| | |
|---|---|
| Policy Document Administrator | *Director of Teaching and Learning*<br>teaching-learning@aut.edu.au |
| Policy Document Approver | Teaching & Learning Committee |
| Responsible Body/Person | Teaching & Learning Committee |
| Next Review date | September 2028 |
| Superseded documents | Academic Misconduct Policy |
| Related documents | *Grievance Resolution Policy – Students*<br>*Course Progress Policy*<br>*Assessment Policy* |
| Related HE Standards | 5.2 |
| Related National Code Standards | N/A |

## 1. PURPOSE

To uphold the highest possible standards of academic integrity within **AUT** coursework awards.

## 2. DEFINITIONS

Definitions for any words in **Bold** in this document can be found in the Policy Glossary. The first instance of each defined term has been outlined in bold.

## 3. SCOPE

This policy applies to all AUT coursework awards.

## 4. POLICY STATEMENT

The Australian University of Theology (AUT) is committed to the principle of academic integrity. In line with tertiary institutions throughout Australia, AUT regards academic misconduct as a serious matter. Affiliated Colleges are responsible for rigorously pursuing the highest possible standards of academic integrity.

## 5. POLICY APPLICATION

### Definition of Academic Misconduct

5.1 Academic misconduct may encompass the following actions:

a) taking unauthorised materials into an examination;

b) arranging for another person to sit an examination in the place of the candidate;

c) improperly obtaining knowledge of an examination paper and using that knowledge in the examination;

d) endeavouring to gain unfair access to content and information where such access is not permitted;

e) engaging in **contract cheating** by engaging another party to undertake part of whole of an assessment item and submitting work for an assessment knowing it to be the work of another person;

f) failing to acknowledge the source of material in an assessment task, including project or thesis;

g) the inappropriate use of Artificial Intelligence (AI) tools including **AI General Purpose tools** which are able to perform any task and are creative in output, AI agents, and In-built AI tools in any assessment task.

In all assessments submitted by students, students shall be required to include a statement about their use of AI including comments on three specific issues: a) use of AI in researching the assessment, b) use of AI in editing of the assignment, and c) use of AI for writing the assessment. A declaration shall be included that the student has not used AI in a manner which breaches the requirements of any AUT policies or regulations, or the requirements of the Affiliated College's Code of Conduct (or equivalent document(s)). This statement and declaration shall be in a form determined by the Affiliated College.

In Secure assessments, students are not permitted to use any AI tools, for example the use of smart glasses, AI enabled earpieces, or other forms of AI enabled personal devices. Students must ensure they can complete Secure assessments without requiring the use of AI-enable devices (for example, students must have alternative non-AI glasses if they normally wear smart glasses).[1]

In **Open assessments**, students are permitted to use AI tools, subject to the conditions below:

I. Inappropriate use of AI includes a student presenting an AI's sentences, paragraphs, writing, analysis, interpretation, evaluation, conclusions or reflections as their own.

II. Any student use of AI must be declared in the form required by their Affiliated College, AND fully referenced. Regarding referencing, where students use an idea or wording which was generated by an AI tool, they should treat it like any other source and include a citation (either footnotes or in-text referencing as specified by the AUT Affiliated College). The name of the tool(s) used (e.g., "ChatGPT") and the type of AI used (e.g. General Purpose or In-Built) must also be declared on the assessment coversheet provided by their Affiliated College and an Appendix showing student prompts to the AI tool and the AI responses must be included.

III. Any AI use must be ethical, and reflect Christian standards and expectations. Students must not use AI to contravene any requirement of their Affiliated College's Code of Conduct or other stated expectations regarding student behaviour, or to contravene the requirements of any other AUT regulation, policy, or published requirement applying to students.

For any given assessment task, the unit coordinator may require students to keep drafts of all assessment tasks in order to help demonstrate the manner

[1] Exceptions to these requirement may be made in special circumstances for certain Secure assessments, such as for AUT-approved reasonable adjustments for disabilities.

in which they have used AI in completing the task, and/or to provide these drafts if concerns are raised about potential misuse of AI tools.

When completing a **Secure assessment** that is an assignment with a validation exercise, students shall be required by the Affiliated College to include a statement regarding any a) use of AI in researching the assessment, b) use of AI in editing of the assignment, and c) use of AI for writing the assessment. This statement shall also include a declaration that the student has not used AI in any manner related to the assessment which breaches the requirements of any AUT policies or regulations, or the requirements of the Affiliated College's Code of Conduct (or equivalent document(s)). This statement and declaration shall be in a form determined by the Affiliated College. An affiliated college may also require that such a statement be included by students completing other types of Secure assessments.

h) submitting a false medical certificate;

i) submitting incorrect, incomplete or misleading information.

### Resources

5.2 The University provides access to Turnitin to its Affiliated Colleges as a tool in the identification of instances of potential academic misconduct.

### Acknowledgment and Usage of Sources

5.3 Students are expected to acknowledge the source of their ideas and expressions used in their written work. Deliberate failure to provide documentation may constitute plagiarism or recycling, which are subject to charges of academic misconduct. As noted above in 5.1(g) of this Policy, students are required to both declare and reference any use of AI in their assessment submissions.

5.4 Plagiarism is understood to be the presentation of work as though it is the student's own words or thoughts without appropriate acknowledgment of the source. Students are required to acknowledge by use of appropriate referencing the origin of extracts, quotes and paraphrases from other people contained in their work (and artificial intelligence tools if authorised).

5.5 Except in the case of AUT approved study and assessment schemes, students ought not to assist other students in the writing of individual assessments, such as providing written material to be copied.

5.6 Material submitted for assessment by a student in a unit for which the student has already gained (or expects to gain) academic credit may not be submitted for assessment by the student in any other unit. Students are also prohibited from reusing in their assignments words and ideas from their own previously published work without proper attribution. Both of these practices constitute recycling. Material submitted by a student for assessment in a unit which was not successfully completed may be submitted again in the same unit if re-enrolled, or in another unit of study. This is not seen as recycling as no academic credit was awarded for the completion of the work.

5.6.1 An exception to the above is within the context of the unit AS001 *Introduction to Research Methods*, where material produced in this unit is intended to be used in a subsequent long project or thesis enrolment.

### Procedures

5.7 Where a marker suspects intentional or inadvertent academic misconduct, the marker is to consult the Academic Dean who will make a determination regarding the nature of the student's intentions.

5.8 In the case of inadvertent academic dishonesty resulting from misunderstanding of academic conventions rather than deliberate deception, students are to be granted an opportunity to resubmit a corrected assessment, the marker shall deduct marks from the assessment and the Academic Dean is to counsel the student concerning the academic conventions prevailing in the University.

5.9 Students who have knowingly divulged, or caused to be divulged, the content of an examination (either a written or oral examination) to other students who are yet to complete the examination, will be dealt with by separate disciplinary processes approved by the Academic Board. Students who have intentionally and knowingly received information relating to the content or nature of an examination for a unit in which they are enrolled, except that which was commonly released by the lecturer/s as part of the unit, will be dealt with by separate disciplinary processes approved by the Academic Board.

5.10 Students who have engaged in **contract cheating** by intentionally and knowingly using or sought to use another party to undertake part or whole of their assessed work for them, whether paid or unpaid, will be dealt with by separate disciplinary processes approved by the Academic Board.

5.11 Affiliated Colleges are required to report to the **University Registrar** all offences with respect to plagiarism, cheating, and inappropriate use of AI for recording in **Paradigm**. Such information is available by means of a note on the student's record on **Paradigm**, available to Affiliated College Registrars at an Affiliated College where a student is either enrolled or intends to enrol.

### Penalties: Intentional Academic Misconduct

5.12 Intentional academic misconduct, in any form listed in 5.1 above, may result in the following penalties:

a) the awarding of a fail grade for the whole unit of which the assessment is a part,

b) the awarding of 0% for the assessment or thesis or project with or without the opportunity to redeem it,

c) the student's exclusion from the AUT award in which he or she is enrolled for a period not exceeding two years,

d) exclusion from any award of the Australian University of Theology, or

e) another outcome appropriate to the case but with an impact less serious than exclusion from enrolment in any AUT award.

5.13 Intentional plagiarism, cheating, and inappropriate use of AI are serious academic offences. However, the AUT also recognises the importance of educating students about the seriousness of the offence. Thus the penalties given below for intentional academic misconduct reflect both the seriousness of the offence and the desire to give students a chance to learn from their actions. A distinction is made between single occurrences, and multiple concurrent occurrences, in which plagiarism is found within multiple assessment tasks in one or more units concurrently:

a) First offence

For a single occurrence in a first offence, a student will be subject to academic counselling, with the maximum penalty being to fail the assessment item with no marks awarded. Where deemed appropriate, the minimum penalty available will be that a student may be granted an opportunity to resubmit the assessment with a maximum of 50% for the assessment.

If multiple concurrent occurrences are detected, a student will be subject to the same potential penalties as for a single first offence and will also be placed on conditional enrolment as set out in the *Course Progress Policy*.

b) Second offence:

For a second offence a student will fail the unit, with no remedial opportunity.

If multiple concurrent occurrences are detected, the student will be deemed to have committed a third offence and the potential penalties for a third offence will apply.

c) Third or major offence:

For a third or major offence, whether single or multiple concurrent occurrences, a student may be excluded from any AUT award, or excluded from the enrolled AUT award for up to two years, or any other outcome appropriate to the case but with an impact less serious than exclusion.

5.14 In the case of severe plagiarism and/or cheating and/or misuse of AI, or where students have engaged in **contract cheating** by intentionally and knowingly used or had sought to use another party to undertake part or the whole of their assessed work for them, whether paid or unpaid, a student may be subject to a separate disciplinary process approved by the Academic Board.

### Appeals

5.15 Any appeal against an outcome will be dealt with in accordance with the *Grievance Resolution Policy – Students* which can be accessed on the AUT website.

## 6. QUALITY ASSURANCE

Annual reviews of the reporting of instances of Academic Misconduct is undertaken, and reported to the Academic Board. Any anomalies noted during the review of reported instances will be investigated as deemed necessary by the Academic Board.

## 7. RELATED DOCUMENTS AND LEGISLATION

AUT Advice to Students about using Generative Artificial Intelligence

TEQSA Academic integrity toolkit: https://www.teqsa.gov.au/contract-cheating

TEQSA Good Practice Note: Addressing contract cheating to safeguard academic integrity: https://www.teqsa.gov.au/latest-news/publications/good-practice-note-addressing-contract-cheating-safeguard-academic

## 8. VERSION HISTORY

| Version | Approved by | Approval Date | Effective Date | Changes made |
|---|---|---|---|---|
| 1 | Dean | 12 March 2008 | | |
| 2 | Dean | 30 October 2010 | | |
| 3 | Academic Board | 14 March 2014 | | |
| 4 | Coursework Committee | 5 August 2016 | 5 August 2016 | Recognition of ACT's use of Turnitin; change to the penalty of a first instance of intentional academic misconduct; requirement that the Academic Dean in each college be responsible for identifying intentional academic misconduct. |
| 5 | Coursework Committee | 16 March 2018 | 16 March 2018 | Update penalties for offences, including reference to concurrent offences. |
| 6 | Coursework Committee | 26 July 2019 | 22 October 2019 | Add 'recycling' to definition. Amend 5.3 & 5.6. |
| 7 | Coursework Committee | 16 April 2021 | 16 April 2021 | Introduce definition and references to contract cheating; update 5.6 student recycling statement when repeating a non-completed unit; policy statement and title update. |
| 8 | Coursework Committee | 17 February 2023 | 17 February 2023 | Clarify the role of Artificial Intelligence with academic integrity |
| 9 | ACT Chair and Dean | 29 November 2023 | 29 November 2023 | Further clarify artificial intelligence issues |
| 10 | Teaching and Learning Committee | 14 Feb 2025 | 14 Feb 2025 | New template, minor editorial updates to implement university status, consideration of Research Methods and long projects for content recycling. |
| 11 | Academic Board | 20 June 2025 | 20 June 2025 | Updated information about AI |
| 12 | Teaching and Learning Committee | 7 Nov 2025 | 7 Nov 2025 | Updated information about AI |

| | | | | |
|---|---|---|---|---|
| 13 | Teaching and Learning Committee | 8 May 2026 | 8 May 2026 | Minor amendment to clarify that 5.12 - 5.14 apply only to intentional academic misconduct |
| 14 | Teaching and Learning Committee | 11 September 2026 | 1 January 2027 | Updated information & guidance about AI and assessment |

*Any hard copy of this electronic document may not be current as the University regularly reviews its policies. The latest version can be found online at aut.edu.au/documents*

**Appendix: Optional Transitional Requirements Until 31 December 2027**

**The following requirements formed part of this Policy and were in effect for all coursework units and assessments until 31 December 2026. An Affiliated College may determine that these requirements are in place for any unit and its assessments until 31 December 2027, instead of those listed above instead of those listed in 5.1(g) of this Policy, above. Where the requirements below are in place for a unit offered by an Affiliated College, the unit coordinator shall advise all students of this in writing by the start date for the unit (including in the unit outline).**

**********

Academic misconduct may encompass the following actions: ….

g) The inappropriate use of Artificial Intelligence (AI) tools including AI General Purpose tools which are able to perform any task and are creative in output, AI agents, and In-built AI tools in any assessment task. Inappropriate use of AI includes a student presenting an AI's sentences, paragraphs, writing, analysis, interpretation, evaluation, conclusions or reflections as their own.

a. Four appropriate uses of AI and a general requirement are outlined below. It is appropriate for Coursework students to use AI:

   i. to conduct preliminary research on a topic. Preliminary research is a step prior to the student's own critical thinking and writing.

      Appropriate AI use for preliminary research includes use

      - to build a basic understanding of a topic for an initial topic search related to an assessment task;
      - as a study tutor during the research and writing process to clarify key terms for an assessment task, or plan a research and study timeline;
      - to improve and refine search terms or strategies, suggest next steps in the research process or identify related topics;
      - to identify useful starting readings;
      - translating readings into another language;
      - to summarise a reading to ascertain its relevance.

ii. for help with formatting citations only if the student has personally read, used, consulted or reviewed the resources as part of their research and thinking.

iii. to obtain general advice on spelling and grammar. However, students should not use explicit AI features to create or substantially edit sentences, phrases or paragraphs of writing; for example, it is acceptable to use Word or Grammarly for grammar advice, but using in-built AI, such as that found in Grammarly products to generate writing which is not the student's own is not acceptable. Students writing in a language other than their first language can use AI for general advice on spelling and grammar, but not for translating their written work. Students with neurological learning disabilities or students writing in a language other than their first language may be granted permission to use in-built AI within Grammarly products or similar tools to improve their writing/communication if such use is approved in advance and acknowledged in the assessment task.

iv. In the case where a lecturer provides written authorisation for the use of an artificial intelligence tool for defined aspects of an assessment task, in which case any student use of AI must be declared AND fully referenced. Where students use an idea or wording which was generated by a AI tool, they should treat it like any other source and include a citation (either footnotes or in-text referencing as specified by the AUT Affiliated College).The name of the tool(s) used (e.g., "ChatGPT) must also be declared on the assessment coversheet provided by their Affiliated College and an Appendix showing student prompts to the AI and the AI responses must be included. Written authorisation can be provided in assignment instructions.

All students must use the assessment coversheet required by their Affiliated College to declare the type of AI used (either General Purpose or In-Built) including the name of the tool(s) used and the unit coordinator may require students to keep drafts of all assessment tasks and/or to provide these if concerns are raised about potential misuse of AI tools.