



Academic Integrity, Plagiarism and AI Misuse Policy

1. Purpose & Objectives

Insight Institute of Further Studies (IIFS) is committed to fostering a culture of academic integrity, personal honesty, and ethical scholarship across all Vocational Education and Training (VET) and CRICOS courses. The primary objectives of this policy are to:

- Establish clear expectations regarding academic honesty and authentic evidence submission for all enrolled students.
- Provide a rigorous framework for preventing, detecting, investigating, and penalizing instances of plagiarism, collusion, contract cheating, and unauthorized Artificial Intelligence (AI) tool usage.
- Ensure full compliance with Australian Vocational Education and Training regulatory standards, including ASQA Outcome Standards and CRICOS obligations.
- Guarantee procedural fairness (Natural Justice) and transparent re-assessment pathways for all learners involved in academic integrity inquiries.

2. Scope & Applicability

This policy applies universally across IIFS operational environments, including:

- All enrolled domestic (VET) and international (CRICOS) students across all delivery locations and study modes (on-campus, practical workshops, blended, and online).
- All trainers, assessors, academic support staff, Student Support Officers, and RTO Quality Management personnel.
- All form of assessments, including written workbooks, practical projects, workplace evidence, online LMS submissions, presentations, and portfolios.

3. Regulatory Framework & Standards Alignment

This policy directly aligns with and operationalizes the following national regulatory benchmarks:

- **Standards for RTOs (ASQA):** Standard 1 (Systematic training and assessment, authentic evidence assessment rules 1.3–1.5) and Standard 4 (Accurate student records and continuous improvement 4.4).
- **National Code of Practice for Providers of Education and Training to Overseas Students:** Standards governing course progress, academic support, and student welfare.

- **Higher Education Standards / TEQSA Academic Integrity Guidelines:** Best-practice benchmarks adapted for VET RTO governance.

4. Definitions & Classification of Misconduct

IIFS defines academic misconduct as any action or attempted action that may result in an unfair academic advantage for oneself or another student. Categories include:

Category	Definition	Examples
Academic Integrity	The commitment to honesty, trust, fairness, respect, responsibility, and courage in all academic endeavours.	Submitting original work, correctly citing external sources, and representing skills truthfully.
Plagiarism	Submitting work, text, diagrams, code, or ideas created by another person without appropriate citation or acknowledgement.	Copying paragraphs verbatim from internet sources, textbooks, or peer documents without quotes or reference tags.
Collusion	Unauthorized collaboration between two or more students to produce assessment tasks submitted as individual efforts.	Sharing completed assessment workbooks with classmates or collaborating on individual short-answer tasks.
Unauthorized AI Misuse	The unapproved or undeclared generation of assessment content using Artificial Intelligence tools (GenAI).	Using ChatGPT, Gemini, Jasper, or paraphrasing engines (e.g., QuillBot) to write answers without trainer consent or disclosure.
Contract Cheating	Engaging a third party (paid or unpaid) to complete an assessment task on a student's behalf.	Purchasing custom essays, hiring assignment writing services, or having a family member complete assessment.
Verbal Validation (Viva Voce)	An oral examination conducted by an assessor to verify that a student possesses the underlying knowledge shown in written submissions.	Asking follow-up questions during or after practical assessments to confirm understanding of submitted text.



5. AI Governance & Integrity Framework

5.1 Principles of AI Usage

Generative AI tools (such as ChatGPT, Claude, and Gemini) are emerging tools in professional and educational sectors. IIFS adopts a structured approach to GenAI:

- **Authorized Use:** AI tools may only be used when explicitly permitted in written assessment instructions for brainstorming, research structure, or proofreading assistance.
- **Mandatory Disclosure:** If AI tools are permitted, students must attach an *AI & Authenticity Declaration Form* detailing the tool used, prompts entered, and how output was modified.
- **Prohibited Use:** Direct copying of AI-generated content into assessment submissions without disclosure is treated as academic misconduct equivalent to plagiarism.

5.2 Data Privacy & Institutional Governance

To protect institutional and student privacy, trainers, staff, and students are strictly prohibited from uploading personal data, student assessment files, or internal IIFS confidential materials into unapproved public consumer-grade AI platforms.

6. Detection & Authenticity Verification Protocols

IIFS employs a multi-layered verification strategy to guarantee assessment authenticity:

Submission Channel	Detection & Verification Method	Action Trigger Threshold
LMS Submissions (Online)	Integrated digital detection platforms (e.g., Turnitin, Grammarly Academic Check) automatically scan submissions against global web archives and student databases.	Similarity score > 20% or AI Probability Flag > 25% requires mandatory manual assessor review.
Hard Copy & Practical Workbooks	Randomized manual sampling through dedicated verification software (e.g., Copyleaks, GPTZero) and assessor stylistic analysis.	Inconsistent terminology, abrupt shifts in language complexity, or formatting anomalies.
Practical & Hands-On Units	Direct observation, workbench questioning, and tool usage validation by qualified trainers.	Discrepancy between written theoretical answers and practical execution capability.

6.2 Mandatory Verbal Validation

Where digital detection tools indicate potential plagiarism/AI generation, or where an assessor suspects a student did not author their submission, the assessor **must** conduct a Verbal Validation interview. The assessor will ask 3–5 targeted oral questions regarding the concepts in the submission. Failure to demonstrate comprehension will substantiate an academic integrity breach.

7. Disciplinary Framework & Offence Hierarchy

IIFS categorizes breaches into progressive tiers, prioritizing education for minor instances while applying firm sanctions for deliberate or repeat misconduct.

Offence Level	Criteria / Trigger	Mandatory Sanctions & Actions
Level 1: Minor / First Offence	Unintentional referencing errors, minor uncited paraphrasing, or first-time minor AI assistance without declaration.	• Mandatory meeting with Trainer & Student Support Officer. • Formal warning letter issued and recorded on Student File. • Completion of Academic Integrity & Referencing Workshop. • Re-assessment permitted (capped at Satisfactory).
Level 2: Moderate / Second Offence	Repeated plagiarism, significant unacknowledged AI text generation (>30%), or direct collusion on individual tasks.	• Formal written breach notice from RTO Academic Manager. • Result logged as 'Not Yet Competent' (NYC) for the unit. • Student required to re-enroll and repeat the entire unit of competency at their own cost.
Level 3: Major / Severe Offence	Contract cheating, impersonation, falsification of workplace records, or third-offence deliberate plagiarism.	• Immediate referral to Executive Management. • Suspension or Cancellation of Enrollment. • For CRICOS students: Mandatory reporting via



Offence Level	Criteria / Trigger	Mandatory Sanctions & Actions
		PRISMS (may impact student visa status).

8. Standard Operating Procedure (10-Step Workflow)

All academic integrity matters must follow the standard 10-step procedure:

- Education & Orientation:** Students receive academic integrity briefing during orientation; sign Authenticity Declarations for all submissions.
- Assessor Training:** Assessors are trained in authenticity verification, AI detection indicators, and conducting Verbal Validation interviews.
- Assessment Submission:** Student submits work via LMS or hard copy with complete reference lists and declarations.
- Digital Screening:** Submissions pass through LMS automated detection tools (Turnitin/AI checkers).
- Assessor Review:** Assessor evaluates work against assessment benchmarks and authenticity flags.
- Verbal Validation (If Flagged):** If flags exceed thresholds or doubt exists, assessor conducts a 10-minute Viva Voce interview and documents responses.
- Breach Substantiation:** If misconduct is confirmed, assessor completes the *Academic Misconduct Incident Form* and notifies the RTO Manager.
- Procedural Fairness Meeting:** Student receives written notice of allegation and is given 5 business days to respond in a formal interview.
- Sanction Application & Logging:** RTO Manager applies appropriate Level 1–3 sanction, records outcome in the Academic Misconduct Register, and issues formal notification.
- Continuous Improvement Logging:** Trends, detection gaps, or emerging AI misuse patterns are logged into the *IIFS Continuous Improvement (CI) Register* for bi-annual system review.

9. Appeals & Natural Justice

Students retain full rights to appeal any decision or sanction applied under this policy in accordance with the *IIFS Complaints and Appeals Policy*. Appeals must be lodged in writing within 20 business days of receiving formal breach notification.

10. Document Control & Related Forms



Related Document Name	Document Code
Student Code of Conduct	POL-STU-001
Academic Misconduct Incident Form	FOR-ACAD-012
Academic Misconduct Register	REG-ACAD-003
AI & Authenticity Student Declaration Form	FOR-ACAD-018
Continuous Improvement Register	REG-QUAL-001
Complaints and Appeals Policy & Procedure	POL-QUAL-005

Yours sincerely,

Kamal Mann

Kamal Mann

CEO Insight Institute of Further Studies