

Policy Title	Academic Integrity Policy and Procedures
Version	v2.5
Date effective	20 April 2023
Review	The Academic Board will review this Policy in accordance with the Institute's Policy Approval Schedule.
Approving body	Academic Board
Approval date	20 April 2023 (v2.4)
Amendment dates(s)	13 November 2025 (v2.5)
Policy Owner & Contact	Dean or delegate
Related Documents	Academic Freedom and Scholarly Activity Policy Assessment & Examinations Policy Examination Guidelines Ethics Clearance Policy Intellectual Property Policy Records Management Policy Student Grievance Management and Appeals Policy Student Grievances and Appeals Flowchart Academic Misconduct Reporting Guidelines for Academic Staff
Related Register	Academic Misconduct Register
Related Legislation	Higher Education Standards Framework (Threshold Standards) 2021 National Code of Practice for Providers of Education and Training to Overseas Students (National Code) Privacy Act 1988
Higher Education Standards Framework (Threshold Standards) 2021 (Cth)	B1.1 "Higher Education Provider" Category Standard 3.1, ss 2 Standard 3.2, ss 1, 3 Standard 4.1, ss 2 Standard 4.2, ss 2 Standard 5.2, ss 1 – 4 Standard 6.1, ss 4 Standard 6.2; ss 1 Standard 6.3; ss 3 Standard 7.2; ss 2

	Standard 7.3; ss 3
Benchmarking Institutes	Australian Institute of Higher Education King's Own Institute Macquarie University Southern Cross University University of Newcastle Western Sydney University
Version History	v2.3 30 September 2020 Academic Board approved policy v2.4 20 April 2023 Minor amendments due to scheduled policy review v2.5 (November 2025) Major amendments (addition of sections 1.3, 4.2-4.4, 5.6, 5.7 (amended); 6.4-6.7, 9.2, 9.3, 9.4, 10.

I. Preamble

I.1 Purpose

The purpose of this Policy is to clearly state Mpika Holdings Pty Ltd (ACN: 612 507 141), trading as the Churchill Institute of Higher Education's ('the Churchill/ Institute's) Policy on academic integrity which applies to all students. This Policy is to be read in conjunction with the Generative Artificial Intelligence (GenAI) Policy, and other related policies listed on page I of this document.

I.2 Background

Academic integrity and honesty are fundamental principles of any educational institute devoted to the pursuit of excellence in teaching and learning. The Institute is committed to maintaining the highest academic standards and will:

- a. instil in students the importance of independent thought, carrying out their own research and knowing how to acknowledge the work of others.
- b. require and expect students to undertake their academic work honestly and to conduct themselves in a manner which is consistent with the principles of academic integrity.
- c. use a range of approaches to raise awareness by students about the critical importance of academic integrity and to educate students to practice academic honesty in the creation, development, and application of their work;
- d. advise students on the Institute's position regarding the risk posed by Generative Artificial Intelligence (GenAI) to academic integrity; and
- e. act in a consistent and equitable manner to access and manage any academic misconduct by students.

I.3 Definitions

- a. **Academic Integrity** means that students always act with honesty and integrity in all academic activities, by not misusing GenAI, cheating, plagiarising / mispresenting or using others' ideas or works and claiming them as their own. A breach of academic integrity is termed academic misconduct
- b. **Academic Misconduct**: means when a student does not uphold and breaches academic integrity.
- c. **Assessment** –has the same meaning as defined in the [Assessment and Examinations Policy](#); and excludes an Examination as defined in 1.3.4 of this policy.
- d. **Examination** means a Final, Deferred and Supplementary Examination. as defined on [the Assessment & Examinations Policy](#).
- e. **Generative Artificial Intelligence (GenAI)** means software and/or apps designed to create text, or creative works or perform mathematical calculations / solve equations based on data / information inputted by the user; and the AI response (output) is generated almost instantly from open websites and user inputs as sources of the response generated. The accuracy information generated is variable; may not be accurate, objective, complete, and / or appropriate to the context of the input; and may not include the sources from which the GenAI produced information was sourced.
- f. **Institute** means Churchill Institute of Higher Education
- g. **Turnitin**: is software that matches text based on uploads of students' assessments and other documents and other documentation sources stored by Turnitin. A text match percentage is provided per student for each assessment that includes any AI detected in uploaded documentation,

2 Scope

This Policy applies to all students enrolled at Churchill Institute; academic staff who detect and report allegations of student academic misconduct; invigilators of examinations (reporting examination misconduct) and administration staff involved with the process and recording of academic misconduct..

3 Policy Statement

- 3.1 The Institute will ensure that academic integrity is managed by fair, timely and transparent procedures, based on clearly defined, consistent and equitable criteria. Failure to maintain academic integrity will be dealt with seriously and appropriate action taken.
- 3.2 Allegations of academic misconduct will be treated as private and confidential between the reporting academic, the student and the staff member(s) who review and determine the outcome.

4 Preventative Measures

The Institute adopts preventative strategies that mitigate the risk of academic misconduct which applies equally to all students and staff of the Institute. Academic Integrity is promoted at orientation and within the classroom by:

- 4.1 Providing compulsory modules and tests of students' knowledge about academic integrity and academic misconduct as a fundamental component of their academic training; and to provide transparency to students about their and the Institute's related responsibilities.
- 4.2 Conducting 'Academic Integrity Workshops' by nominated staff member(s) during orientation and other times during each semester.
- 4.3 Monitoring the reasons for and any disproportionate increases for upheld allegations of student academic misconduct and reviewing the currency and effectiveness and of mandatory student learning as required.
- 4.4 Clearly communicating assessment/examination requirements to students.
- 4.5 Encouraging students to make every effort to avoid academic misconduct by taking responsibility for understanding what constitutes academic misconduct and assessment/examination requirements through attendance of workshops and other programs.

5 Elements of Academic Integrity

Academic misconduct/ misdemeanour at the Institute is inclusive, but not limited to the following, students:

5.1 Cheating in Examinations

In attempting any examination, the student(s) must not:

- a. read, copy from, or otherwise use another student's work during an exam or knowingly allow another student to do so;
- b. acquire, attempt, possess, or distribute examination materials or information without any pre-approval;
- c. accept assistance from any person/source who is not an examination supervisor whilst in the examination room;
- d. consult with another source outside the examination room during the examination process;
- e. impersonate another source or procure impersonation in attempting the examination.

5.2 Plagiarism

Plagiarism occurs when the student(s) present their thoughts, ideas, or work of another source without proper acknowledgement of the author or the source. Students must not:

- a. partly or significantly copy ideas, concepts, text, data, and information from another source and present it as his or her own work;
- b. construct content which is drawn from any source without attribution of the source;
- c. summarise another person's work without acknowledgement of the source;
- d. submit substantially the same final version of any material as another student.
- e. Therefore, in presenting a written assignment, students should make it clear when a direct quotation is used, and in the case of using resources to build an argument, an acknowledgement of the resources

should be made by using the appropriate method of referencing.

5.3 Collusion

In the event of assessment, in which individually assessable work is required to be submitted, the formulation of ideas must be the independent work of each student. Therefore, the student must not:

- a. undertake unauthorised collaboration in which students work together to produce an identical assessment, either in part or in whole;
- b. encourage or assist another person to commit collusion by allowing the person to copy their work for completing an assessment.

5.4 Recycling assignments

- a. The Institute expects students not to submit an assessment that is an identical or a substantially similar assessment for another or previously submitted unit.
- b. The Institute understands that academic work within a discipline could be interrelated and expects students, when transcribing content for use in similar topics, to enhance and refine the content of an assignment as they progress through their degree.
- c. It is not acceptable to resubmit the exact copy of work previously submitted without enhancing or refining the concepts contained in the assignment.
- d. Submitting an exact copy of work or any portion of work previously submitted in another unit may adversely affect the student's grade and/or be considered a violation or academic misconduct of this Policy and the *Student Code of Conduct*.

The following exceptions to variations on recycling are allowed:

- a. If a student wishes to repurpose work from a past unit for a current unit that student may do so only if the following criteria are satisfied:
- b. The Unit Coordinator grants permission.
- c. The student emails the Unit Lecturer a copy of the originally submitted work that they wish to repurpose prior to submitting an assignment that contains the recycled material.
- d. This submission includes the start date of the unit where the material was originally used. The Unit Lecturer may then provide written approval of the resubmission.
- e. The reused material is properly attributed in terms of 'self-citing' in the submitted document.
- f. The student substantially enhances and refines what was submitted previously. A student may resubmit, without penalty, work from a previous unsuccessful attempt at a unit in a second or subsequent attempt at the same course if Institute credit has not previously been earned in the unit.
- g. An unsuccessful attempt is defined as failing the unit, earning a grade of F (Fail) or IN (Incomplete), failing to meet the grade necessary to satisfy a general competency, or failing to meet the grade for the unit required by the degree.
- h. However, the student must inform the current Unit Lecturer (via email) of this reuse of content prior to submission of the reused material.
- i. Students retaking a unit are not required to cite work from their previous attempt at the same unit.

5.5 Impersonation

- a. The student must personally undertake all assessments required for each unit of study and must not allow or procure impersonation of themselves in relation to any assessment.
- b. For Example: Academic Fraud, where a student procures work from another source and submitting the work as student's own without reference to the author.

5.6 Contract Cheating / Use of Commercial "Study Support" Services

- a. *Students who produce work and claim it as their own that is determined to have been produced by a*

‘study support’, ‘assignment help’ or similarly named “service” or person engaged by the “service” is known as “contract cheating” and is considered as major misconduct;

- b. Students are warned that academic staff are trained in how to detect the use of contract cheating websites and resources; the penalties for their use are severe at Churchill; and*
- c. that some of these “services” blackmail students by demanding ongoing payments in return for not reporting the student’s academic dishonesty to their education provider; and in some cases, future employers.*

5.7 Use of Generative Artificial Intelligence (GenAI)

- a. The use of Genitive AI may only be used when an assessment item states its use is permitted; and when permitted, the parameters of its use must be specified (such as including inputted text, citing sources identified by the GenAI software in the answer / output)
- b. The presentation of AI-generated text or other information used for assessments that is claimed as a student’s own work without acknowledging the use of GenAI per 5.6.1 above, is considered plagiarism and will attract a penalty (refer to section 11)
- c. Refer to the [Generative AI Policy](#) for more information.

6 Identifying and Detecting Academic Misconduct

- a. Students are expected to maintain appropriate levels of academic integrity in all assessments.
- b. Detecting and identifying academic misconduct is fundamentally an allegation made by an academic/examiner whose responsibilities involve detecting academic misconduct when marking and moderating students’ assessments and reporting allegations per the process outlined in this policy
- c. The Institute uses text-based similarity detecting software such as Turnitin for all text-based written assessments.
- d. Academic staff are expected to interpret Turnitin reports and text-matching percentages within the context of their academic discipline and the nature of the type of assessment task.
- e. A high text match does not constitute plagiarism when the text is referenced correctly, but large amounts of quoted text may be indicative of other academic issues.
- f. Examination invigilators will report incidents of student misconduct in examinations based on any violation of the Examination Guidelines issued to students.
- g. The Institute will provide written academic misconduct detection and reporting guidelines to academic staff each semester for guidance; and offer related professional development, as required.
- h. Students will be made aware of academic integrity and academic misconduct at their orientation, in all unit outlines and all academic integrity related resources / materials provided to them.
- i. Academic staff engaged by the Institute are required to uphold academic integrity and have experience in the *detection of student academic misconduct*, including contract cheating, misuse of GenAI, interpretation of Turnitin reports, collusion between students and as is otherwise relevant, which will be included in all academic position descriptions.
- j. For an assignment, which is not a text-based written assignment, the lecturer must take all reasonable steps to eliminate or minimise the possibility of breaches of academic integrity.

7. Levels of Academic Misconduct

In promoting consistency and fairness in dealing with the severity of the misconduct, there are three levels of categories.

7.1 Minor Academic Misconduct:

- a. Minor Academic Misconduct is perceived to be due to a student’s inexperience with academic writing, and/or presenting their academic work, or a lack of referencing skills; or incorrectly applying the referencing standard adopted by the Institute

- b. Minor Academic Misconduct is normally applied to students who are in their **first semester** at the Institute and only applies to the first submission.
- c. Where academic misconduct is identified as Minor Academic Misconduct, the student should be informed by the Lecturer / Unit Coordinator and given a chance to correct their work and resubmit it for marking.
- d. No penalty will be applied if the resubmission can meet the academic standard.
- e. The action applied to a Minor Academic Misconduct breach is that student should be given mandatory educational advice (in the form of a workshop or self-directed study) to improve their writing and referencing skills.

7.2 Intermediate Academic Misconduct

- a. Intermediate Academic Misconduct is where a student is in their second or subsequent semester of enrolment; and the student conduct is considered dishonest and unfair in relation to their academic work.
- b. To be considered as an Intermediate Academic Misconduct, the student must have been previously warned of the misconduct or ignorance of academic integrity or academic conventions that includes a $\geq 20\%$ Turnitin text match and / or use of Geni AI (when permitted) where the text has not been referenced) or ;
- c. In the case where an Intermediate Academic Misconduct is identified, the case should be reported to the applicable Course Coordinator, who will determine the outcome and impose a penalty for the offence.
- d. The actions that can be taken included a formal warning, requirement to repeat the assessment, but with reduced maximum mark, a reduced mark for the assessment or a zero mark for the assessment.

7.3 Major Academic Misconduct

- a. Major Academic Misconduct reflects multiple instances of intermediate level misconduct or that is above the intermediate level and shows a clear intention to deceive the examiner/assessor.
- b. To be considered as a Major Academic Misconduct, the overall consequence of the misconduct is to have significantly compromised the assessment process, and demonstrates an intentional disregard for the principles of academic integrity outlined in this policy
- c. Where Major Academic Misconduct is identified and considered serious enough to warrant a penalty beyond the authority of the Course Coordinator, the matter will be referred to the Dean and Deputy Dean for review and decision,
- d. Examples include but are not limited to –when all or at least 50% of an assessment task for plagiarism Created with GenAI or produced by another student or entity; or proven cheating in examinations.

8 Reporting – and Determining the Outcome of Allegations of Student Academic Misconduct

8.1 Minor Level Academic Misconduct Allegations

- a. The Lecturer / Unit Coordinator shall report the matter as Minor Misconduct on the online Allegation of academic misconduct form for inclusion in the Academic Misconduct Register.
- b. The Lecturer / Unit Coordinator will otherwise manage the matter per 7.1 of this Policy

8.2 Intermediate Level Academic Misconduct Allegations

- a. Academic staff who detect academic misconduct in student assessments must report the online academic misconduct form, state the reasons for the allegation of academic misconduct (e.g.: contract cheating, plagiarism, misuse of GenAI, etc.) and attach the supporting evidence.
- b. The student will be advised in writing within five (5) working days that an allegation of academic misconduct has been made against the student;

- c. the notification will include the date it is issued, the applicable semester of study, the applicable unit (code and title) and assessment item (number / title) and the , the reasons for the academic misconduct allegation with reference to the applicable section(s) of this policy (e.g.: contract cheating, plagiarism, misuse of GenAI, etc.) and the evidence.
- d. The student will be requested to respond within 5 working dates of the notification issue date if they admit to or deny the academic misconduct allegation and may include any additional or new information or evidence they consider is relevant to their response.
- e. The Course Coordinator will then review all the information provided (as reported by the academic and the student's response), and will determine if the academic misconduct allegation is upheld or dismissed; and
- f. If the student does not respond within the five working (5) day period, the Course Coordinator will determine an outcome (upheld or dismissed) based on the information reported in 8. 2.
- g. If upheld, the Course Coordinator will determine I impose a c penalty that is reasonable and proportionate for an intermediate level of academic misconduct (per section 10 pf this policy) with consideration of any prior academic misconduct upheld against the student.
- h. If a Course Coordinator reported the allegation of academic misconduct, then another Course Coordinator or the Dean or Deputy Dean shall instead determine the outcome per sections 8.2.3 and 8.2.4 above.
- i. The student will be notified of the Course Coordinator's decision within 5 working days that includes the reason, penalty plus and the student's right to appeal the decision per section 11 of this policy. –

8.3 Major Academic Misconduct Allegations

- a. Academic staff who detect major academic misconduct in student assessments must report the online academic misconduct form, state the reasons for the allegation of academic misconduct (e.g.: contract cheating, plagiarism, misuse of GenAI, etc.) and attach the supporting evidence.
- b. The student will be advised in writing within five (5) working days that an allegation academic misconduct has been lodged against them, that will include the date it is issued, the applicable semester of study, the applicable unit (code and title) and assessment item (number / title) Level of (Major academic misconduct), and the reasons with reference to the applicable section(s) of this policy (e.g.: contract cheating, plagiarism, misuse of GenAI, etc.) and the evidence.
- c. The student will be requested to respond within five (5) working dates of the notification issue date if they admit to or deny the academic misconduct allegation.
- d. The Dean and Deputy Dean will then review all the information provided (as reported by the academic and the student's response), and will determine if the academic misconduct allegation is upheld or dismissed; and
- e. If the student does not respond within the five working (5) day period, the Dean and Deputy Dean will determine an outcome (upheld or dismissed) based on the information reported in 8. 2..1
- f. and. If upheld, the Dean will determine and impose a penalty that is appropriate for major academic misconduct (per section 10 pf this policy) with consideration of any prior academic misconduct allegation(s) upheld against the student; and
- g. if the penalty is to exclude the student from the course, The Dean must make a recommendation to the Academic Board that will determine if the student is excluded.
- h. If the Deputy Dean reported the allegation of academic misconduct, then the Dean and another Course Coordinator shall instead determine the outcome per sections 8.2.3 and 8.2.4 above
- i. The student will be notified of Dean's decision within five (5) working days, which includes the reason, penalty and that the student may appeal the decision per section 13 of this policy.

9 Misconduct in Examinations

If a student is suspected of academic misconduct during an examination:

- a. an examination invigilator will submit an examination Incident report that outlines why the student breached the *Examination Guidelines* relating to the conduct of examinations.
- b. The Dean or delegate will review and determine if the alleged examination misconduct was a breach of the *Examination Guidelines*; and
- c. The Dean or delegate may dismiss the allegation or issue a written caution to the student that will be taken into account for any future allegations of examination misconduct; or
- d. Uphold the allegation and impose a penalty per Section 10 of this policy.

10 Penalties for Academic Misconduct

- a. Penalties apply to student upheld cases of academic misconduct committed in examinations and assessment.
- b. If the Institute finds a student guilty of (upholds an allegation of) Minor, Intermediate or Major Academic Misconduct, the student's details, Unit Code and Name, Assessment Item; the Level of Academic Misconduct and the any penalty of the incident will be recorded in the Academic Misconduct Register.
- c. This register will be managed and monitored by the Dean or delegate.
- d. The consequences of academic misconduct are subject to the level of misconduct determined.
- e. Student(s) can be given a warning, or may incur a penalty through a reassessment, or grades could be changed.
- f. Corrective or supportive change must be implemented to all misconduct situations.
- g. The Institute applies the following penalties of the different levels of misconduct:

Minor Academic Misconduct	Intermediate Academic Misconduct	Major Academic Misconduct
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> a. Issue of Formal Caution (Exams / Assessments) b. Remedial Action – Resubmission of Assessment c. Np penalty when assessment resubmission meets requirements. d. Student notified that is recorded on the Academic Misconduct Register and any future allegations (upheld) will be managed as Intermediate Misconduct. e. The student is given the opportunity to correct their work. However, the resubmission will not lead to student's grade to next grade range (assessments only). 	<p>Penalties imposed can include:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> a. a formal warning; and b. a requirement to repeat the assessment, but with reduced maximum mark (25% deducted) , or c. 25-100% of marks deducted when GenAI use not permitted in an assessment; or d. 33-100% of marks deducted for $\geq 25\%$ GenAI use appear in a Turnitin report when GenAI is <i>not</i> permitted to be used. e. 25-100% of Examination Marks deducted f. a zero (0) mark for the assessment or examination <p>Students will also be required to:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> g. Repeat the Academic Integrity Module and Quiz h. complete a workshop on academic writing i. receive other form(s) of remedial advice. 	<p>The penalties for this misconduct can be severe, and include the following:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> a. a zero mark for the assessment or examination b. F (Fail) Grade awarded for the unit in which academic misconduct occurred (assessment or examinations); c. the withdrawal of credit for a completed unit and/or rescission or withholding of any award. d. Permanent exclusion from the course and enrolment cancelled (for repeated occurrences of major academic misconduct.

11 Student Appeals of Academic Misconduct Outcomes and Penalties

- a. A student may appeal an academic misconduct allegation that is upheld against the on the grounds procedural fairness (this policy was breached /not followed by staff of the Institute); or
- b. The student has new and relevant evidence relating to the academic misconduct allegation; and / or
- c. The student considers that the penalty imposed was either unreasonably harsh or disproportionate to the Level of Academic Misconduct committed; and / or did not consider if the student is a first or repeat offender; or was applied in error per section 10 of this policy.
- d. Appeals must be made in writing and lodged with the Institute within five (5) working days of the student receiving written notification of the decision (Minor and Intermediate level misconduct) and lodged on the online Student Grievance and Appeals Form.
- e. Appeals will be considered at Step 2 of the *Student Grievance and Appeals Management Policy*.
- f. The Institute will respond in writing to the academic appeal within five (5) working days and will either uphold or dismiss the appeal.
- g. Appeals of Major Misconduct allegation decision outcomes will be considered at Step 3 of the *Student Grievance and Appeals Management Policy* by the Academic Board.

12 Responsibilities

12.1 Governance Responsibilities

- a. The Academic Board is responsible for the approval and amendment of this policy; and
- b. For reviewing the Academic Misconduct Register at least annually that includes an explanatory narrative with an emphasis on organisational /student learnings, improvements and quality assurance.

12.2 Operational Responsibilities

- a. The CEO & Dean or delegate is responsible for the implementation of this policy, its publication on the Institute's website and for its inclusion and referencing in commencing student orientation programs and all Unit Outlines each semester.
- b. Maintaining the Student Academic Misconduct Register and submitting a report to the Academic Board at least annually (per section 12.1 above).
- c. Providing students with academic integrity resources and testing to evidence students' understanding of academic integrity and academic misconduct based on this policy; and
- d. Providing academic staff with guidelines on how to detect and report different types of academic misconduct based on this policy.