



Academic Integrity Policy and Procedure

1 Purpose

The purpose of this policy and procedure is to formally define academic integrity, academic misconduct and plagiarism and to provide policy and procedural standards for the management of plagiarism and academic misconduct, including the imposition and enforcement of penalties.

2 Scope

This policy applies to all students of MIT, and guides staff in the Institute's understanding of these important issues.

3 Definitions

Term	Definition
Academic Integrity	Academic Integrity is the honest presentation of academic work through acknowledgment of the work of others while developing new insights, knowledge and ideas. It embraces values such as honesty and maintenance of academic standards. It includes the avoidance of plagiarism and every kind of cheating.

Warning: uncontrolled when printed.

Original Issue:	05 July 2015
Revised by the Policy Committee:	01 November 2023
Approved by Academic Board	02 May 2024
Endorsed by Board of Directors	14 June 2024
Current Version:	14 June 2024
Review Date:	13 June 2029
	Page 1 of 18



Term	Definition
Academic Misconduct (or Misconduct)	means conduct on the part of a student (including conduct during practicums or external placements in their capacity as a student of the Institute) that: a) undermines academic integrity and erodes academic standards, and includes cheating, collusion, contract cheating, cheating through unacknowledged use of artificial intelligence technology and plagiarism; b) seeks to gain for himself or herself, or for any other person, any academic advantage through the improper use of facilities, information or the intellectual property of others; c) includes – • making a false representation as to a matter affecting a student's status; • breach of academic integrity as a student, or by some other person with the purpose of helping a student gain an improper academic advantage; • tampering, or attempting to tamper, with examination scripts, class work, grades or records; • making available material to unauthorised external organisations such as contract cheating sites; • failing to abide by reasonable directions of a member of academic staff in relation to academic matters; • gaining, or attempting to gain, possess, or distribute examination materials or information without approval; • impersonating another student, or arranging for anyone to impersonate a student, in an examination or other assessment task; • altering or falsifying any document that the Institute requires of the student (e.g. medical certificate or other supporting documentation) for the purposes of gaining academic advantage; • altering group assessment work without the collaborating students' consent.

Warning: uncontrolled when printed.

Original Issue:	05 July 2015
Revised by the Policy Committee:	01 November 2023
Approved by Academic Board	02 May 2024
Endorsed by Board of Directors	14 June 2024
Current Version:	14 June 2024
Review Date:	13 June 2029
	Page 2 of 18



Term	Definition
Academic Registrar	Academic Registrar means the person holding the position of Group General Manager within the Institute.
Artificial Intelligence Technology Tool	Means a software tool using artificial intelligence techniques to generate text from prompts provided by the user (such as ChatGPT or Google Bard), or to improve the quality of a draft of work provided by the user (such as Google "Help Me Write"). The use of such a tool is not always forbidden, but students must declare their use of such a tool, and unless instructed NOT to do so, should provide full details of the input they used when invoking the tool. The policy for the use of AI Tools is detailed in the "Use of GenAI for Learning, Teaching and Research Policy and Procedure".
Cheating	means to act dishonestly or unfairly in order to gain an advantage or to assist another student to gain an advantage. Cheating may occur at any time before during or after an assessment or examination and includes, but is not limited to – a) plagiarising; b) colluding with others; c) contract cheating; d) cheating through unacknowledged use of artificial intelligence technology; e) fabricating data or inventing references; f) bringing unauthorised material, including an electronic device, into an examination without the explicit permission of the supervisor, whether or not the material is actually used or not (if used the offence may be rated as more serious); g) submitting the same assessment or academic work in more than one unit without prior permission of the unit coordinator; h) breaching examination or course rules.

Warning: uncontrolled when printed.

Original Issue:	05 July 2015
Revised by the Policy Committee:	01 November 2023
Approved by Academic Board	02 May 2024
Endorsed by Board of Directors	14 June 2024
Current Version:	14 June 2024
Review Date:	13 June 2029
Page 3 of 18	



Term	Definition
Collusion	means unauthorised cooperation with other people in order to deceive others. Collusion may occur when two or more students, or a student and any other person(s), act together to cheat, plagiarise or engage in other academic misconduct, or incite others to do so, leading to the presentation of an assessment or academic work as independent when it has been produced in whole or part in collusion with other people. Collusion includes students working together when not explicitly permitted to do so, providing their academic work to another student, or offering to assist in completing another person's assessment or academic work. Collusion includes unattributed assistance provided by another person in relation to the work undertaken, including assistance with the form or structure of the work submitted.
Contract cheating	means intentionally, and with the intent to deceive, arranging for a third party to undertake part or all of the work presented, whether for any kind of payment, or otherwise. This includes: obtaining, for payment or otherwise, some other person or agency to undertake part or all of the work; submitting the work of others, either with or without their knowledge, and claiming to have done it; arranging for some other person, either another student or any other person, to do part or all of the work. The unauthorized, or undeclared use of an Artificial Intelligence Tool will be considered, and penalised, as "Contract Cheating", with the "contract" having been undertaken by the computer.
Copying	means to make a similar or identical version of an academic work. Copying is a form of plagiarism, using the same words or ideas belonging to another person's academic work and passing them off as a student's own. It includes using another's work, with minor changes to wording and phrasing, in order to suggest that the work is in fact the student's own.
Disciplinary Committee	is defined in clause 5.2.
Executive Dean	is the Head of the Academic Department of MIT to whom the Heads of School report.

Warning: uncontrolled when printed.

Original Issue:	05 July 2015
Revised by the Policy Committee:	01 November 2023
Approved by Academic Board	02 May 2024
Endorsed by Board of Directors	14 June 2024
Current Version:	14 June 2024
Review Date:	13 June 2029
	Page 4 of 18



Term	Definition
Group work	is assessed work undertaken by a group of collaborating students, as required by the assessment specification.
Head of School (HoS)	the relevant Head of School of Business or the Head of School of Information Technology and Engineering, or nominee, provided the nominee is of a senior rank, generally a Deputy or Associate Head of School.
Plagiarism	means the practice of taking someone else's work or ideas and passing them off as one's own. Plagiarism occurs when the origin of the material used is not appropriately referenced. It is a form of cheating and is a serious academic offence that may lead to expulsion from the Institution. Plagiarism can include (but is not limited to): direct copying; unreferenced paraphrasing; use of facts and information from a source without acknowledgement; submitting answers or papers using text that is not your own; reworking data and passing it off as your work; submitting presentations, programs/coding, spreadsheets, files of others with minor changes; misleading use of citations; and assisting another person to plagiarise.
Ratification of Decision	When a decision is made that academic misconduct has occurred, the student will be given the opportunity to respond. After considering the response, or the lack thereof, the decision maker will ratify a decision – either the original decision or an alternate decision in the light of the student response.
Reporter	is often the assessor (the academic staff member responsible for marking of an assessment and recording of a grade) or unit coordinator, but also includes the relevant exam supervisor or other members of staff.
Self-plagiarism	occurs when a person republishes or resubmits their own previously assessed academic work and presents it as new without appropriately referencing the earlier work, in part or in whole. This may occur when a student, without proper referencing, re-uses parts of, or all of, an assessment or academic work of their own that has been previously submitted for assessment. Self-plagiarism may be judged as Level 1, 2 or 3 Plagiarism depending on when it occurs within a student's study at the Institute and the seriousness of the incident.

Warning: uncontrolled when printed.

Original Issue:	05 July 2015
Revised by the Policy Committee:	01 November 2023
Approved by Academic Board	02 May 2024
Endorsed by Board of Directors	14 June 2024
Current Version:	14 June 2024
Review Date:	13 June 2029
	Page 5 of 18



Term	Definition
Turnitin	Turnitin is an online tool designed to assist staff and students to check the uploaded text of an assignment or academic work against a database containing web content, online e-journals and previously uploaded assessments.

4 Policy Statement

This policy and its procedure and associated documents outline the approach to the oversight of academic integrity at the Institute, including the monitoring and accountability for breaches of academic integrity and the management of actions to address underlying causes through a preventative and educative approach.

4.1 Plagiarism

Academic staff are responsible for determining if academic integrity has been breached in an assessment which they are marking. An important factor in determining the gravity of the breach is assessing whether intentional plagiarism has occurred, and in determining the proportion of the work submitted which has been plagiarised. This is generally the responsibility of the relevant Course Coordinator.

4.2 Academic Misconduct, including Plagiarism

4.2.1 General Academic Misconduct

A student must not, by act or omission, do anything that has the purpose, or has, or is likely to have, the effect of obtaining for the student or for any other person an advantage in an assessment, by unauthorised or unfair means. Nor may a student assist or attempt to assist a person with such conduct.

In determining whether an advantage is intended, or is likely, to be obtained, the fact that such an advantage is not or could not be obtained due to circumstances beyond the control of the student concerned shall be disregarded.

The level of intentionality is a factor in determining the seriousness of academic misconduct. As students are required to successfully complete the unit AIM100 Academic Integrity in their first trimester, it will be reasonably assumed that students, having completed the module, understand the nature of academic misconduct in relation to plagiarism, collusion and cheating, so that offences will generally not be accepted as "unintentional".

Warning: uncontrolled when printed.

Original Issue:	05 July 2015
Revised by the Policy Committee:	01 November 2023
Approved by Academic Board	02 May 2024
Endorsed by Board of Directors	14 June 2024
Current Version:	14 June 2024
Review Date:	13 June 2029



The assessment of the seriousness of any breach will consider the gravity of the different levels and types of academic misconduct as presented in 4.3. Generally, as an example, a student or students, having successfully completed AIM100 but who undertake contract cheating, would be assessed as having committed major academic misconduct and treated accordingly on the basis of intentionality.

When misconduct is identified in group work, all students who signed off that the group had not engaged in academic misconduct shall be considered as having committed any misconduct that has been identified, even when they have not themselves been identified as the person who committed misconduct. However, different penalties may be applied that reflect differing degrees of culpability.

4.2.2 Research Misconduct

- Potential research misconduct by students engaged in research must be reported to the relevant Head of School. The Head of School will refer the matter to the Ethics Officer (being the Designated Officer under the Responsible Conduct of Research Policy and Procedure).
- An investigation into an allegation of research misconduct may be undertaken in accordance with the Responsible Conduct of Research Policy and Procedure Section 5.3-5.
- Following any investigation, the Ethics Officer will notify the Head of School of the finding.
- Where an allegation of research misconduct is upheld the Head of School must convene the Disciplinary Committee in accordance with this policy, section 5.2-3.
- The Disciplinary Committee must be convened within 10 business days of the acknowledgment of the notice from the Ethics Officer and must apply a penalty in accordance with the “penalties for academic and research misconduct” Section 6.
- The Disciplinary Committee must notify the student of the outcome and penalty applied within 5 business days of the committee decision.
- Nothing in this section prevents the Ethics Officer from directing the matter back to the Head of School. The Head of School must then conduct an investigation in accordance with Section 5.

Warning: uncontrolled when printed.

Original Issue:	05 July 2015
Revised by the Policy Committee:	01 November 2023
Approved by Academic Board	02 May 2024
Endorsed by Board of Directors	14 June 2024
Current Version:	14 June 2024
Review Date:	13 June 2029
	Page 7 of 18



4.3 Levels of Academic Misconduct and Plagiarism

The three levels of academic misconduct are:

Level of Misconduct	Plagiarism	Collusion or Contract Cheating	Cheating
Major (Level 3)	Plagiarism is assessed as: deliberate, reckless and/or gross and persistent negligence; repeated intentional practice (ie, the student has been previously accused, and found guilty, of plagiarism at least once before); or a single intentional incident involving 25% or more of work (ie, presentation of content at least 25% has been essentially copied without attribution from other sources).	Intentional collusion between students without attribution. Contract cheating of any sort, according to the definition, which includes undeclared use of Artificial Intelligence Technology tools.	Intentional cheating, such as: making a false representation as to a matter affecting a student's status as a student or with the purpose of gaining an academic advantage; observed use of unauthorised material or a mobile phone in an examination; tampering, or attempting to tamper, with examination scripts, class work, grades or records; gaining, or attempting to gain, possess, or distribute examination materials or information without approval; altering or falsifying any document that the Institute requires of the student (eg. medical certificate or other supporting documentation) for the purposes of gaining academic advantage; impersonating another student, or arranging for anyone to impersonate a student, in an examination or other assessment task. The theft or copying of another student's assignment. Making available MIT academic material to unauthorised external organisations.

Warning: uncontrolled when printed.

Original Issue:

05 July 2015

Revised by the Policy Committee:

01 November 2023

Approved by Academic Board

02 May 2024

Endorsed by Board of Directors

14 June 2024

Current Version:

14 June 2024

Review Date:

13 June 2029



Level of Misconduct	Plagiarism	Collusion or Contract Cheating	Cheating
Moderate (Level 2)	Plagiarism can be assessed as: either intentional (i.e. after completing <i>AIM100 Academic Integrity</i> or equivalent) or unintentional. Plagiarised content is usually between 10% and 25% of assessment content. Repeated instances of minor plagiarism should generally be considered as moderate plagiarism.	Repeated instances of intentional or unintentional minor collusion, such as failure to adhere to the guidelines for group work; or presenting work in significant part in collusion with others.	Any breach of examination requirements as notified by an academic staff member, or examination supervisor that is not judged to be “major”. The copying of part of another student’s assignment. Repeated instances of intentional or unintentional minor cheating.
Minor (Level1)	Plagiarism is assessed as unintentional on the basis of inexperience. Inexperience in minor plagiarism may be accepted in the case of students who have little prior experience of the Australian Higher Education system, who are not sufficiently aware of appropriate academic skills – eg. first year students in their first trimester. Generally this includes poor referencing, or plagiarism of less than 10% of assessment content. Students who have	Student engages in minor collusion on the basis of ignorance, for example, not understanding that even minor components of an assessment should not be shared work with another student. Students who have completed <i>AIM100</i> will in general not be considered to be inexperienced.	Students fail to abide by reasonable directions from a member of academic staff concerning a minor issue of academic integrity. Examination breaches are NOT included here – all such are considered to be at least “moderate” breaches.

Warning: uncontrolled when printed.

Original Issue:

05 July 2015

Revised by the Policy Committee:

01 November 2023

Approved by Academic Board

02 May 2024

Endorsed by Board of Directors

14 June 2024

Current Version:

14 June 2024

Review Date:

13 June 2029



	completed <i>AIM100</i> will in general not be considered to be inexperienced.		
--	--	--	--

5 Procedure

5.1 Plagiarism and Academic Misconduct

At all levels of academic misconduct, an alleged case of academic misconduct must be reported within five (5) working days to:

- the Course Coordinator where it relates directly to one unit of study; or
- the Head of School in all other cases.

The Plagiarism and Misconduct Register must be checked for any previous instances of academic misconduct, to assist with assessing the level of the offence in accordance with Clause 4.3.

Allegations classified by a Course Coordinator as Level 2 or 3 misconduct should be sent directly to the Head of School, who will then be responsible for the matter. At Level 1, the Course Coordinator will normally manage the issue.

Minor misconduct Level 1 Process	Responsibility	Timeline
a) Reporter reports the academic misconduct. This may involve interaction with the student.	Reporter	Within 5 working days
b) If the Course Coordinator/Head of School determines that academic misconduct: • has not occurred – in the case that the student had been previously notified of the reported misconduct, the student will be advised the matter has been dismissed; or • has occurred, the Plagiarism and Misconduct Register is checked for any previous instances of plagiarism or misconduct, and a penalty applied (Clause 6);	Course coordinator or/ Head of School	Student must be informed within 7 days. Student must contact Course Coordinator/ Head of

Warning: uncontrolled when printed.

Original Issue:	05 July 2015
Revised by the Policy Committee:	01 November 2023
Approved by Academic Board	02 May 2024
Endorsed by Board of Directors	14 June 2024
Current Version:	14 June 2024
Review Date:	13 June 2029
	Page 10 of 18



Minor misconduct Level 1 Process	Responsibility	Timeline
notify the student of the accusation and proposed penalty in writing, including the opportunity to seek a discussion with the Course Coordinator/Head of School before the decision is ratified. c) Once the decision has been ratified by the Course Coordinator/Head of School, provide a written report to the School and notification of outcome to student in writing in accordance with Clause 6 Penalties . The student should be informed of the right of review by the Academic Appeals Committee if the grounds for a review are met. d) Provide written information on the academic misconduct details and outcomes for the student file and copy to the Academic Registrar for recording in Plagiarism and Misconduct Register.	Course Coordinator/ Head of School	School within 7 days if contesting decision. Within 7 days

Moderate misconduct Level 2 Process	Responsibility	Timeline
a) Reporter reports the academic misconduct, which is classified as Level 2 or 3 by the Course Coordinator, who escalates to Head of School. Head of School determines if academic misconduct has occurred. This may involve interaction with the student.	Reporter Course Coordinator / Head of School	Within 5 working days
b) If the Head of School determines academic misconduct: - has not occurred – in the case that the student had been previously notified of the reported misconduct, the student will be advised the matter has been dismissed; or - has occurred, the Plagiarism and Misconduct Register is checked for any previous instances of plagiarism or misconduct, and a penalty	Head of School	Student must be informed within 7 days. Student must contact Head of School

Warning: uncontrolled when printed.

Original Issue:	05 July 2015
Revised by the Policy Committee:	01 November 2023
Approved by Academic Board	02 May 2024
Endorsed by Board of Directors	14 June 2024
Current Version:	14 June 2024
Review Date:	13 June 2029



applied (Clause 6); • notify the student of the accusation and proposed penalty in writing, including the opportunity to seek a discussion with the Head of School before the decision is ratified. Where the Head of School determines that the misconduct should be treated as major (Level 3), the matter should be reported to the Executive Dean, who will manage the remainder of the process as specified under major misconduct, below. c) Once the decision has been ratified by the Head of School, provide a written report to the School and notification of outcome to student in writing in accordance with Clause 6 Penalties . The student should be informed of the right of review by the Academic Appeals Committee if the grounds for such a review are met. d) Provide written information on academic misconduct details and outcomes for the student file and copy to the Academic Registrar for recording in the Plagiarism and Misconduct Register.		within 7 days if contesting decision.
--	--	--

Major misconduct Level 3 Process	Responsibility	Timeline
a) Reporter reports the academic misconduct, which is classified as Level 2 or 3 by the Course Coordinator, who escalates to Head of School. Head of School determines if academic misconduct has occurred. This may involve interaction with the student. b) If the Head of School determines academic misconduct	Reporter/ Unit Coordinator/Head of School	Within 5 working days

Warning: uncontrolled when printed.

Original Issue:	05 July 2015
Revised by the Policy Committee:	01 November 2023
Approved by Academic Board	02 May 2024
Endorsed by Board of Directors	14 June 2024
Current Version:	14 June 2024
Review Date:	13 June 2029
Page 12 of 18	



- has not occurred – in the case that the student had been previously notified of the reported misconduct, the student will be advised the matter has been dismissed; or - has occurred, the Plagiarism and Misconduct Register is checked for any previous instances of plagiarism or misconduct, and the incident classified. A Level 2 case is handled as above. The remainder of this table assumes it has been classified as Level 3, and escalated to the Executive Dean.	Head of School	Within 5 working days
c) Constitute the Disciplinary Committee to investigate the incident as follows. The Disciplinary Committee conducts a hearing (where the student is given the opportunity of response to the accusation) and determines if the student has committed the misconduct. If so, it determines the penalty in accordance with Clause 6 Penalties.	Executive Dean	Within 10 working days of the acknowledgment.
d) Notify student of penalty in writing including the opportunity to seek a review by the Academic Appeals Committee.		
e) Provide written information on academic misconduct details and outcomes for the student file and copy to the Academic Registrar for recording in the Plagiarism and Misconduct Register.	Executive Dean	Within 7 days

At each level where a penalty is applied, the student may appeal the decision in accordance with the Academic Appeals Policy and Procedure, which generally allows for appeal on, and only on, the basis of new evidence which was not heard when the original decision was made, or on significant procedural irregularity (including the imposition of an inappropriate penalty) which may have affected any decisions made.

Where a student believes any decision has been reached by a misapplication of Institute policies or procedures- International Students may lodge a complaint with the Commonwealth Ombudsman (online), Tel: 1300 362 072

Website: <https://ombudsman.gov.au> and Domestic Students may apply for external review, for example using Resolution Institute to source an external mediator.

Website: <https://www.resolution.institute> Email: infoaus@resolution.institute

Warning: uncontrolled when printed.

Original Issue:	05 July 2015
Revised by the Policy Committee:	01 November 2023
Approved by Academic Board	02 May 2024
Endorsed by Board of Directors	14 June 2024
Current Version:	14 June 2024
Review Date:	13 June 2029

5.2 The Disciplinary Committee

The Disciplinary Committee ("Disciplinary Committee") is comprised of: the Executive Dean (or nominee) and two (2) members of the academic staff (one from each school) from a nominated group of staff approved by the Chair of the Academic Board.

- The Chair of the Disciplinary Committee is the Executive Dean (or nominee).
- The Secretary will be the Academic Registrar (or nominee) and is non-voting.
- Wherever possible membership of the Disciplinary Committee will ensure gender representation.
- A person will not be appointed a member of the Disciplinary Committee who has had any involvement in the matter forming the subject of the hearing, or where for any other reason it would be inappropriate for the person to be a member.
- A quorum of the Disciplinary Committee is two.
- The Disciplinary Committee must conduct a hearing in the manner that it considers appropriate in accordance with the requirements of procedural fairness and natural justice.
- The student is entitled to be accompanied by a support person or an advocate.

5.3 The Hearing

At the hearing, the Disciplinary Committee must give the student –

- a copy of, or an opportunity to inspect, all material evidence associated with the allegation (if not already provided); and
- a reasonable opportunity to appear before the Disciplinary Committee - to answer the allegations, and in particular, to comment on the substantive material on which the allegation is based.

The Disciplinary Committee will consider any written or oral statements made by the student in relation to the allegation; and maintain order in the hearing and, for this purpose, the Disciplinary Committee has the power to order the removal of a person, including a student or the person accompanying the student (if any).

In considering a case, the Disciplinary Committee must make a decision based on findings of facts that are established on sound reasoning and relevant evidence.

Warning: uncontrolled when printed.

Original Issue:	05 July 2015
Revised by the Policy Committee:	01 November 2023
Approved by Academic Board	02 May 2024
Endorsed by Board of Directors	14 June 2024
Current Version:	14 June 2024
Review Date:	13 June 2029

A student is entitled to appeal the decision of the Disciplinary Committee according to the Academic Appeals Policy and Procedure. Generally appeals are only investigated if they are based on new evidence which was not heard when the original decision was made, or on significant procedural irregularity which may have affected any decisions made.

6 Penalties

The decision-maker (Course Coordinator, Head of School, Executive Dean or the Disciplinary Committee, as appropriate) shall determine the penalty for misconduct as set out in the penalty table below. The penalty shall be determined at the discretion of the decision-maker(s), and prior to setting the penalty the decision-maker shall consider –

- a) the nature and extent of misconduct;
- b) the length of tertiary experience;
- c) the student's disciplinary record;
- d) whether the student should be deemed to have intended to engage in academic misconduct because –
 - the student had successfully completed the compulsory unit *AIM100 Academic Integrity* and therefore is deemed to have understood what constituted academic misconduct in respect of his or her course, unit or particular piece of work; and
 - the student signed a Declaration and Statement of Authorship in respect of the relevant piece of work that stated that they had read and understood the information on plagiarism, and the penalties that may be imposed where an academic offence is committed; and
 - the student's act of plagiarism or other misconduct is clearly covered by the information provided to the student;
- e) whether there is evidence of a deliberate and premeditated decision to engage in misconduct;
- f) the nature and relative weighting of an assessment;
- g) the impact of the conduct on other people; or
- h) whether there are any mitigating circumstances (noting that failure to complete *AIM100* is not considered a mitigating circumstance).

Warning: uncontrolled when printed.

Original Issue:	05 July 2015
Revised by the Policy Committee:	01 November 2023
Approved by Academic Board	02 May 2024
Endorsed by Board of Directors	14 June 2024
Current Version:	14 June 2024
Review Date:	13 June 2029
	Page 15 of 18



Penalty table- Plagiarism and Academic Misconduct

Level and	Penalty Examples include:
Level 1- Minor Plagiarism or Academic Misconduct	The Institute adopts an educative approach where possible for minor breaches. For a first instance, the incident is treated as an assessment matter. <u>Ideally, permit re-submission.</u> Generally reduce the overall mark for the assessment task, or restrict the maximum that can be gained in a resubmission in order to confirm the seriousness of plagiarism. Require the student to complete, if appropriate, the module <i>AIM100 Academic Integrity</i>. Provide the student with a written warning. The following is a summary of the penalties that may be applied: • Student repeats and resubmits work, possibly with a specified maximum number of marks to be awarded; • Reduction in marks by stated amount as a consequence of academic misconduct; • Zero marks in relation to a specific component of a piece of assessment that is the subject of the academic misconduct.
Level 2- Moderate Plagiarism or Academic Misconduct	The following is a summary of the penalties that may be applied, according to circumstances: • Student repeats and resubmits work for a maximum result of 50% (in other words, a mark over 50% will be reduced to 50%); • Zero marks in relation to a specific component of a piece of assessment that is the subject of the academic misconduct. • Reduction in marks by stated amount as a consequence of plagiarism; • 0% for the whole work; • 0% for the unit (in exceptional cases only).
Level 3- Major Plagiarism or Academic Misconduct	The following is a summary of the penalties that may be applied: • 0% for the work; • 0% for the unit; • Suspension from the course; • Permanent exclusion from MIT.

Warning: uncontrolled when printed.

Original Issue:

05 July 2015

Revised by the Policy Committee:

01 November 2023

Approved by Academic Board

02 May 2024

Endorsed by Board of Directors

14 June 2024

Current Version:

14 June 2024

Review Date:

13 June 2029



	Degree not awarded or rescinded. Only in very exceptional circumstances should a penalty lighter than “0% for the work” be imposed.
--	--

7 Responsibilities

7.1 The Institute- The Institute has an ongoing commitment to foster a culture of learning informed by academic integrity. All staff and students will be provided with specific information and training pertaining to academic integrity, as part of professional development for staff, and as hurdle education requirements for students.

7.2 Staff- Academic staff have a responsibility to cultivate, with their students, a climate of mutual respect for original work and a clear understanding of standards for academic integrity. They have responsibility to check carefully that students have not committed breaches of Academic Integrity, and, if they discover that a breach has occurred, to ensure that it is pursued according to this policy.

7.3 Students- First and foremost, students have the responsibility to pursue their studies with integrity, avoiding any kind of breach described in this policy. Students will receive training to ensure they are familiar with and understand the appropriate academic skills required to avoid plagiarism and academic misconduct. They will be required to successfully complete *AIM100 Academic Integrity* in the first trimester of study, and must use Turnitin on request and complete a Declaration and Statement of authorship for each assessment in order for the assessment to be marked.

7.4 Other Responsibilities

- The Academic Board is responsible for the scheduled review of this policy and procedure.
- The Executive Dean is responsible for the operational implementation of this policy and procedure and for reporting to the Academic Board at least once a year as to the origins, numbers and outcomes of students who have plagiarised or are guilty of other forms of academic misconduct, and of appeals against exclusion for academic misconduct.
- All academic misconduct records must be retained in accordance with the Records Management Policy and Procedure.

Warning: uncontrolled when printed.

Original Issue:	05 July 2015
Revised by the Policy Committee:	01 November 2023
Approved by Academic Board	02 May 2024
Endorsed by Board of Directors	14 June 2024
Current Version:	14 June 2024
Review Date:	13 June 2029



8 Implementation and Communication

This policy and procedure will be implemented and communicated through the Institute via:

- the Institute's website;
- Staff professional development.

Supporting Documents-

MIT Policies and Procedures

Plagiarism Reporting Form/ Declaration and Statement of Authorship

Warning: uncontrolled when printed.

Original Issue:	05 July 2015
Revised by the Policy Committee:	01 November 2023
Approved by Academic Board	02 May 2024
Endorsed by Board of Directors	14 June 2024
Current Version:	14 June 2024
Review Date:	13 June 2029
	Page 18 of 18