



Academic Integrity Policy

Australian Institute of Digital Technology Pty Ltd

Version 2.0 | Effective 1 June 2026

RTO
45801

CRICOS
03983J

ABN
70 643 935 586

Level 1, 377 Lonsdale Street, Melbourne VIC 3000
support@aidt.edu.au | 0411 441 061 | www.aidt.edu.au



POLICY 18

Academic Integrity Policy

Document Number	AIDT-POL-018	Version	2.0
Effective Date	1 June 2026	Next Review Date	June 2027
Policy Owner	Training Manager	Approved By	CEO
Applicable Legislation & Standards	Standards for RTOs 2025 (Standards 1.7, 1.8); Copyright Act 1968 (Cth); Privacy Act 1988 (Cth)		

1. Purpose

This policy establishes AIDT's commitment to academic integrity and the standards expected of all students in relation to the completion and submission of assessment work. The integrity of AIDT's assessments is the foundation of the value of its qualifications. A qualification from AIDT carries meaning in the labour market because employers can trust that a student who holds it has actually demonstrated the competencies it represents. Every instance of academic misconduct that goes undetected and unaddressed corrodes that trust — for every graduate who earned their qualification honestly.

The rapid spread of generative AI tools has created new complexity in academic integrity management that this policy addresses directly. AIDT's position is principled: the question is not whether any particular technology was used, but whether the submitted work genuinely represents the student's own competency. A student who uses an AI tool to generate an assessment response and submits it as their own work has not demonstrated competency in the relevant unit — they have demonstrated only that they can operate an AI tool. Where this is detected, it is treated as academic misconduct regardless of the quality of the AI output.

This policy should be read alongside AIDT-POL-003 (Training and Assessment Policy), which addresses the assessment design and management obligations that AIDT's trainers and assessors carry in relation to academic integrity. Academic integrity is a shared responsibility: AIDT designs assessments that are hard to fraudulently satisfy, and students are responsible for completing them honestly.

2. Types of Academic Misconduct

- **Plagiarism:** Presenting the work, ideas, words, data, or intellectual output of another person as one's own, without appropriate attribution. Includes direct copying from published sources (websites, textbooks, other students' assignments), close paraphrasing that reproduces the substance of a source without acknowledgment, and the use of images, diagrams, or data without attribution.
- **Collusion:** Submitting work that was collaboratively produced with another student on an assessment task that is required to be completed individually, without the assessor's prior written authorisation. Note that AIDT regularly



assigns legitimate group tasks — collusion refers specifically to collaboration on individually assessed work.

- **Cheating in supervised assessments:** Using any prohibited resource, material, note, device, or unauthorised assistance during a supervised assessment task. Includes accessing unauthorised information on a mobile phone, passing notes, or communicating with another student about assessment content.
- **Contract cheating:** Paying, inducing, or instructing any third party — whether a person, a commercial ghostwriting service, or an AI subscription platform — to produce an assessment task that is then submitted as the student's own work. This is the most serious category of academic misconduct because it involves premeditated, deliberate deception.
- **AI misuse:** Using a generative AI tool (ChatGPT, Claude, Gemini, Copilot, or any other AI language model) to produce assessment content that is then submitted as the student's own work, without the explicit prior written authorisation of the assessor. Authorisation to use AI for research, drafting support, or other study purposes does not constitute authorisation to submit AI-generated responses as one's own assessment work.
- **Fabrication:** Creating, inventing, or falsifying data, research results, workplace documents, logbook entries, supervisor observation reports, or any other assessment evidence. Fabrication in placement-based assessments — where the student claims to have performed tasks they have not performed, or records hours they did not work — is treated as the most serious form of fabrication.
- **Impersonation:** Arranging for another person to attend a supervised assessment, practical demonstration, or oral interview on the student's behalf.
- **Self-plagiarism:** Re-submitting work produced for a previous enrolment period or a different course without disclosure, where the work has not been substantially updated or adapted for the current assessment task.

3. Detection Methods

AIDT uses the following methods to detect academic misconduct. No single method is relied upon exclusively, and all detection outcomes are subject to the investigation procedure in Section 4 before any misconduct finding is made.

- Plagiarism detection software applied to written submissions to identify text similarity with external sources and other student submissions.
- Assessor judgement based on the quality and style of submitted work relative to the student's demonstrated capability in class and in prior assessments. A marked change in quality or style — whether higher or lower — may trigger an authenticity query.
- Oral questioning by the assessor following any submission where authenticity is uncertain. Students who have genuinely engaged with an assessment task can discuss and explain it; students who have not cannot.
- Cross-submission comparison where similar content is identified across multiple students in the same cohort.
- Review of metadata in electronically submitted documents, where available, to identify authorship anomalies.

4. Investigation Procedure and Consequences

Where an assessor suspects academic misconduct, they do not record a result — they refer the matter to the Training Manager. The student is notified in writing that an investigation is underway, with a brief description of the nature of the concern, and is invited to provide a written explanation within 5 business days. The Training Manager reviews all evidence — the submission, any detection software output, the student's explanation, and any other relevant material — and makes a finding.

Consequences are proportionate to the severity and history of the breach, as follows:

Inadvertent or minor (e.g. inadequate referencing)	Written guidance on correct referencing practice. Student required to resubmit with correct attribution. No formal warning recorded.
First instance — moderate (e.g. deliberate plagiarism of a significant section, unauthorised collusion)	Not Yet Satisfactory result for the affected task. Formal written warning on the student's file. Student required to resubmit a new, individually produced version under monitored conditions within 5 business days.
Serious (e.g. contract cheating, AI fraud, fabrication of workplace evidence)	Not Yet Competent result for the affected unit. Formal written warning on file. Student required to re-attempt the full unit under supervised conditions. Where additional assessment attempts are required, fees apply. CEO is notified.
Repeated or systemic (multiple instances, or a combination of categories)	Cancellation of enrolment following the full procedural process in AIDT-POL-011. DHA notified via PRISMS. No refund for fees paid for affected units.

The student may appeal any academic misconduct finding and its consequences through AIDT-POL-009 (Complaints and Appeals) within 10 working days of receiving the written determination.