

PLAGIARISM & ACADEMIC INTEGRITY (INCLUDING ARTIFICIAL INTELLIGENCE) POLICY & PROCEDURE

Document Control

Document title	Plagiarism and Academic Integrity (including Artificial Intelligence) Policy and Procedure
Version	V2.0
Approved by	Chief Executive Officer
Date approved	25 October 2025
Next review due	October 2026
Document owner	Campus Manager / Academic Manager

Standards & Legislation Mapping

This policy declares the specific requirements it gives effect to under Britts College self-assurance obligations.

Framework	Reference(s)
Standards for RTOs 2025	Quality Area 1 (Training and Assessment) – Outcome Standard 1.4 (assessment evidence is authentic, valid, current and sufficient); Quality Area 4 (Governance) – Standard 4.2 (roles and responsibilities) and Standard 4.4 (self-assurance monitoring).
National Code 2018	No standalone standard applies; however, this policy underpins the authenticity of assessment and course-progress evidence relied on for CoE issuance and PRISMS reporting and supports Standard 10 (Complaints and Appeals) where a misconduct finding is disputed.
ESOS Act 2000	The framework establishing Britts College's obligations to overseas students, under which accurate and authentic assessment outcomes must be reported.
Other legislation	Copyright Act 1968 (Cth) – unauthorised reproduction of others' work; Privacy Act 1988 (Cth) – handling of academic misconduct records.

Quality Area key: QA1 Training & Assessment · QA2 VET Student Support · QA3 VET Workforce · QA4 Governance.

1. Purpose

Britts College is committed to upholding academic integrity and the authenticity of assessment evidence across all its training and assessment activities. This policy defines plagiarism, academic misconduct and the acceptable and unacceptable use of Artificial Intelligence (AI) in student work and outlines the consequences of engaging in these behaviours.

Authentic assessment evidence is fundamental to the trust placed in Britts College's qualifications by students, industry, employers and the regulator. This policy protects that trust by making the College's expectations clear and by giving staff and students a consistent, evidence-based process for managing suspected breaches.

2. Scope

This policy applies to:

- all students enrolled in a Britts College training product, including domestic and overseas (CRICOS) students;
- all staff, trainers, assessors, contractors and third parties involved in developing, delivering or marking assessment on Britts College's behalf; and
- all forms of assessment evidence, whether written, oral, practical, digital or produced with the assistance of AI tools.

This policy applies equally to overseas students on a student visa. There are no differing academic integrity obligations for CRICOS students; however, a finding of academic misconduct against an overseas student may also have consequences for their course progress and visa condition reporting obligations under the ESOS framework and will be managed regarding those obligations.

3. Definitions

Term	Definition
Plagiarism	Misrepresenting as one's own original work the ideas, interpretations, words or creative works of another, whether published or unpublished, and whether print, electronic or AI-generated. Includes copying text without quotation and citation, paraphrasing without acknowledgment, and submitting another person's work as one's own.
Academic misconduct	Any form of dishonest behaviour in academic work, including plagiarism, collusion, cheating and unauthorised AI use.

Collusion	Unauthorised collaboration between students, or between a student and another person, to produce work submitted as the student's own individual assessment.
Cheating	A form of deceit intended to gain an advantage in assessment, including taking unauthorised material or information into an assessment.
Artificial Intelligence (AI)	Systems or tools capable of performing tasks that typically require human intelligence, such as problem-solving, decision-making, natural language processing or learning from data – for example, ChatGPT and similar generative platforms.
AI misuse	Unethical or inappropriate use of AI tools, including using AI to cheat, plagiarise or generate misleading assessment content.
Common knowledge	Facts or information generally known within a field, which can be drawn on without specific acknowledgment (e.g. common facts of history, common-sense information, accepted folklore).
Assessment Authenticity Declaration	The student declaration accompanying an assessment submission, confirming the work is the student's own and disclosing any permitted use of AI.
Rules of evidence	The Standards for RTOs 2025 requirement that assessment evidence be valid, sufficient, authentic and current.

4. Policy Statement and Principles

Britts College is committed to providing a learning environment that fosters independent learning and academic integrity, and to informing staff and students of the standard of academic behaviour expected of them. The College's approach is guided by the following principles:

- **Original work.** Students must submit only their own original work, or work that properly acknowledges the ideas, words or creative output of others, including AI-generated content.
- **Authentic assessment evidence.** Assessment decisions rely on evidence that is genuinely the student's own; content substantially drawn from AI without disclosure compromises that evidence and is treated as a breach of academic integrity.
- **A considered position on AI.** Britts College does not blanket-prohibit AI. AI may be used as a tool to enhance learning where the assessment instructions permit it and where its use is disclosed; it must not be used to bypass the skill development the assessment is designed to evidence.

- **Clear permissions per assessment.** Whether, and how, AI may be used is set out in the assessment instructions for each task. Where instructions are silent or expressly prohibit AI, no AI use is permitted.
- **Disclosure obligation.** Where AI use is permitted, students must acknowledge and reference AI-generated, edited, rewritten or translated content, including via the Assessment Authenticity Declaration.
- **Proportionate, evidence-based response.** Suspected breaches are investigated fairly and consistently, with outcomes proportionate to the nature and severity of the breach.

5. Legislative and Regulatory Framework

This policy gives effect to Britts College's obligations under the following instruments:

- **Standards for RTOs 2025** — Outcome Standard 1.4, which requires that assessment complies with the Principles of Assessment and the Rules of Evidence, so that assessment judgements are based on evidence that is valid, sufficient, authentic and current.
- **National Code 2018** — supports Standard 10 (Complaints and Appeals) where a student disputes an academic misconduct finding and underpins the integrity of progress and completion data reported for overseas students.
- **ESOS Act 2000** — the framework under which Britts College's obligations to overseas students, including accurate reporting of genuine academic outcomes, arise.
- **Copyright Act 1968 (Cth)** — underpins the requirement that students not reproduce the copyrighted work of others without acknowledgment.
- **Privacy Act 1988 (Cth)** — governs the handling of personal information contained in academic misconduct records.

6. Roles and Responsibilities (RACI)

Britts College does not have a governing board. Control and influence over Britts College, and all decision-making authority, rest solely with the CEO and the Director. Accountability under this policy therefore sits exclusively with the CEO and the Director; all other roles are responsible for carrying out activities, or are consulted or informed, under the direction of the CEO and the Director.

R Responsible (does the work) **A** Accountable (owns the outcome – one per row) **C** Consulted **I** Informed

Activity / Decision	CEO / Director	Training Mgr / Compliance	Trainers & Assessors	Student Support / Admin	Students
Approve this policy	A	R	I	I	I
Set AI permissions in assessment instructions	A	R	R	C	I
Explain integrity, referencing and AI expectations to students	A	C	R	R	I
Complete the Assessment Authenticity Declaration	A	I	I	I	R
Review submissions for plagiarism / unauthorised AI use	A	R	R	C	I
Investigate a suspected breach	A	R	C	C	I
Determine outcome of a misconduct finding	A	R	C	I	I
Record breach and outcome in student file	A	R	C	R	I
Manage an appeal against a finding	A	R	C	C	R

7. Procedure / Policy in Practice

7.1 Academic integrity and the use of AI

One of Britts College's core functions is to develop each student's ability to apply critical reasoning to assessment tasks through independent thought, reflecting the student's own consideration of the task or workplace requirement. Students are expected to acknowledge, through appropriate referencing, any earlier work – including AI-generated content – from which they have drawn information. Failure to do so is a breach of academic integrity.

Content drawn from AI sources presents a particular risk to assessment integrity, because a student may obtain a response by prompting an AI platform rather than developing the work themselves. Britts College's approach balances the reality of AI's growing role in study and work with the need for genuine assessment evidence:

- Where the assessment instructions permit AI use, students must acknowledge and reference any AI-generated content, including where they have paraphrased, quoted or summarised it, and must disclose where work has been edited, rewritten or translated by AI (via the Assessment Authenticity Declaration).
- Where the assessment instructions expressly prohibit AI use, or do not clearly permit it, students must not use AI to produce their response. All assessment work is subject to review for AI-generated content, and undisclosed AI use will be treated as a breach of academic integrity.

7.2 Referencing

Referencing demonstrates that a student has engaged with issued material or undertaken their own research. Failure to reference appropriately is unethical academic behaviour and will result in a student's work not being accepted. Work submitted for assessment must contain an original component – it is not sufficient to compile the work of others, even where properly acknowledged. Where careless or inadequate referencing is identified, the student will be required to correct the error and resubmit.

Students are encouraged to apply the Harvard Referencing System for in-text citation, which requires the author's name, the year of publication and the page number, for example:

- (Dwyer & Hopwood 2010, p. 239) – placed at the end of a sentence, before the punctuation; or
- Dwyer and Hopwood (2010, p. 239) identify that ... – integrated into the sentence.

A Reference List must appear at the end of the student's work, listed alphabetically, with the title of each source italicised and including the author, year, title, edition, publisher and place of publication, for example:

- Dwyer, J and Hopwood, N, 2010, *Management Strategies and Skills*, McGraw Hill Australia, Sydney.

7.3 Common knowledge

Every field has a body of knowledge that has become part of the public domain and can be drawn on without specific acknowledgment – common facts of history, common-sense information, and accepted folklore. For example, it is not necessary to reference that a named individual held a

particular public office, that humans require food and water for survival, or a widely known piece of Australian folklore.

7.4 Cheating

Cheating is a form of deceit intended to gain an advantage in assessment and is usually associated with bringing unauthorised material into an assessment. Trainers are responsible for clearly explaining assessment expectations, what constitutes cheating, and for promoting a climate of honesty among students.

7.5 AI-generated content in student submissions

AI platforms are capable of producing detailed, coherent content across a wide range of topics, which poses a genuine challenge to academic integrity. Where AI use is permitted, it will be expressly stated in the assessment instructions, and students must acknowledge and reference AI-generated content like any other information source. Where this permission has not been expressly given, using AI sources or tools to prepare an assessment submission is prohibited.

Acceptable uses (no permission required)

- assisting students to understand complex concepts by explaining them in simpler terms;
- researching a subject to build understanding;
- assisting with creative thinking and brainstorming ideas;
- explaining unfamiliar phrases or figures of speech;
- analysing information to identify trends and patterns; and
- improving the clarity of a student's own written communication.

Unacceptable uses

Where a student uses AI to generate material for assessment that they then represent as their own ideas, research or analysis, they are not submitting their own work. Examples of unacceptable use include:

- direct generation of assessment responses;
- using AI in a way that bypasses the skill development the assessment is designed to evidence;
- using AI to produce professional communication tasks submitted as the student's own;
- using AI to fabricate or embellish evidence collection; and
- using AI to produce practical skills documentation or group work submitted as authentic, unassisted work.

7.6 Student responsibilities

Students are responsible for:

- submitting only work that is their own, or that properly acknowledges the ideas, words or creative work of others;
- not lending their original work to others for any reason;
- understanding assessment conditions and seeking clarification where in doubt;
- understanding what constitutes appropriate referencing, and the consequences of inappropriate referencing;
- using AI tools only in accordance with the acceptable-use guidance in this policy and the relevant assessment instructions; and
- discouraging others from plagiarising, by observing the practices above.

7.7 Managing a suspected breach

Step	Action
Step 1 – Identify	A trainer or assessor identifies a suspected breach (e.g. through similarity checking, an AI-detection tool, or inconsistency with a student's demonstrated ability).
Step 2 – Notify	The student is notified of the concern and given the opportunity to respond before a finding is made.
Step 3 – Determine	The Training Manager / Compliance Officer reviews the evidence and the student's response and determines whether a breach occurred.
Step 4 – Act	Where a breach is confirmed, an outcome is applied proportionate to its severity – ranging from resubmission with feedback, through a formal warning, to a finding of academic misconduct recorded on the student's file. Repeated or serious breaches may result in further disciplinary action in accordance with Britts College's Student Code of Conduct.
Step 5 – Record & review	The outcome is recorded, and the student is advised of their right to appeal under the Complaints and Appeals Policy. Breach trends are reported to the Continuous Improvement Register.

8. Records Management

Assessment Authenticity Declarations, similarity/AI-detection reports and records of academic misconduct investigations and outcomes are controlled records held in Britts College's student management and compliance systems. Records are accessible to the General Manager / Academic Manager / Compliance Officer, relevant trainers and assessors, and the student concerned, and are retained in accordance with Britts College's Records Management Policy.

Records are available on request to support Britts Colleges's self-assurance position and any regulatory audit.

9. Monitoring, Review and Continuous Improvement

- Academic misconduct trends (including AI-related findings) are reported to and reviewed at the Continuous Improvement Register as a standing agenda item at quality and management meetings.
- Assessment validation and moderation activity considers the effectiveness of this policy in supporting authentic assessment evidence.
- An internal audit is conducted at least annually to confirm compliance with this policy and the relevant legislative and regulatory requirements.
- This policy is reviewed at least every two years, and sooner where changes to the Standards, legislation, regulatory guidance, or the capability of AI tools indicate the approach requires revision. Revisions are approved by the CEO and recorded in the Document Control table.

Self-assurance review questions

- How are students and staff made aware of academic integrity expectations and the College's position on AI?
- How is the effectiveness of similarity and AI-detection tools monitored and improved over time?
- How are academic misconduct trends used to improve assessment design and staff practice?
- How consistently are findings and outcomes applied across trainers, assessors and campuses?

Consequences of non-compliance

- **For Britts College** — breaches of legislation or regulatory requirements may result in regulatory action by ASQA, reputational damage, and questions over the validity of qualifications issued.
- **For staff** — disciplinary action, which may include formal warnings, suspension or termination of employment.
- **For students** — outcomes ranging from required resubmission through to a recorded finding of academic misconduct and, in serious or repeated cases, further disciplinary action under the Student Code of Conduct.

10. Related Documents

- Assessment Policy and Procedure
- Continuous Improvement Policy and Procedure
- Complaints and Appeals Policy and Procedure
- Records Management Policy
- Privacy Policy
- Student Code of Conduct
- Assessment Authenticity Declaration (form)

11. Approval

This policy is approved by the Chief Executive Officer of Britts College. Approval of each version is recorded in the Britts College Policy Register.