or escalating incidents of misconduct are identified;
    - When the proposed penalty may significantly impact the student's progression or eligibility to graduate.

    The Dean (or their delegate) will review the recommendation to ensure consistency, proportionality, and alignment with the Institute's academic integrity principles before making a final determination.

e. The student will be notified of the outcome of the review via the student email, normally within 10 working days of the decision;
f. Students will be informed of their right to appeal, in accordance with the *Student Grievance Management Policy and Procedure*.

c) Level 3 (Serious and Intentional)

Level 3 constitutes the most serious breaches, involving actions such as repeat offenses, clear collusion, plagiarism, contract cheating, and significant breaches of academic integrity. This level typically involves students in the later stages of their studies, who are expected to have acquired skills demonstrating academic integrity.

i. Factors determining Level 3 misconduct include but are not limited to:

a. Alleged offences that may impact the Institute's reputation;
b. Clear evidence of collusion among students;
c. Repeat Level 2 offence(s);
d. Contract cheating or exam cheating;
e. Testamur Fraud

ii. The following procedures apply:

a. The academic staff member will check the Academic Misconduct Register for previous allegations and report to the Academic Success Coordinator. The level of misconduct (Level 2 or Level 3) may not be immediately evident;
b. In addition to process outlined for Level 1 misconduct, the Academic Success Coordinator will send an email to the student inviting them to participate in an interview with the reporting academic staff and the Academic Success Coordinator to address concerns related to academic integrity;
c. The interview is typically scheduled to take place within 5 to 10 working days of the student being contacted; however, this timeframe may vary depending on individual circumstances. The student may be accompanied by a support person of their choosing;
d. Following the interview, the Academic Success Coordinator and the reporting academic staff report to the Discipline Coordinator and the Dean;
e. For Level 3 cases, the Discipline Coordinator and the Dean review the case following the interview and make a final determination on the level of misconduct and the appropriate penalty;
f. The outcome is normally determined within 5 working days of receiving documentation from the Academic Success Coordinator;
g. The Academic Success Coordinator updates the student record in the Academic Misconduct Register;
h. The student is notified via email, informing them of the right to appeal following the *Student Grievance Management Policy and Procedure*;
i. For international students, a suspension or cancellation of the student's enrolment will be reported to the Department of Home Affair after the appeals process is complete in line with the *Deferment, Suspension and Cancellation Policy and Procedure.*

iii. For a level 3 academic integrity misconduct penalties are subject to the discretion of the Institute as decided by the Discipline Coordinator and the Dean. One or more penalties may be applied which include, but are not limited to:

a. The student is awarded a 0% grade for the subject;
b. The student is awarded a 0% grade for the assignment;
c. No supplementary assessments are permitted;
d. A suspension or cancellation of the student's enrolment in the course;
e. Additional or multiple penalties may be applied, as deemed appropriate by the Dean or nominee.

5. Responsible and Ethical Use of AI

The Institute acknowledges the increasing prevalence of AI tools in higher education and affirms its commitment to promoting their ethical, transparent, and responsible use within academic practice. The use of generative AI technologies, such as ChatGPT and similar tools, must align with the core values of academic integrity—honesty, trust, fairness, respect, and responsibility.

Responsible use of AI involves:

a) Students may use AI tools to support learning, such as generating ideas, clarifying concepts, or enhancing understanding. However, AI must not be used to complete or generate substantial parts of assessments unless explicitly permitted;

b) Any use of AI tools in the development of academic work must be clearly declared. This includes disclosing the type of tool used, the nature of its use, and the extent to which it contributed to the final submission;

c) Submissions must reflect the student's own analysis, understanding, and academic voice. AI-generated content that is presented without proper attribution or misrepresented as original student work constitutes a breach of academic integrity;

d) Students must adhere to the specific requirements set by academic staff regarding the use or prohibition of AI tools in assessments. Where AI use is permitted, proper referencing or acknowledgment must follow subject or course-specific guidelines.

The Institute will also continue to utilise text-matching software, such as Turnitin, to support the detection of academic misconduct, including inappropriate or undisclosed AI usage. This ensures consistency, fairness, and the preservation of educational standards across all levels of study. A comprehensive Artificial Intelligence (AI) Action Plan will be developed and implemented once the Institute becomes operational, where appropriate, to ensure the effective, ethical, and contextually relevant integration of AI within academic and administrative practices.

As part of this approach, the Institute will implement targeted training and guidance for both staff and students on the responsible and transparent use of Generative Artificial Intelligence (Gen-AI) tools. This training will be integrated into the Institute's academic integrity framework and will support staff and students to understand acceptable and unacceptable uses of Gen-AI in learning, teaching and assessment, including the importance of acknowledging AI-assisted work where permitted, maintaining academic honesty, protecting assessment integrity, and complying with relevant institutional policies.

The Institute will draw on external good practice resources, including TEQSA's Gen AI Knowledge Hub and *Gen-AI Student Resources and Support Hub* (https://www.teqsa.gov.au/guides-resources/higher-education-good-practice-hub/gen-ai-knowledge-hub/gen-ai-student-resources-and-support), to inform the development and ongoing review of its staff and student training materials. TEQSA's resources are intended to support institutions, staff and students in

responding to the opportunities and risks associated with Gen-AI in teaching, learning, assessment and research, and include guidance on ethical and responsible student use of Gen-AI tools.

To ensure ongoing relevance, the Institute will periodically review and update its Gen-AI training and guidance to reflect developments in AI technology, emerging academic integrity risks, TEQSA guidance, and sector good practice. The Institute will also monitor the use of AI tools in academic contexts and seek feedback from staff and students to support continuous improvement, promote ethical use, and ensure alignment with the Institute's academic integrity expectations.

6. Reporting and Recording

All instances of suspected or alleged cases of academic misconduct or dishonesty will be communicated to the Discipline Coordinator, Academic Success Coordinator and the Dean. Additionally, the Academic Success Coordinator will regularly report on academic misconduct occurrences at the monthly Executive Management Team meeting. The Teaching & Learning Committee will receive regular reports on academic misconduct at every meeting through the Dean. A detailed annual report will be presented to the Academic Board.

The Academic Board monitors the effectiveness of the *Academic Integrity Policy and Procedure* and makes necessary adjustments to the Policy or practice as required.

All records of investigations and outcomes of allegations involving breaches of academic integrity by students will be managed in accordance with the *Records Management Policy and Procedure*.

a) Reporting Suspected Academic Misconduct from Third Parties and Whistle-blower Protection

The Institute is committed to fostering a positive culture of academic integrity, where all members of the community feel supported and empowered to report suspected academic misconduct in good faith, without fear of adverse consequences. Reports may be received from a range of sources, including students, exam invigilators, academic and administrative staff.

The Institute recognises the complexities that can arise in investigating such reports, particularly in cases where direct evidence such as a Turnitin similarity report is not available. All concerns will be handled sensitively and with due regard for fairness, ensuring that no action is taken without substantial, credible evidence. This approach upholds both procedural integrity and the rights of all individuals involved.

7. Appeals

Students may appeal a decision or penalty arising from the application of this Policy in accordance with the Institute's *Student Grievance Management Policy and Procedure*, which establishes the framework for managing appeals affecting students.

Appeals must be lodged in writing and within the timeframes specified in that Policy and may be made on the grounds of procedural irregularity, the availability of new and relevant evidence that was not reasonably available at the time of the decision, or where the penalty applied is considered disproportionate to the breach.

All appeals will be managed in a fair, timely, and impartial manner, consistent with the principles of natural justice and procedural fairness. Students will be notified of the outcome of the appeal in writing, and all records will be managed in accordance with the Institute's *Records Management Policy and Procedure*.

8. Review and Evaluation

This Policy will be reviewed at least every two years, or earlier if required due to changes in legislation, regulatory requirements, technological developments within professional and industry sectors, or institutional priorities, to ensure its ongoing relevance, accuracy, and effectiveness.

Version Control

Version	Date of Approval	Approved By	Related Documents
1.2	15 April 2026	Academic Board	Assessment Policy and Procedure Deferment, Suspension and Cancellation Policy and Procedures Student Grievance Management Policy and Procedure Student Code of Conduct Records Management Policy and Procedure
Benchmarking Institutions			King's Own Institute The University of Adelaide The University of Notre Dame Australia
Policy Owner			Dean
Legislations			Education Services for Overseas Students Act 2000 (Cth) (ESOS Act) Higher Education Standards Framework (Threshold Standards) 2021 (Cth) (HESF 2021) National Code of Practice for Providers of Education and Training to Overseas Students 2018 (Cth) (National Code) Tertiary Education Quality and Standards Agency Act 2011 (Cth) (TEQSA Act)
Higher Education Standards Framework (Threshold Standards) 2021 (Cth)			Standard 5.2; Standard 6.2; Standard 6.3; Standard 7.2; Standard 7.3.