

PROCEDURE		
Ref. to Legislative Frameworks: HESF (Threshold Standards) 2021: Standards 5.2 / 6.3 National Code 2018: Standard 8.4 / 8.8 / 10	Academic Integrity	
Version: 7.0	Approved By: Academic Dean	Issued on: 12/08/2026 Review by: 12/08/2028

Revision History

Current Version	Description of Change	Procedure Developer(s)	Effective Date
7.0	Title changed from Academic Misconduct and Pleagiarism to Academic Integrity to align with the policy. Updated purpose, scope and responsibilities to align with the policy. Inclusion of a detailed appeals process related to Academic Misconduct and Plagiarism. Inclusion of AIAS in 2.2.1 (6).	Academic Dean, Head of Academic Integrity and Compliance Manager	12/08/2026
6.3	Updated the penalties with AI Writing Indicator Value. Inclusion of invigilated examinations/tests in misconduct detection, penalty procedures, and clarity in assessment protocols.	Academic Dean, Head of Academic Integrity and Compliance Manager	20/08/2025

6.2	Updated the procedure with reference to the inappropriate use of AI and similar technology tools and the penalties associated with misconduct. Updated the similarity table and included the AI content table based on the index value of TURNITIN report. Updated responsibilities and references.	Compliance Manager, Head of Academic Integrity and Academic Dean	29/11/2024
6.1	Updated reference to Artificial Intelligence	Compliance Manager and Academic Dean	22/09/2023
6.0	Updated to HESF 2021 Included definition on misrepresentation	Compliance Manager and Academic Dean	09/03/2023
5.0	- Additional clarification of roles and responsibilities were included. - Changes to the Deferment, Suspension or Cancellation of a Student's Enrolment Procedure v9 were reelected in 2.3.2	Academic Dean	24/01/2020
4.2	Reviewed amended and approved	Head of Academic Departments Committee (HOAD) and The Academic Quality Assurance Portfolio Holder	23/05/2019

PURPOSE

This procedure supports the Academic Integrity Policy by establishing a fair, transparent, evidence-based and educative framework for preventing, identifying, investigating and responding to suspected academic integrity breaches in AAPoly's higher education courses.

The procedure supports the maintenance of academic integrity, assessment validity and assurance of student learning by setting out the principles, responsibilities, evidence requirements, decision-making processes, outcomes and appeal mechanisms that apply to academic integrity matters.

The procedure also supports responsible, ethical and transparent use of GenAI where permitted by assessment instructions, subject guides or institutional requirements, while ensuring that students submit work that validly demonstrates their own learning, knowledge, skills and achievement of learning outcomes.

SCOPE

This procedure applies to academic integrity breaches including, but not limited to, plagiarism, collusion, contract cheating, unauthorised collaboration, misrepresentation, fabrication or falsification of information, recycling of work, examination misconduct, and the unauthorised, undeclared or inappropriate use of Generative Artificial Intelligence (GenAI), artificial intelligence-enabled tools and similar technologies.

This procedure applies to all students enrolled in, or undertaking AAPoly higher education assessment—domestic, overseas, online, offshore, on leave, suspended, or former—where the alleged breach relates to work or conduct during their enrolment, and extends to academic integrity matters arising across all higher education learning and assessment environments, including face-to-face, online, blended, supervised, unsupervised, invigilated, non-invigilated, group work, work-integrated learning, placement, capstone, project-based, and GenAI-enabled assessment contexts.

This procedure also applies to prospective students and applicants where alleged academic integrity concerns relate to admission, credit transfer, recognition of prior learning, supporting documentation, academic records, English language evidence or other information submitted for entry into an AAPoly higher education course.

For staff, this procedure applies to all academic staff, sessional academic staff, markers, invigilators, supervisors, academic support staff, and professional staff involved in teaching, learning, assessment, supervision, academic support, misconduct reporting, investigation, decision-making, appeals, records management or academic governance.

PROCEDURE

1. Detecting, Preventing and Managing Suspected Academic Integrity Breaches

AAPoly adopts an open and secure approach to academic integrity. This approach balances trust in students with appropriate safeguards to protect assessment validity, assurance of learning and the integrity of AAPoly's higher education qualifications.

Academic integrity is best supported through education, clear communication, responsible assessment design, transparent expectations, fair and consistent processes, and evidence-based decision-making. Students are recognised as partners in their learning and are

expected to act honestly, responsibly and transparently in all learning and assessment activities, including where Generative Artificial Intelligence (GenAI), artificial intelligence-enabled tools or similar technologies are permitted.

Indicators of a possible academic integrity breach may be identified through traditional academic review, electronic tools, assessment calibration, assessment security processes, invigilated or supervised assessment, student disclosures, staff observations, learning analytics, or other relevant evidence. An indicator of concern does not, by itself, constitute a finding of academic misconduct. Any suspected breach must be reviewed and managed in accordance with this procedure, including the requirements for evidence, procedural fairness and student response.

1.1 Academic and traditional review methods

Academic staff may identify possible indicators of academic integrity concerns through academic judgement and review of assessment submissions. Indicators may include, but are not limited to:

- i. unusual or inconsistent formatting, structure, terminology, tone or writing style;
- ii. irregular or inconsistent citation and referencing practices;
- iii. references, sources, quotations, data, cases or examples that appear fabricated, irrelevant, inaccessible or inconsistent with the assessment task;
- iv. content that is generic, off-topic, unusually sophisticated, inconsistent with the student's demonstrated learning, or not responsive to the assessment instructions;
- v. unexplained similarity with published sources, online material, previous student submissions, file-sharing sites, commercial academic cheating services or other submitted work;
- vi. signs of collusion, unauthorised collaboration, recycling of work, contract cheating, impersonation, falsification, fabrication or misrepresentation;
- vii. unexplained inconsistencies between submitted work and other verified evidence of the student's learning, such as tutorial work, drafts, presentations, formative tasks, supervised tasks or previous assessment performance.

These indicators must be considered cautiously and in context. They are not proof of misconduct and must be supported by relevant evidence before any allegation is made.

Any suspected misconduct during an invigilated, supervised or authenticated assessment, including possession or use of unauthorised materials, impersonation, use of communication devices, copying, unauthorised collaboration, disruptive conduct or breach of assessment conditions, may constitute suspected academic misconduct. Invigilators or supervising staff must document and report the incident using the approved Academic Integrity Incident Report, supported where appropriate by evidence such as seating plans, incident notes, screenshots, photographs, assessment materials, device records, witness statements or other relevant records.

1.2 Electronic review methods

AAPoly may use electronic tools, including text-matching software, search engines, learning management system data, document metadata, version history, plagiarism detection tools, and AI-writing indicators to assist in identifying possible academic integrity concerns.

Electronic tools are screening and review tools only. Reports from Turnitin, AI-writing indicators, similarity reports, search engines or other software must not be used as the sole basis for a finding of academic misconduct or the application of a penalty. Such reports must be interpreted by appropriately trained staff and considered alongside the

assessment instructions, permitted GenAI use, the AI Assessment Scale, student declaration, draft evidence, version history, student explanation, learning context and other relevant evidence.

Where GenAI use is suspected, staff must consider whether the use was authorised, declared, appropriate to the assessment instructions, and consistent with the subject guide and AI Assessment Scale. Staff must also consider whether the assessment design required students to demonstrate their own knowledge, skills and achievement of the relevant learning outcomes.

1.3 Calibration and assurance of learning

Calibration is a key element of AAPoly's assurance of learning approach. It enables staff to compare and verify student achievement across multiple assessment tasks and learning activities and to identify significant and unexplained inconsistencies that may require academic support, assessment verification or academic integrity review.

Subjects must be designed and delivered to provide opportunities for both formal and informal calibration of student learning. Calibration may include review of formative work, drafts, supervised or authenticated tasks, tutorial activities, presentations, oral questioning, practical demonstrations, reflective work, portfolio evidence, invigilated assessments, viva voce, version history, learning logs or other verifiable evidence of learning.

In support of assurance of learning, subjects must include multiple points of assessment and at least one secure or authenticated assessment point, where appropriate to the discipline, level, learning outcomes and assessment design. Secure or authenticated assessment may include, but is not limited to, an invigilated test or examination, supervised in-class task, oral defence, live presentation, practical demonstration, code review, authenticated portfolio checkpoint, reflective interview or other method that enables staff to verify that the student has personally achieved the relevant learning outcomes.

Where an academic staff identifies a significant and unexplained inconsistency between a student's submitted work and other verified evidence of learning, the lecturer may undertake an academic verification process. This may include requesting drafts, notes, version history, source materials, reflective commentary, an interview, oral explanation or other evidence relevant to authorship and learning.

Any interview or verification activity must be conducted fairly and respectfully. The student must be informed of the purpose of the discussion, provided with reasonable information about the concern, and given an opportunity to explain their work. Where an interview is recorded, the student must be informed before recording commences, and the recording must be stored securely in accordance with records management and privacy requirements.

If, after academic verification, there remains sufficient evidence of a possible academic integrity breach, the lecturer must complete the Academic Integrity Incident Report and submit it, with supporting evidence, to the Program Coordinator and Head, Academic Integrity in accordance with this procedure.

2. Investigation of a Suspected Academic Misconduct

2.1 Identification and Initial Review of Suspected Academic Misconduct

Where an academic staff member identifies a suspected academic integrity breach, including suspected plagiarism, collusion, contract cheating, misrepresentation, fabrication, recycling of work, unauthorised collaboration, examination or test misconduct, or unauthorised, undeclared or inappropriate use of Generative Artificial Intelligence or similar technologies, the matter must be managed in accordance with this procedure.

- a. The academic staff member must document the suspected academic integrity concern in the approved Academic Integrity Incident Report and submit it to the Program Coordinator. The report must include relevant evidence, where available, such as the assessment submission, assessment instructions, marking rubric, permitted GenAI use requirements, [AI Assessment Scale](#) level, Turnitin or similarity report, AI-writing indicator report, source material, invigilator report, screenshots, witness statements, draft or version history evidence, LMS records, interview notes or other relevant information.
- b. The Program Coordinator will conduct an initial review of the Academic Integrity Incident Report to determine whether the matter is complete, supported by relevant evidence, and suitable to proceed under this procedure. The Program Coordinator may request further information from the academic staff member, determine that no further action is required, recommend an educative response where the matter appears to involve poor academic practice rather than misconduct, or refer the matter to the Head, Academic Integrity.
- c. Where the Program Coordinator determines that there is sufficient evidence to proceed, the report and supporting evidence will be forwarded to the Head, Academic Integrity. At this stage, no finding of academic misconduct will be made. The purpose of this stage is to determine whether there is sufficient evidence to issue a formal allegation notice to the student or to refer the matter for formal investigation.
- d. The Head, Academic Integrity will review the report and determine one of the following actions:
 - i. close the matter where there is insufficient evidence;
 - ii. refer the matter back to the Program Coordinator or the relevant academic staff for further information;
 - iii. recommend an educative intervention where the concern appears to involve poor academic practice, misunderstanding or minor non-deliberate breach;
 - iv. issue a formal allegation notice to the student and invite the student to respond; or
 - v. refer the matter to the Student Discipline Committee (SDC) where the allegation appears to involve serious, repeated or complex academic misconduct.
- e. Where a formal allegation notice is issued, the student must be provided with clear information about the allegation, the relevant evidence, the applicable policy and procedure, possible outcomes, available support services, the right to bring a support person where a meeting or interview is required, and the timeframe for providing a response.
- f. No finding of academic misconduct will be made, and no penalty will be applied, until the student has been notified of the allegation, provided with relevant evidence, given a reasonable opportunity to respond, and the evidence has been considered by the authorised decision-maker.
- g. Findings of academic misconduct will be determined on the balance of probabilities, having regard to the seriousness of the allegation and the quality, relevance and sufficiency of the evidence.

- h. Academic staff who identify or report a suspected breach may provide evidence and academic context but must not be the sole decision-maker in determining whether academic misconduct has been substantiated.
- i. Only finalised substantiated findings of academic misconduct will be recorded as first, second, third or subsequent breaches for the purpose of determining repeated misconduct. Where a matter is under review or appeal, the record must show that the outcome is pending or under appeal.
- j. Records of academic integrity concerns, allegations, evidence, decisions and outcomes must be maintained securely in the student management system and/or approved academic integrity register, with access limited to authorised staff involved in the process.

2.2 Scope of Determination of the SDC Regarding Academic Integrity incident

- a. The SDC hears and determines referred allegations of serious, complex or repeated academic integrity incident, including misconduct during invigilated, supervised or authenticated assessments.
- b. The SDC may also review appeals from academic misconduct decisions where the members hearing the appeal were not involved in the original investigation or decision. Where the SDC made the original decision, any appeal or internal review must be referred to an independent appeal body or the Academic Review Committee (ARC) in accordance with this procedure.
- c. The SDC must determine matters fairly, impartially and on the basis of relevant evidence. A finding of academic misconduct may only be made where the allegation is substantiated on the balance of probabilities, having regard to the seriousness of the allegation and the quality, relevance and sufficiency of the evidence.

2.2.1 First Substantiated Breach

Where a first academic integrity breach is substantiated, the outcome must be proportionate to the nature, seriousness and impact of the breach. In determining an appropriate outcome, the decision-maker must consider:

- a. the type and extent of the breach;
- b. whether the conduct appears inadvertent, reckless or deliberate;
- c. the clarity of the assessment instructions, including permitted or prohibited use of GenAI;
- d. the AI Assessment Scale level or other GenAI-use instructions applicable to the assessment;
- e. the student's year level, prior academic integrity education and relevant learning support needs;
- f. the extent to which the student gained or attempted to gain an unfair academic advantage;
- g. the reliability and sufficiency of the evidence;
- h. whether the student engaged honestly and constructively with the process;
- i. any mitigating or aggravating circumstances;
- j. the need to protect assessment validity, assurance of learning and the integrity of AAPoly's higher education qualifications; and
- k. whether the breach occurred during an invigilated, supervised or authenticated assessment, and the security requirements of that environment.

Possible outcomes for a first substantiated breach may include one or more of the following:

- a. no finding of academic misconduct, where the allegation is not substantiated; educative intervention, academic skills support or required completion of academic integrity training;
- b. formal warning;
- c. resubmission or replacement assessment, with or without a mark cap;
- d. mark reduction for the affected assessment task;
- e. zero mark for the affected component or assessment task;
- f. fail grade for the subject, where the breach is serious and the assessment is essential to demonstrating achievement of learning outcomes; or
- g. referral to the SDC for serious, complex or high-risk misconduct.

For breaches occurring during invigilated, supervised or authenticated assessments, outcomes must also reflect the heightened importance of maintaining security and validity in such environments.

Examples of minor breaches may include limited or inadvertent referencing errors, misunderstanding of collaboration boundaries, or minor non-compliance with assessment instructions where there is no substantial unfair advantage and the student engages honestly with the process.

Examples of moderate breaches may include more substantial plagiarism, unauthorised collaboration, undeclared or inappropriate GenAI use, use of unauthorised notes or materials in an assessment, or conduct that compromises the validity of part of the assessment.

Examples of serious or very serious breaches may include contract cheating, impersonation, fabrication or falsification of evidence, substantial plagiarism, deliberate unauthorised GenAI use that prevents assurance of learning, copying during an examination, use of communication devices to gain advantage, repeated misconduct, or conduct that substantially compromises the integrity of an assessment or qualification.

Penalties for Plagiarism Act Based on the Similarity Index Value of Turnitin Report	
Similarity Index*	Proposed Penalty
0 - 20 % (no offence)	No Penalty if the Turnitin similarity index is less than 20% and the similarities are coming from more than one source.
21% - 30% (not severe)	a) A warning letter; and at the discretion of the subject facilitator, the student may be asked to resubmit the assessment within 5 working days or a different assessment within ten working days. Assignments to be marked according to marking rubrics with 25% penalty. b) If the student resubmits in time, the student may receive up to 50% of the total original mark of the assessment. c) If the student did not meet the assessment deadline, the student would receive a zero mark for the assessment.

31% - 50% (severe)	a) A warning letter; and the student will be asked to resubmit the assessment within 5 working days or a different assessment within ten working days. Assignments to be marked according to marking rubrics with 50% penalty. b) If the student resubmits in time, the student may receive up to 50% of the total original mark of the assessment. c) If the student did not meet the assessment deadline, the student would receive a zero mark for the assessment.
> 51% to 100% (very severe offence)	A warning letter and a zero mark for the assessment task if the Turnitin similarity index is more than 51%.
• The similarity index in Turnitin is the proportion of the document that is copied from or similar to other reports submitted by other authors, or the same author but for different subjects or locations. • The overall similarity index reading should not include the cover page or the reference list. If a student plagiarised an assessment, the subject lecturer should (i) fill an academic integrity incident report, (ii) provide the evidence to support the claim, and if required (iii), the lecturer should conduct a recorded interview and forward it to the Head, Academic and Integrity.	

Penalties for Unauthorised use of Generative AI Based on the AI Writing Indicator Value of Turnitin Report	
AI Usage Index*	Proposed Penalty
0 - 30 % (no offence)	No Penalty if the Turnitin AI writing indicator is less than or equal to 30% and the indicator displays an asterisk (*) for the percentage.
31% - 40% (not severe offence)	A warning letter; and a 25% penalty on the achieved marks.
41% - 50% (severe offence)	A warning letter; and a 50% penalty on the achieved marks.
51% to 100% (very severe offence)	A warning letter and a zero mark for the assessment task if the Turnitin AI writing indicator index is 51% or more. Where concerns arise regarding the authenticity or authorship of an assessment submission, including cases where the GenAI detection indicator is between 50% and 70%, the Head of Academic Integrity and/or the Program Coordinator may, at their discretion, require the student to undertake a Viva Voce (oral verification assessment). The Viva Voce provides the student with an opportunity to demonstrate their understanding, knowledge, and application of the subject matter in relation to the submitted assessment. The outcome of the Viva Voce will be considered alongside all available evidence in accordance with the Academic Integrity Policy and Procedures.
• The AI writing indicator in Turnitin exhibits the overall percentage of text detected as AI within the assessment. This includes the two categories; 1) the amount of likely AI-generated text and, 2) the AI-generated text that was also likely paraphrased, • The overall AI writing indicator should not include the cover page or the reference list. • If a student plagiarised an assessment with AI content, the subject lecturer should (i) fill an academic integrity incident report, (ii) provide the evidence to support the claim, and if required (iii), the lecturer should conduct a recorded interview and forward it to the Head, Academic and Integrity.	

Turnitin similarity reports, AI-writing indicators, search engine results and other electronic tool outputs may be used as evidence to support further review. They must not be used as the sole basis for a finding of academic misconduct or the automatic application of a penalty. Any such report must be interpreted by academic staff who are subject matter experts in the context of the assessment instructions, AI Assessment Scale, student declaration, source analysis, drafts, version history, student explanation, oral verification where required, and other relevant evidence.

A student may appeal within **five (5) working days** an academic misconduct decision or penalty in accordance with the Academic Integrity Appeals Process, regardless of whether the student admitted or denied the conduct.

Scope of Determination of the SDC Regarding Academic Misconduct

The SDC hears and determines referred allegations of serious, complex or repeated academic misconduct, including misconduct during invigilated, supervised or authenticated assessments.

The SDC may also review appeals from academic misconduct decisions where the members hearing the appeal were not involved in the original investigation or decision. Where the SDC made the original decision, any appeal or internal review must be referred to the ARC or another independent internal review body in accordance with this procedure.

The SDC must determine matters fairly, impartially and on the basis of relevant evidence. A finding of academic misconduct may only be made where the allegation is substantiated on the balance of probabilities, having regard to the seriousness of the allegation and the quality, relevance and sufficiency of the evidence.

2.2.2 Second Substantiated Breach

Where a student has a prior finalised substantiated finding of academic misconduct and a further allegation of academic misconduct is substantiated, the matter will be treated as a second substantiated breach.

The academic staff member must provide the Academic Integrity Incident Report and all relevant evidence to the Head, Academic Integrity. Relevant evidence may include the assessment submission, assessment instructions, marking rubric, student declaration, Turnitin similarity report where applicable, AI-writing indicator where applicable, source analysis, AI Assessment Scale requirements, draft or version history, LMS records, invigilator report, seating plan, screenshots, witness statements, interview notes, student response and any other relevant evidence.

The Head, Academic Integrity will review the matter and refer the allegation to the SDC where there is sufficient evidence of a repeated breach. No finding or penalty will be applied until the student has been notified of the allegation, provided with relevant evidence, given a reasonable opportunity to respond, within **five (5) working days** and the matter has been determined by the authorised decision-maker.

Where a second academic misconduct breach is substantiated, the outcome must be proportionate to the nature and seriousness of the breach, the evidence available, the student's response, any mitigating or aggravating circumstances, the need to assure student learning, and the need to protect the integrity of AAPoly's higher education qualifications.

For plagiarism, collusion, contract cheating, unauthorised collaboration, recycling of work, fabrication, misrepresentation, or unauthorised, undeclared or inappropriate GenAI use, a second substantiated breach will normally result in a second formal warning and a zero mark for the affected assessment task. A different outcome may be applied where justified by the evidence, the seriousness of the breach, the assessment context or mitigating circumstances.

For misconduct during an invigilated, supervised or authenticated assessment:

- a. a minor or moderate second substantiated breach may result in a second warning and a mark reduction of up to 50% for the assessment task, depending on the seriousness of the conduct and the extent to which assessment validity was compromised;
- b. a serious second substantiated breach, including repeated cheating, impersonation, use of unauthorised communication devices, copying, use of relevant unauthorised materials, falsification or conduct that substantially compromises assessment integrity, may result in a zero mark for the assessment task, a fail grade for the subject where necessary to protect assurance of learning, and referral to the Student Discipline Committee for consideration of further action.

Turnitin similarity reports, AI-writing indicators and other electronic tool outputs must not be used as the sole basis for a finding of academic misconduct or the automatic application of a penalty. Such evidence must be interpreted in context and considered alongside the assessment instructions, AI Assessment Scale, student declaration, source analysis, drafts, version history, student explanation and other relevant evidence.

A student may appeal the decision or penalty in accordance with the Academic Integrity Appeal process. Where the SDC made the original decision, the appeal or internal review must be heard by the ARC or another independent internal review body whose members were not involved in the original investigation or decision.

Only finalised substantiated findings of academic misconduct will be recorded as first, second, third or subsequent breaches. Where a matter is under appeal, the student record must show that the outcome is pending or under review.

Scope of Determination of the ARC Regarding Academic Misconduct

The ARC hears and determines referred allegations of serious, repeated or high-risk academic misconduct, including third and subsequent substantiated breaches, where the matter may warrant a fail grade for the subject, suspension, cancellation, exclusion or another serious academic penalty.

The ARC must act fairly, impartially and on the basis of relevant evidence. A finding of academic misconduct may only be made where the allegation is substantiated on the balance of probabilities, having regard to the seriousness of the allegation and the quality, relevance and sufficiency of the evidence.

Where the ARC made the original decision, any appeal or internal review must be referred to an independent internal review body, CEO nominee, or Academic Board delegate whose members were not involved in the original investigation or decision.

2.2.3 Third Substantiated Breach

Where a student has two prior finalised substantiated findings of academic misconduct and a further allegation of academic misconduct is substantiated, the matter will be treated as a third substantiated breach.

The relevant academic staff member must provide the Academic Integrity Incident Report and all relevant evidence to the Head, Academic Integrity. Relevant evidence may include the assessment submission, assessment instructions, marking rubric, student declaration, Turnitin similarity report where applicable, AI-writing indicator where applicable, source analysis, AI Assessment Scale requirements, draft or version history, LMS records, invigilator report, seating plan, screenshots, witness statements, interview notes, student response and any other relevant evidence.

Where the Head, Academic Integrity determines that there is sufficient evidence to refer the matter, the matter will be referred to the ARC for formal consideration. At this stage, no final finding or penalty will be applied.

The student must be notified in writing of the allegation, the evidence, possible outcomes, available support services, the right to bring a support person where a meeting or hearing is required, and the timeframe for providing a response.

Where a third academic misconduct breach is substantiated, the ARC may impose one or more outcomes, including a final warning, zero mark for the affected assessment task, fail grade for the subject, required academic integrity training, or another proportionate outcome. A fail grade for the subject will normally apply where the breach compromises assurance that the student has personally achieved the relevant learning outcomes.

Any admission by the student must be considered together with the available evidence, the student's explanation, any mitigating or aggravating circumstances, and the need to protect assessment validity and qualification integrity.

The student must be notified in writing of the decision, reasons for the decision, penalty imposed, records to be maintained, and appeal or internal review rights.

2.2.4 Fourth and Subsequent Substantiated Breach / Exclusion from Course

Where a student has three prior finalised substantiated findings of academic misconduct and a further allegation of academic misconduct is substantiated, the matter will be treated as a fourth or subsequent substantiated breach and must be referred to the ARC.

The ARC may recommend suspension, cancellation or exclusion from the course where the breach is serious, repeated, deliberate, or substantially compromises assessment validity, course progress, institutional systems, qualification integrity, or the trustworthiness of AAPoly's academic awards.

In determining whether suspension, cancellation or exclusion is appropriate, the ARC must consider:

- a. the number and seriousness of prior finalised substantiated findings;
- b. the nature and seriousness of the current breach;
- c. whether the conduct was deliberate, reckless or repeated despite prior warnings;

- d. whether the conduct involved contract cheating, impersonation, fabrication, falsification, unauthorised GenAI use that prevents assurance of learning, or serious examination misconduct;
- e. the student's response, cooperation, honesty and engagement with the process;
- f. any mitigating or aggravating circumstances;
- g. whether a lesser penalty would adequately protect academic integrity, assessment validity and qualification integrity; and
- h. the impact of the proposed outcome on course progress, enrolment status and, where relevant, overseas student visa-related obligations.

Where the ARC recommends suspension, cancellation or exclusion, the recommendation must be referred to the Chief Executive Officer (CEO) or authorised delegate for executive review before implementation. The executive review will confirm whether the procedure has been followed, the finding is supported by evidence, the penalty is proportionate, and applicable regulatory obligations have been addressed.

Where the student is an overseas student, any suspension, cancellation or exclusion will be managed in accordance with the ESOS Act, National Code Standards 9 and 10, and AAPoly's Deferment, Suspension or Cancellation of Enrolment Procedure. AAPoly will only report through PRISMS when required and after applicable notice and appeal processes have been completed, unless otherwise required by law.

The outcome will be recorded in the confidential student file and academic integrity register. The academic transcript will record only the approved academic outcome, such as a fail grade or enrolment status, unless a separate approved policy expressly authorises a misconduct notation.

The student must be notified in writing of the decision, reasons for the decision, penalty imposed, internal appeal or review rights, external complaint options, and any relevant implications for enrolment or course progress.

3. Academic Integrity Appeals Process

A student may appeal an academic misconduct decision, finding, severity classification or penalty in accordance with this procedure. An appeal must be submitted in writing to the Student Services team within **five (5) working days** of the student being notified of the decision, unless an extension is approved. An extension may be granted where the student demonstrates reasonable grounds, including illness, wellbeing concerns, difficulty obtaining evidence, accessibility needs, international student circumstances, or other compassionate or compelling circumstances.

The appeal must identify the grounds of appeal and include any supporting evidence. A student may seek advice from Student Services, academic support, wellbeing services, an advocate, or another support person before submitting an appeal.

Submitting an appeal does not automatically overturn the original decision. However, where the appeal relates to suspension, cancellation, exclusion, course progress, PRISMS reporting, or any matter that may affect an overseas student's enrolment status, AAPoly will manage the matter in accordance with the ESOS Act, National Code Standards 9 and 10, and relevant AAPoly enrolment procedures.

3.1 Appeal Submission

When a student submits an academic integrity appeal, the Student Services team will acknowledge receipt in writing and conduct an administrative completeness check. Student Services will forward the appeal and supporting documents to the appropriate appeal body or authorised officer. Student Services must not determine the merits of the appeal. The appeal must not be determined by any person who was involved in the original allegation, investigation, decision, penalty determination, or earlier appeal decision.

3.2 Grounds of Appeal

An appeal against an academic integrity or academic misconduct decision may be lodged on one or more of the following grounds:

- a. procedural irregularity or failure to follow the relevant policy or procedure;
- b. new or relevant evidence that was not reasonably available at the time of the original decision;
- c. reasonable apprehension of bias, conflict of interest or lack of independence in the original decision-making process;
- d. failure to consider relevant evidence submitted by the student;
- e. incorrect application or interpretation of the Academic Integrity Policy, the Academic Integrity Procedure, assessment instructions, subject guide, AI Assessment Scale, examination /test rules or other relevant requirements;
- f. the decision was not reasonably supported by the evidence;
- g. the penalty was disproportionate to the nature, seriousness or circumstances of the breach;
- h. relevant compassionate, compelling, accessibility, wellbeing or mitigating circumstances were not adequately considered.

Appeals submitted without valid grounds, outside the required timeframe, or without sufficient information may be dismissed. Before dismissing an appeal on these grounds, AAPoly may provide the student with a reasonable opportunity to clarify or complete the appeal submission where appropriate.

3.3 Appeal Review and Outcome

The relevant appeal body will review:

- a. the original academic misconduct decision;
- b. the evidence relied upon in making the original decision;
- c. the student's appeal submission and supporting evidence;
- d. whether the original process was fair and procedurally sound;
- e. whether the decision was reasonably supported by the evidence; and whether the penalty was proportionate.

The appeal body may determine to:

- a. affirm the original decision;
- b. vary the original decision or penalty;
- c. set aside the original decision;
- d. substitute a new decision;
- e. refer the matter back for reconsideration by a different decision-maker; or
- f. require further investigation before a final appeal outcome is determined.

The appeal outcome will normally be determined within **ten (10) working days** of receipt by the relevant appeal body. Where additional time is required, the student will be informed in writing of the reason for the delay and the expected timeframe.

Student Services will notify the student in writing of the appeal outcome, reasons for the decision, any actions or academic penalties applied, any further internal review rights, external complaint options, and the recordkeeping arrangements.

3.4 Internal Independent Review

If the student is not satisfied with the outcome of the appeal, the student may request an internal independent review within **five (5) working days** of being notified of the appeal decision.

The internal independent review will be conducted by the ARC or another approved internal review body whose members were not involved in the original investigation, decision or first appeal.

The internal review body may affirm, vary, set aside, substitute or remit the decision. The internal review body will normally make a decision within ten (10) working days of receiving the request. Where additional time is required, the student will be informed in writing.

Student Services will notify the student in writing of the internal review outcome, reasons for the decision, any actions required, and any remaining internal or external review options.

3.5 Final Internal Review and External Complaint Options

Where the matter involves a serious penalty, including suspension, cancellation, exclusion, fail grade for a subject, or another significant academic or enrolment consequence, the student may request a final internal review by the CEO, authorised delegate, or Academic Board Appeals Panel, as determined by AAPoly's governance framework.

The final internal review will consider whether the process was fair, the decision was supported by evidence, the penalty was proportionate, and applicable regulatory obligations were met.

At the conclusion of the final internal process, AAPoly will provide the student with written notice of the final internal outcome and information about external complaint options.

Students who remain dissatisfied with the way AAPoly has managed their case may contact the National Student Ombudsman, in accordance with the Academic Integrity Policy.

RESPONSIBILITIES

1. Academic Dean is responsible for:

- Academic ownership, review and maintenance of this procedure and for ensuring that academic integrity arrangements are aligned with AAPoly's academic governance framework, higher education regulatory requirements, and continuous improvement processes.
- Ensuring academic integrity trends, risks, systemic issues and improvement actions are reported to the relevant academic governance body, including the Academic Board where required.
- Not participating in any later appeal or internal review of a matter where the Academic Dean has been involved in an original decision, investigation, committee appointment or prior review, unless permitted under an approved conflict-of-interest process.

2. Associate Dean (Education) is responsible for:

Supporting consistent implementation of this procedure across courses, campuses and delivery modes, including:

- ensuring that academic staff and relevant professional staff are informed of this procedure, receive appropriate guidance or training, and understand their responsibilities in relation to academic integrity, assessment design, GenAI use, AI Assessment Scale requirements, detection indicators, evidence handling and student support.
- supporting the communication of academic integrity expectations to students through orientation, subject guides, learning management systems, academic skills resources and other appropriate channels.

3. Head, Academic Integrity is responsible for:

- Coordinating the operational management of academic integrity matters under this procedure.
- Reviewing referred academic integrity concerns, coordinating evidence collection, ensuring procedural fairness, communicating with students and staff, maintaining secure case records, and referring matters to the appropriate decision-maker or committee.
- Ensuring Turnitin similarity reports, AI-writing indicators, search engine results or other electronic tool outputs are not used as the sole basis for a finding of academic integrity breach or the automatic application of a penalty.
- Maintaining the academic integrity register, ensuring accurate recording of finalised substantiated findings, and preparing academic integrity trend reports for governance review and continuous improvement.

4. Program Coordinator

- Is responsible for conducting an initial review of Academic Integrity Incident Reports to determine whether the report is complete, supported by relevant evidence and suitable for referral to the Head, Academic Integrity.
- May request further information from academic staff, clarify assessment context, confirm the relevant assessment instructions or AI Assessment Scale requirements, and identify whether the matter appears to involve poor academic practice, academic support needs, or a suspected academic integrity breach.
- The Program Coordinator must not determine an appeal where they were involved in the original report, verification, investigation or decision.

5. Academic staff, Markers and Invigilators

- Academic staff, markers, facilitators and invigilators are responsible for understanding and applying this procedure in their teaching, assessment and supervision activities.
- Academic staff are responsible for providing students with clear assessment instructions, including expectations for referencing, collaboration, use of sources, permitted or prohibited use of GenAI, AI Assessment Scale requirements, assessment declarations and examination or test rules.
- Academic staff must design and deliver assessment activities that support assurance of learning and provide opportunities for calibration or verification of student achievement, where appropriate.
- Where the academic staff identify a suspected academic integrity concern, they must document the concern using the approved Academic Integrity Incident Report and provide relevant evidence. Academic staff may provide academic context and subject-matter advice but must not be the sole decision-maker in determining whether academic misconduct has been substantiated.
- Invigilators and staff supervising tests, examinations or authenticated assessments are responsible for monitoring assessment conditions, documenting suspected breaches,

preserving relevant evidence and reporting concerns in accordance with this procedure.

- All staff involved in academic integrity matters must maintain confidentiality, manage evidence securely, act fairly and avoid prejudging the outcome of any allegation.

6. Students

- Are responsible for Acting honestly, responsibly and transparently in all learning and assessment activities.
- Understanding and complying with AAPoly's academic integrity requirements, assessment instructions, subject guide requirements, AI Assessment Scale requirements, referencing expectations, collaboration rules, examination rules and assessment declaration requirements.
- Submitting work that is their own, acknowledge all sources appropriately, declare the use of GenAI or other assistance where required, retain relevant drafts or evidence of their learning process where applicable, and avoid conduct that may compromise academic integrity.
- Are also responsible for engaging honestly and respectfully with academic integrity processes, responding to communications within required timeframes, attending meetings or hearings where required, providing truthful information and seeking clarification or support where needed.
- Students may access academic support, student services, wellbeing support or an approved support person when responding to an academic integrity concern or appeal.

7. Student Services

- Student Services is responsible for administrative coordination of student communications under this procedure, including acknowledgement of appeals, issuing approved notices, recording outcomes, advising students of available support services, and providing information about internal appeal and external complaint options.
- Student Services must ensure that student communications are timely, accurate, clear, respectful and appropriately recorded.

8. Compliance Manager

- The Compliance Manager is responsible for advising on regulatory compliance risks associated with academic integrity matters, including alignment with the Higher Education Standards Framework, ESOS Act, National Code requirements and records management obligations.
- Where a matter may result in suspension, cancellation, exclusion or reporting through PRISMS, the Compliance Manager must be consulted before implementation of the outcome.

9. Student Discipline Committee (SDC)

- The SDC hears and determines referred academic misconduct matters and may review appeals where its members were not involved in the original investigation or decision.
- The SDC must operate fairly, impartially and in accordance with its Terms of Reference. Members must declare any actual, potential or perceived conflict of interest and must not participate in a matter where independence may reasonably be questioned.
- The SDC must make decisions based on relevant evidence, procedural fairness, the balance of probabilities and proportionality. Written reasons must be provided for decisions.

10. Academic Review Committee (ARC)

- The ARC hears referred serious, repeated or high-risk academic misconduct matters and conducts internal reviews or appeals where its members were not involved in the original investigation, decision or earlier appeal.
- The ARC must operate fairly, impartially and in accordance with its Terms of Reference. Members must declare any actual, potential or perceived conflict of interest.
- Where a matter may result in suspension, cancellation, exclusion or another serious enrolment consequence, the ARC may make a recommendation to the CEO or authorised delegate for executive review before implementation.

11. Chief Executive Officer (CEO) or Authorised Delegate

- The CEO or authorised delegate is responsible for executive review of recommendations involving suspension, cancellation, exclusion or other serious enrolment consequences.
- The executive review must confirm that the procedure has been followed, the finding is supported by evidence, the penalty is proportionate, appeal rights have been provided, and relevant regulatory obligations have been addressed.

12. Academic Board

- The Academic Board is responsible for academic governance oversight of the effectiveness of academic integrity arrangements, including review of academic integrity trends, systemic risks, serious or repeated breaches, assessment assurance risks and continuous improvement actions.
- The Academic Board does not normally determine individual misconduct cases unless required under the approved governance framework or appeal process.

13. Third-party Personnel and Contractors

- Any third-party personnel, contractors, external markers, supervisors or delivery partners involved in teaching, assessment, academic support, invigilation or academic decision-making must comply with this procedure and relevant AAPoly academic integrity requirements.
- AAPoly remains responsible for ensuring that third-party arrangements do not compromise academic integrity, assessment validity or the integrity of AAPoly's higher education awards.

14. All Staff (involved in academic integrity)

- All staff and committee members involved in academic integrity matters are responsible for maintaining confidentiality, managing records securely, limiting access to authorised personnel, and ensuring that records of allegations, evidence, communications, decisions, appeals and outcomes are accurate and complete.
- Only finalised substantiated findings of academic misconduct will be recorded as first, second, third or subsequent breaches for penalty escalation purposes.

FEEDBACK

Queries or feedback about this procedure should be directed to the Academic Dean through academicdean@aapoly.edu.au. The Academic Dean will respond to the written question or feedback within two (2) weeks from the receipt unless an extenuating circumstance requires an immediate response or action. The feedback and subsequent outcome will be documented in the version register which will form a part of quality assurance and continuous improvement of AAPoly.

REFERENCES

Source	Document Title
Internal	Learning Resources and Educational Support Policy and Procedure
	Academic Integrity Policy
	AAPoly Higher-Education Student Handbook
	AAPoly Academic Integrity, Honesty and Free Intellectual Inquiry Policy
External	Higher Education Standards Framework (Threshold Standards) 2021
	National Code of Practice for Providers of Education and Training to Overseas Students 2018
	TEQSA: Academic Integrity Toolkit (2026)
	TEQSA: What is academic integrity?
	National Student Ombudsman