

Academic Misconduct Determination Guidelines (V10)

Document part of the Academic Integrity Procedure

Contents

1. Purpose	1
<i>Early Intervention (EI) for Academic Integrity</i>	2
2. Severity Overview (on the balance of probabilities):.....	3
3. Penalty	4
4. Examples of Academic Misconduct	5
<i>Example 1: Plagiarism</i>	5
<i>Example 2: Contract cheating</i>	5
<i>Example 3: Examination/Test Cheating/Oral exam</i>	6
<i>Example 4: Resubmitting/recycling previously assessed work/duplicate submission</i>	6
<i>Example 5: Fabrication</i>	7
<i>Example 6: Impersonation</i>	7
<i>Example 7: Academic Fraud</i>	7
<i>Example 8: Solicitation and promoting the breach of academic integrity</i>	8
<i>Example 9: Collusion</i>	8
<i>Example 10: Bribes</i>	9
<i>Example 11: Facilitating academic dishonesty</i>	9
<i>Example 12: Unauthorised use of technology, including text-spinners and GenAI tools. And agents</i>	10

1. Purpose

These guidelines provide a consistent, TEQSA-aligned and ASSURE-aligned approach to determining academic misconduct at Federation University. The guidelines:

- describe the three levels of misconduct severity (Low, Medium, High),
- outline penalty options based on severity and prior history,
- integrate expectations for ethical and responsible use of Generative Artificial Intelligence (AI) tools,
- support transparent, student-centred and understandable decision-making, and
- encourage consistency across the schools/institutes, misconduct committees, and assessment environments including AI-integrated contexts.

These guidelines also need to be considered in context with the following key documents:

- [Academic Integrity Procedure](#)

- [Student Misconduct Procedure](#)
- [ASSURE framework](#)

These documents emphasise ethical, pedagogically sound AI-supported teaching and learning practice across Federation University.

Early Intervention (EI) for Academic Integrity

Early Intervention may be offered when a student demonstrates poor academic practice, not misconduct. It is to ensure students learn correct academic conversations before penalties apply.

→ Eligibility for EI

EI may be offered in the first three semesters of study only and when:

- the concern reflects inexperience or misunderstanding,
- the behaviour is not intended to gain advantage,
- the student has not already received an EI in the same unit this study period,
- the work does not involve copying, impersonation, submission of another's work, or substantial (less than 5%) unacknowledged GenAI content, and
- the task is not a quiz, exam, or secure assessment point.

→ Not Eligible for EI

EI cannot be used for:

- repeated or on-going poor practice, (including any issue that has already been addressed through an EI in a previous semester, assessment period, or unit instance);
- deliberate deception;
- extensive unacknowledged use of GenAI tools;
- assessments requiring strict authentication (e.g. invigilated/oral exams, or supervised practicals).

→ Process

If eligible, the student receives:

- clear instructions outlining what must be corrected and the deadline for resubmission;
- a requirement (where appropriate), to complete the Academic Integrity Module (AIM) again and/or consult with a Learning Skills Advisor (LSA), and to engage with relevant resources (e.g. academic skills support, library services, referencing guidelines);
- a seven (7) day window to resubmit the assessment; and
- transparent marking expectations consistent with the Academic Integrity Procedure.

The Unit Coordinator, lecturer, or marker will review the resubmitted work to determine whether the identified issues have been adequately addressed and will re-mark the assessment accordingly.

For first-year units, students may be eligible for the full range of marks.

For all other units, the maximum mark awarded will be up to 50% of the total marks for the assessment task.

Where an EI is applied, staff must ensure that the EI is formally recorded in FDL, including any recording

software to support consistency, transparency, and future decision making.

Where a student is not eligible for EI, does not accept the EI, or fails to adequately address the identified issues:

- the matter must be reported as a potential academic misconduct case via the Advocate portal by the academic staff, particularly where a penalty is being applied.

Cases submitted through the Advocate portal are reviewed by the Student Integrity team, who will:

- check for relevant contextual information (e.g. Learning Action Plans, prior upheld incidents, or previous EIs); and
- assign the case to an Academic Integrity Officer (AIO) for vetting and recommendation.

Based on this review, the AIO may recommend:

- no further action (e.g. insufficient evidence);
- resolution at the Institute level; or
- referral to the Student Misconduct Committee (SMC) for a formal hearing.

2. Severity Overview (on the balance of probabilities):

Severity is assessed using intent, experience, level of advantage, and alignment with TEQSA and ASSURE principles, ensuring fair and consistent judgments.

Note: Inappropriate use of GenAI has been covered across several example areas including a section focused on GenAI itself.

Severity Level	Description
Low	• Reflects poor academic practice or misunderstanding. Minimal or no intent to deceive. • Error in judgment and/or lack of understanding of good scholarship practice due to the student's academic inexperience.
Medium	• Partially deliberate behaviour resulting in a significant advantage • Carelessness in scholarship that is below the standard expected for the level being studied and/or the student's academic experience.
High	• Deliberate attempt to gain a major advantage (e.g., outsource, accessing exam material, personation, or submitting AI content as original work). • Serious carelessness in scholarship that is well below the standard expected for the level being studied and/or the student's academic experience.

3. Penalty

Penalty	Second breach Low/First High/Second medium	Third breach Any (students with a third or subsequent breach will have their case referred to the Misconduct Committee)
Behavioural agreement	✓ (with other penalties)	✓ (with other penalties)
Sit/resit Academic Integrity module	✓ (with other penalties)	✓ (with other penalties)
Reduced assessment mark (by 50% points)		
Additional academic integrity or other coursework		
Opportunity to revise/resubmit (Fail/Pass)		
Failure of assessment	✓	
Record on FDL	✓	✓ (with other penalties)
Failure in unit		✓
Suspension	✓ (with other penalties)	✓
Exclusion (cases with a recommended penalty of exclusion will be referred to the Student Misconduct Committee)	✓ (with other penalties)	✓

4. Examples of Academic Misconduct

Example 1: Plagiarism

The presentation of work/s by another person/s as one's own work by failing to properly acknowledge those person/s. This includes copying from another student where the original author is unaware of the incident. Proper acknowledgement means to clearly identify which parts of a work originate from which source.

Severity	Description
Low	- Failure to acknowledge sources of quotations, ideas or data (including when paraphrasing) - Poor referencing, including citing incorrectly - Paraphrasing one paragraph by only changing a few words without changing the sentence structure of the original text Changing the sentence structure but not the words - Putting quotation marks around part of a quotation but not around all of it - Submitting the wrong assignment (where they can produce proof of the "correct one" and that it was completed prior to the submission date).
Medium	- Copying and failing to acknowledge an amount of information from AI/academic publications where that information forms a reasonable (i.e., 5-15%) part of the assignment - Paraphrasing (5-15%) to disguise the extent of plagiarism - Submitting an assignment incorporating significant material taken from other sources and without acknowledgement; - May include partial copying or rewording of AI generated text or ideas without acknowledgement.
High	- Submitting another's work and representing it as one's own - Disguising plagiarism via double translation - Unauthorised AI-facilitated content created for submission; - Submitting tasks completed entirely by AI as one's own without acknowledgement or any student revision.

Example 2: Contract cheating

Contracting/allowing another person or unauthorised use of artificial intelligence to create part thereof or all assessable content. Contract cheating includes paid and unpaid arrangements made through a third party, which includes friends/family.

Severity	Description
Low	Getting assistance from parents, siblings or friends who work in the industry to do an assessment
Medium	- Seeking or receiving substantial help from another student, tutor, freelancer, or AI system that results in shared authorship or content creation beyond approved limits. - Using 'study help' sites or AI generators without acknowledgement to produce large sections of work (relevant to the assessment task format).
High	- Paying, exchanging, or bartering with another person, service, or AI content vendor to create any part of an assessment; uploading or purchasing answers from GenAI forums or freelance platforms - Seeking a payment for work prepared for another student(s) or coordinating collaborative cheating networks. - Producing entire work through GenAI tools, sites without acknowledgement.

Example 3: Examination/Test Cheating/Oral exam

Severity	Description
Low	- Continued writing after examination/test time is completed - Exceeding the time allocation on an online test - Bringing (but not using) unauthorised material into a closed-book examination where there is no evidence of intent to access or use it - Having (theoretical) access to unauthorised material or technology (e.g. a phone in a pocket but no access attempted) - Minor breach, such as consulting digital aids or leaving GenAI enabled devices open accidentally during a supervised test.
Medium	- Receiving assistance on an assessment task that has the effect of making it someone else's work - Communicating with another student during exams/tests but not on the exam/test itself (e.g., asking the time) - Removing or endeavouring to remove from the examination room any question/answer/other paper, provided for use by the student during the course of the examination, or other material which is the property of the University, unless authorised by the examination supervisor and examiner.
High	- Copying another student's work in an examination. - Accessing confidential examination information prior to an examination. - Bearing notes in non-authorised locations (e.g., on the body, in pens or smart devices). - Sending, receiving or accessing or endeavouring to send, receive or access any source of stored electronic information during the examination unless specified by the examiner - Removing or endeavouring to remove from the examination room any question/answer/other paper, provided for use by the student during the course of the examination, or other material which is the property of the University, unless authorised by the examination supervisor and examiner. - Using GenAI, smart devices, or external people to remotely feed answers in real time during an in-person or online exam - Using unauthorised GenAI tools, material or internet-connected devices to access hints, definitions, or generated answers during online quizzes or remote exams.

Example 4: Resubmitting/recycling previously assessed work/duplicate submission

Severity	Description
Low	- Reusing previously submitted work from an earlier attempt or subject without acknowledgement, where there is no intent to mislead and the advantage gained is minimal (self-plagiarism) - May include minor reuse of text refined using AI
Medium	Resubmitting substantial part of previously submitted work from another unit or study period without acknowledgement, including AI-assisted rewriting of earlier submissions to disguise reuse.
High	Resubmitting previously submitted marked work from another unit, previous attempt or study period in full without acknowledgement

Example 5: Fabrication

Severity	Description
Low	May include accidental insertion of GenAI suggested data or references without validation.
Medium	- Making up sources for a bibliography/reference list or using hallucinated sources produced by GenAI - Making up footnotes or in-text citations based on fabricated or hallucinated sources - Falsely representing the proportion of individual work towards a group assignment - Creating fake data, graphs, or citations using GenAI tools.
High	- Claiming results of research where none have been found - Claiming specific results from research where the findings are inconsistent or inconclusive - Changing results of research - Intentional and unauthorised falsification or invention of any information or experimental data in an assessable item or paper - Claiming GenAI made data are real results.

Example 6: Impersonation

Severity	Description
Low	Minor, unintentional or accidental use of another's identity or system issues, like logging in with another account by mistake (accidental)
Medium	Using another person's login, sharing authentication codes, or submitting via another account (deliberately).
High	- Deliberate impersonation or identity fraud, including pretending to be another student or staff member in assessments, online authentication and in-class attendance - Pretending to be another student and completing an assessment task/exam on their behalf or presenting themselves in attendance at a class in which student participation is required as a hurdle. - Using AI tools to mimic voices, faces, or digital identities - Arranging for others to impersonate oneself.

Example 7: Academic Fraud

Severity	Description
Low	
Medium	Giving a false excuse or submitting GenAI generated or digitally edited documentation (for example, screenshots, attendance emails) to obtain an extension/rearrangement/deferment/concession.
High	- Creating or submitting AI generated documents (e.g., fake letters, ID cards, attendance proofs) to misrepresent identity. - Creating, forging, or submitting false or GenAI generated official records, including medical certificates, or institutional letters, to gain academic or personal benefit. - Forging a medical certificate for special consideration - Manipulating genuine evidence using GenAI image or text tools.

Example 8: Solicitation and promoting the breach of academic integrity

Severity	Description
Low	- Posting your own study notes or examples on public or shared platforms e.g., chat groups, forums, or cloud folders without recognising others could copy and submit them dishonestly. - Sharing an assessment or part of it with another student or friend without realising it could be misused e.g. sending notes or drafts meant to help them. - Supplying an assessment item or part thereof to another, on the understanding it would not be copied for the purposes of submission or without understanding potential integrity risks. - Inadvertently entering or uploading sensitive assessment information (e.g., assignment instructions, rubrics, or feedback) into public GenAI tools without realising that this data may be stored or reused by the tools.
Medium	- Knowingly providing a friend or classmate with a completed or near-complete assessment that they might submit as their own. - Uploading assessment content or university materials to shared platforms or study-help websites e.g., Chegg, CourseHero or social-media groups without permission. - Providing a fellow student with a completed or marked assignment where there would be potential that they will use the content dishonestly - Uploading a copy of a unit outline or other unit or course materials to a website or server without the express permission of the University
High	- Actively helping others to cheat, such as producing or editing work for another student to submit, with or without payment. - Running, promoting, or advertising academic cheating, freelancing, or ghost-writing services. - Recruiting others to share or distribute assessment materials for dishonest use. - Deliberately giving AI tools full access to restricted or confidential assessment materials, students work or feedback so they can use, sell or reuse it. - Selling or supplying students' work or university material to a third-party, including GenAI.

Example 9: Collusion

The unauthorised act of a student presenting work, which is the outcome of directly working with others, as their own.

Severity	Description
Low	- Working with one or more people (without the authorisation of teaching staff) to prepare and produce a piece of work that forms part of an assessment task. - Allowing others to copy a relatively small part of a student's work for an assessment task. May include jointly using a shared GenAI chat or workspace to draft short responses when collaboration was not permitted.
Medium	- Working with one or more people (without the authorisation of teaching staff) to prepare and produce a piece of work that forms a substantial part of an assessment task. - Allowing others to copy a substantial part of work for an assessment task or sharing large sections of work knowing it may be reused dishonestly. - Seeking a lower or nil penalty for reported plagiarism by denial of a relationship with another student(s).

	Using shared GenAI prompts, group accounts, or messaging platforms to co-create content submitted as individual work.
High	- Organising shared GenAI workspaces, repositories, or social-media groups to distribute solutions. - Selling or distributing GenAI generated materials for use.

Example 10: Bribes

Please note that the regulations regarding staff's acceptance of gifts are detailed in the [Gifts, Benefits, Hospitality, Procedure](#).

Severity	Description
Low	Implying or joking about offering something in return for better marks, even if not acted upon.
Medium	
High	- Offering a staff member money, gifts, sexual or other favours to gain a defined advantage in assessment/examination marking. - Providing favours or services (e.g., free tutoring, tech support, or event access) to staff in hopes of receiving undefined rewards, such as leniency or preferential treatment.

Example 11: Facilitating academic dishonesty

Severity	Description
Low	- Supplying an assessment item or part thereof to another, on the understanding it would not be copied for the purposes of submission or without understanding potential integrity risks. - Inadvertently entering or uploading sensitive assessment information (e.g., assignment instructions, rubrics, or feedback) into public GenAI tools without realising that this data may be stored or reused by the tools.
Medium	- Providing a fellow student with a completed or marked assignment where there would be potential that they will use the content dishonestly - Uploading a copy of a unit outline or other unit or course materials to a website or server without the express permission of the University
High	- Deliberately giving AI tools full access to restricted or confidential assessment materials, students work or feedback so they can use, sell or reuse it. - Selling or supplying students' work or university material to a third-party, including GenAI.

Example 12: Unauthorised use of technology, including text-spinners and GenAI tools. And agents

Severity	Description
Low	- Occasional poor or incorrect referencing/paraphrasing of AI assisted text but no intention to cheat - Accidentally submitting the wrong file or early draft containing AI assisted edits, and can show the correct version was finished on time
Medium	- Copied a small part (approx. 5–15%) from GenAI outputs, online content, or text-spinners without acknowledging. - Rephrasing GenAI-generated material to disguise origin or combining multiple AI outputs without critical human contribution. - Failure to meet disclosure requirements for AI use in assessments.
High	- Submission of substantial (15%+) GenAI produced or translated work as personal work, especially in Lane 1 (Independent Capability) tasks that must be done independently. - Intentionally used a text-spinning or translation on purpose to cover up AI made writing. - Use of unapproved AI tools to create or translate whole assessment.

Version 10

- *Reviewed by Academic Integrity Officers and led by A Turner (16.3.26)*
- *Reviewed by the Artificial Intelligence Working Group (6.4.23)*
- *Reviewed by the GenAI SWAT team and AIOs (14.1.26)*
- *Reviewed by Deputy, PVC and Academic Integrity Manager (3.3.26)*
- *Note: Have sent to AIOs for final check (3.3.26)*
- *Feedback period closed 16.3.26 and published V10*