

Academic Honesty and Misconduct Policy and Procedure

1 Purpose and scope

The policy provides a framework for upholding the highest standards of academic integrity, honesty, and course quality, and for detecting and managing academic misconduct at AIE Institute.

This policy applies to all members of AIE Institute's higher education community.

2 Objectives

This policy outlines:

- a. Strategies to promote academic honesty
- b. Mechanisms to detect plagiarism and cheating
- c. Processes for academic misconduct.

AIE Institute is committed to ensuring that academic honesty is integral to the values of AIE Institute, and that it produces ethical graduates. AIE Institute expects all staff and students to act with integrity and honesty when developing, creating and using information and ideas, and to conduct themselves with the highest ethical standards in all aspects of academic work. In particular, AIE Institute expects that:

- a. Staff and students ensure that their academic work is their own original work
- b. The ideas of others are acknowledged appropriately
- c. All staff and students are responsible for identifying and reporting academic misconduct.

3 Implementation

The Academic Board ensures that mechanisms are in place to safeguard the reputation of AIE Institute, its staff and graduates. AIE Institute is vigilant in maintaining academic integrity and aims to eliminate plagiarism and cheating. All members of staff are responsible for implementing this policy and senior members of staff are also responsible for monitoring academic misconduct. AIE Institute:

- a. Expects all staff and students to be responsible for academic integrity and to undertake all academic work honestly
- b. Promotes academic honesty by distributing policies and information to AIE Institute's higher education community
- c. Encourages students to engage in ethical learning and scholarship practices
- d. Promotes and encourages academic literacy and integrity
- e. Ensures assessments are designed, approved, and delivered with regard to academic integrity and assessment security, including measures that deter misconduct, support its detection, and provide evidence that students have achieved the relevant learning outcomes
- f. Actively monitors and documents the security and detectability of assessments and uses evidence gathered through each semester's delivery to identify vulnerabilities, evaluate the effectiveness of existing measures, and improve assessment design and delivery
- g. Uses assessment security measures appropriate to assessment context, which may include staged submissions, evidence of development and iteration, application of feedback, reflection, rejoinders, peer review, in-class production meetings, supervised or in-class assessment activities, presentations, demonstrations, and individual accountability within group work

- h. Provides information and support to students at orientation and throughout their study
- i. Provides staff with training and development on how to identify contract cheating
- j. Monitors academic work and apply fair processes to deal with academic misconduct, including plagiarism and cheating
- k. Maintains records of allegations of misconduct and breaches of academic or research integrity on relevant staff and student files and an Academic Misconduct Register.

4 Procedure

4.1 Academic integrity for students

AIE Institute uses multiple methods to support assessment security and identify potential academic misconduct. These methods may include text-matching software; comparison of submissions; review of drafts, source files, version histories, and production records; peer-review activity; in-class production meetings; supervised or in-class assessment activities; presentations and demonstrations; and student explanations of their work, decisions, processes, and contributions.

An indicator, inconsistency, or result produced by a detection method does not, by itself, establish that academic misconduct has occurred. Relevant evidence must be considered collectively through fair and transparent processes before a determination is made.

Where concerns arise regarding authorship, contribution, or achievement of the learning outcomes, a student may be asked to explain, demonstrate, apply, adapt, or reproduce relevant aspects of their submitted work. Information obtained through this process may be considered alongside other available evidence. A student's response to an individual question or activity must not be treated as conclusive evidence of academic misconduct in isolation. Students are provided with written advice during enrolment that mechanisms, including software, may be used to detect academic misconduct. Students are required to acknowledge their awareness of these practices. Students are responsible for:

- a. Understanding academic honesty and misconduct and avoiding unethical practices
- b. Ensuring that their academic work is their own, original, and appropriately acknowledging the work and ideas of others.

4.2 Submitting assignments

Students, when submitting assignments or any other piece of work for assessment:

- a. Must declare that the work is their own original work, or the work of the group
- b. Acknowledge that student disciplinary processes may be enacted in cases of academic misconduct, such as plagiarism or cheating.

See the *Assessment, Moderation and Progress Policy and Procedure* for details.

4.2.1 Plagiarism

Plagiarism is the reproduction of someone else's words, ideas or findings and presenting them as one's own ideas without proper acknowledgement, including:

- a. Using generative AI in the development or production of assessment work without acknowledging and referencing its use
- b. Using generative AI to produce or substantially complete work that the student is required to undertake themselves to demonstrate the relevant knowledge, skills, assessment criteria, or learning outcomes, regardless of whether the use of generative AI is acknowledged
- c. Direct copying or paraphrasing from someone else's published work (either electronic or hard copy) without acknowledging the source (or authors)

- d. Using facts, information and ideas derived from a source without acknowledgement
- e. Assisting another person to commit an act of plagiarism
- f. Submitting a paper to be graded or reviewed that has been written by another person
- g. Purchasing a paper from someone else or from a commercial entity such as from the internet or other similar commercial service
- h. Copying answers or text from another classmate and submitting it as one's own
- i. Citing data without crediting the original source
- j. 'Reworking' data from another source (such as another student's research data) without acknowledgement or to pass it off as one's own work
- k. Proposing another author's idea as if it were one's own
- l. Submitting someone else's presentation, program, spreadsheet, or other file with no alterations or only minor alterations.

4.2.1.1 Generative AI usage

Generative AI may be used as a support tool where its use does not substitute for the student's own demonstration of the knowledge and skills being assessed. Students remain responsible for the accuracy, quality, and integrity of all submitted work and must verify any information, quotations, references, or other material produced or suggested by generative AI.

All use of generative AI must be acknowledged and referenced, including generative AI features embedded within other software or services. The acknowledgement must identify the tool used and explain how it contributed to the development or production of the submitted work. Acknowledgement does not make generative AI use acceptable where that use prevents the student from independently demonstrating the relevant learning outcomes.

4.2.2 Self-plagiarism

Self-plagiarism is the reproduction of your own work without evolving it or proper acknowledgement, including:

- a. Submitting an assignment from a previous academic year to a current class without written permission from the Academic Director
- b. Recycling or paraphrasing parts of an old assignment without citing it (e.g., copy-pasting paragraphs, paraphrasing information, reusing art or code from previously submitted work)

During your studies you will have units that build upon previous ideas, especially during group projects. You may also be inspired by previously submitted designs and art works or wish to reuse modules of code. Reuse of these items is permissible with correct referencing however it must show substantial iteration and improvement, and it must not be used to address a full learning outcome in your new assessment. It is recommended that you discuss any reuse of your previously submitted work with the unit lecturer to ensure you avoid self-plagiarism.

4.2.3 Cheating

Cheating in general can be defined as acting dishonestly or unfairly in order to gain an advantage.

Cheating in examinations or tests includes:

- a. Copying or attempting to copy from another student (or external party)
- b. Attempting to use unauthorised material either in written or electronic format
- c. Verbally communicating with another student or attempting to communicate with another student
- d. Fabricating information, data, research or other elements.

Contract cheating occurs when students employ or use a third party to undertake their assessed work for them. A third party may be paid or unpaid and may include:

- a. Essay writing services
- b. Friends, family or other students
- c. Private tutors
- d. Electronic tutorials (e.g. Youtube)
- e. Copyediting services
- f. Agency websites
- g. 'Reverse classifieds' (Lancaster & Clarke, 2016, p. 639)

Using a tutor, editor, friend, family member, other student, or support service does not automatically constitute contract cheating. Contract cheating occurs where a third party undertakes, produces, substantially alters, or completes assessed work that the student is required to undertake themselves. Students remain responsible for ensuring that any assistance they receive remains within the permitted boundaries and does not substitute for their own demonstration of the relevant learning outcomes.

Other forms of cheating can be categorised as falsifying information, such as:

- a. Fabricating references or using incorrect references
- b. Falsifying lab or experimental data or observations.

4.2.3.1 *Intentional and unintentional plagiarism or cheating*

The seriousness of the misconduct is partly determined by whether the conduct is regarded as intentional or unintentional. *Intentional plagiarism* or cheating is carried out knowingly with an intent to deceive and is therefore considered as serious misconduct. *Unintentional plagiarism* may occur due to lack of familiarity with academic writing practices and is therefore considered to be less serious on the first occurrence.

4.2.4 Levels and penalties for student academic misconduct

There are varying levels of student misconduct. It is acknowledged that students studying higher education for the first time may make small errors as part of their academic learning process. The following factors, levels and penalties are provided to guide the procedures for assessing student academic misconduct.

4.2.4.1 *Factors*

Academic staff consider the circumstances of the substantiated misconduct when determining its level. Relevant factors include:

- a. The student's stage of study and the extent to which they could reasonably be expected to understand the relevant academic integrity requirements
- b. Whether the misconduct was intentional or unintentional
- c. The extent of the affected work and its significance to the assessment requirements, criteria, and learning outcomes
- d. Whether the student has any previous substantiated instances of academic misconduct, including whether the previous conduct was the same as or substantially similar to the current conduct
- e. Whether the student deliberately concealed the conduct, knowingly provided false or misleading information, or fabricated evidence.

Factors must be considered collectively when determining the level of misconduct. The presence of multiple factors may increase the level where the combined circumstances make the misconduct more serious. A second substantiated instance of the same or substantially similar misconduct should be classified as at least Level 2.

Deliberate concealment, knowingly false or misleading information, or fabrication of evidence should be classified as at least Level 2. Substantial or systematic deception, or deception that compounds an already serious breach, may contribute to classification as Level 3.

4.2.4.2 Level of misconduct

The level of academic misconduct has been divided into three categories to assist with determining the appropriate penalty.

4.2.4.2.1 Level 1 – minor

The conduct is limited in extent or significance to the assessment requirements, criteria, and learning outcomes, and no factors requiring classification at Level 2 or Level 3 apply.

Examples may include limited unattributed copying or paraphrasing; limited unauthorised or unacknowledged use of generative AI; limited inappropriate collaboration; or limited reproduction of work from a tutorial without appropriate acknowledgement or independent application.

4.2.4.2.2 Level 2 – moderate

The conduct is moderate in extent or significance to the assessment requirements, criteria, and learning outcomes, or the combined factors make the conduct more serious than a Level 1 breach.

Level 2 also applies where the conduct is a second substantiated instance of the same or substantially similar misconduct, or where the student deliberately concealed the conduct, knowingly provided false or misleading information, or fabricated evidence.

Examples may include unauthorised or unacknowledged generative AI use affecting a meaningful component of an assessment; inappropriate collaboration affecting work required to be completed individually; moderate unattributed copying, reproduction, or adaptation of another person's work; or submission of work closely reproduced from a tutorial where independent application was required.

4.2.4.2.3 Level 3 – major

The conduct is substantial in extent or significance to the assessment requirements, criteria, and learning outcomes and constitutes a serious breach. Level 3 may also apply where substantial or systematic deception compounds the original misconduct.

Examples may include submission of work substantially produced by another person, service, or generative AI system; substantial copying or reproduction of another person's written, creative, or technical work; substitution or impersonation in an assessment activity; substantial fabrication or falsification of work, data, production evidence, or assessment records; or misconduct that substantially prevents AIE Institute from confirming the student's authorship, contribution, or achievement of the learning outcomes.

4.2.4.3 Penalties

The determined level of academic misconduct informs the selection of an appropriate and proportionate penalty or outcome. The examples provided for each level are indicative rather than mandatory or exhaustive.

When selecting a penalty or outcome, the decision-maker considers:

- a. The student's stage of study and the extent to which they could reasonably be expected to understand the relevant academic integrity requirements
- b. Whether the original conduct was intentional or unintentional
- c. The extent and significance of the affected work
- d. Any previous substantiated instances of academic misconduct
- e. Whether the student honestly acknowledged and accurately explained the conduct
- f. Whether the student accepted responsibility and engaged constructively with the investigation
- g. Whether the student is willing to undertake appropriate academic integrity education or corrective action
- h. Any other relevant mitigating circumstances.

These considerations guide the selection of a penalty or outcome but do not change the determined level of misconduct. The decision-makers for academic misconduct are:

- a. Level 1 – Course Coordinator
- b. Level 2 – Academic Director
- c. Level 3 – Academic Board.

The relevant lecturer assesses the student's demonstrated knowledge, provides relevant evidence, and may recommend a level, penalty, or next step. The Course Coordinator remains responsible for the formal determination and outcome of a Level 1 matter.

- a. One or more of the following penalties or outcomes may be applied: A formal student warning
- b. Requirement for the student to undertake academic integrity education, learning support, counselling, or other appropriate corrective activities
- c. Resubmission of the assessment item or undertaking supplementary assessment, with maximum achievement of a pass grade
- d. Requirement to undertake another form of examination, which has improved assessment security
- e. Reduction in the marks allocated to the relevant assessment component consistent with the level of academic misconduct
- f. A mark of zero allocated to the assessment item
- g. A fail grade applied to the unit, with the option to re-enrol at a future date
- h. Exclusion from the course with an option to re-enrol at a future date
- i. Withdrawal of a conferred award.

Indicative Level 1 penalties and outcomes may include a formal warning; required academic integrity education or learning support; resubmission or supplementary assessment with achievement capped at a pass grade; a proportionate reduction in marks; or a mark of zero where the entire assessment item is affected.

Indicative Level 2 penalties and outcomes may include more extensive or ongoing academic integrity education and learning support; further assessment or verification of learning; or consideration of academic progression as per the Assessment, Moderation and Progress Policy and Procedure.

Indicative Level 3 penalties and outcomes may include failure of the unit, suspension or temporary exclusion, exclusion from the course, or withdrawal of a conferred award.

Examples provided for each level do not prevent the decision-maker from selecting another available penalty or outcome where it is proportionate to the circumstances and within the decision-maker's authority.

4.2.5 Procedures for student academic misconduct

Findings of academic misconduct must be made on the balance of probabilities. The decision-maker must be satisfied, based on the available evidence, that it is more likely than not that the misconduct occurred. The evidence required must be sufficiently clear and persuasive having regard to the seriousness of the alleged misconduct and the potential consequences for the student. This standard is based on guidance published by the Tertiary Education Quality and Standards Agency (TEQSA, 2026).

To determine whether academic misconduct has occurred based on this standard, the following procedure will be undertaken:

- a. Where academic misconduct is suspected or identified, academic staff such as the lecturer or examiner first identifies the suspected type of misconduct and gathers relevant evidence, such as the relevant assessment submission, student's current demonstrated level of knowledge, typical work and any identified sources or similar works.
- b. Academic staff refer the suspected misconduct to the Course Coordinator via email with the relevant evidence.

- c. Within 7 working days of receiving the referral, the Course Coordinator reviews the evidence and checks the student's record for any previous substantiated findings of academic misconduct. The Course Coordinator then determines whether to:
 - I. Take no further action because the concern is not sufficiently supported
 - II. Conduct further investigation as a potential Level 1 matter
 - III. Refer the matter to the Academic Director for investigation as a potential Level 2 or Level 3 matter.
- d. If further investigation is required the student is invited via email to attend a meeting with the relevant Academic staff member/s, and Course Coordinator or Academic Director, to allow the student to justify their submission. The student is recommended a time for the meeting, are invited to bring a support person, and advised that their results will be withheld until the meeting occurs
- e. The notice will advise the student to respond in writing to the allegation within 14 working days
- f. If the student does not respond within the 14-day timeframe, the decision-maker determines whether a penalty will be imposed, defines the penalty, and decides if any support mechanisms are required
- g. If, at any stage of a Level 1 investigation, the Course Coordinator considers that the available evidence may indicate Level 2 or Level 3 misconduct, the Course Coordinator refers the matter and supporting evidence to the Academic Director. This includes evidence identified or provided during the student meeting.
- h. The Academic Director receives a copy of all correspondence regarding the alleged academic misconduct
- i. If academic misconduct is substantiated, the decision-maker determines the level of misconduct and applies any penalties or outcomes in accordance with section 4.2.4.3.
- j. A formal notice of the decision is sent to the student within 1 week of the meeting together with information outlining their right to appeal the decision
- k. Copies of the notice and subsequent actions are sent to relevant administrative and academic personnel to ensure that the allegation and decision is recorded on the student's file, and assessments are adjusted accordingly, where relevant
- l. All instances of academic misconduct, no matter how minor, are recorded on the student's file.
- m. Where academic misconduct is not substantiated, the student is notified of the outcome and the withheld assessment result is released when marking is complete.

4.2.5.1 Reporting misconduct outcomes

The decision-maker will notify the Academic Director, Course Coordinator, relevant Head of School, and relevant lecturers of the outcome of an academic misconduct matter.

The Academic Director periodically reviews de-identified academic misconduct data and reports relevant trends and outcomes to the Academic Board. These findings are used to inform assessment-security monitoring and improvement, staff development, student academic integrity education, and review of this policy and its procedures.

4.3 Appeals

A student who has been assessed as having committed an act of misconduct can appeal the penalty decision in the following ways:

- a. A written appeal to the Academic Director (Level 1) or Academic Board (Level 2 or 3), dependent on the level of the academic misconduct
- b. If the first option fails, then an appeal can be made in writing to the Academic Board, and it will make a decision; or to the Board of Directors if the Academic Board made the initial decision

- c. If a student is still unhappy with the decision, they may make an appeal to an external party, such as:
 - I. A nominated academic member of staff based in a local university or in the country in which the student resides, who can mediate or arbitrate
 - II. International students may seek a review by the Overseas Student Ombudsman. The contact details for the Ombudsman are located in the Student Grievance Policy and Procedure.

Students should refer to the Student Grievance Policy and Procedure for details of the appeals process.

4.4 Academic integrity for staff

Staff are responsible for:

- a. Maintaining high ethical standards in conducting research and scholarly activities within the guidelines of the Intellectual Inquiry and Academic Freedom Policy and Procedure
- b. Promoting academic integrity and honesty amongst students
- c. Monitoring and detecting student academic misconduct
- d. Reporting academic misconduct to a senior member of academic staff.

4.4.1 Staff academic misconduct

Matters of alleged staff academic misconduct should be promptly reported to the Academic Director. If the Academic Director determines that there may be a case of academic misconduct, then the matter should be referred to the CEO, together with a report on the alleged misconduct.

4.4.1.1 Process

- a. The CEO will commence an investigation of the matter, and may appoint other persons to assist with the investigation
- b. The staff member shall be notified in writing of the allegations made against them, including any evidence; the staff member will be given 14 days to provide a response to the allegations, including the provision of evidence to counter the allegation
- c. Copies of the notice and subsequent actions are sent to relevant administrative and academic personnel to ensure that the allegation and decision is recorded on the staff file
- d. All instances of academic misconduct, no matter how minor, are recorded on the staff file
- e. The CEO will arrange for a meeting to be held between the staff member, the CEO, the Academic Director, and a member from the Academic Board; the staff member may bring a representative who is not a practising lawyer or barrister
- f. The CEO will ensure that any new information is promptly provided to all parties for consideration and response.

On completion of the investigation, the CEO will prepare a report to the Academic Board outlining the findings, evidence, conclusions and recommendations.

The Academic Board will consider the report and decide whether to:

- a. Take no further action
- b. Request further information from any of the parties
- c. Take disciplinary action.

4.5 Appeals

If the staff member is not satisfied with the decision, he/she may seek an appeal as outlined in the Staff Grievance Policy and Procedure.

5 Definitions

Academic integrity refers to the values of honesty, trust, fairness, respect and responsibility in all academic endeavours, including preparing and presenting work for assessment as part of coursework or research.

Academic literacy refers to the capacity to undertake study and research, and to communicate findings and knowledge in a manner appropriate to the particular disciplinary conventions and scholarly standards expected at a higher education level.

Academic misconduct is any activity or practice including but not limited to cheating in any assessments, plagiarism, unauthorised collusion, fraudulent or unethical research and scholarship practices.

Assessment security refers to measures implemented to protect the integrity, fairness, and validity of academic assessments. It includes strategies and design choices intended to ensure that submitted work is the student's own, is completed under the intended conditions, and is free from unauthorised assistance by making academic misconduct more difficult to undertake and easier to detect.

Cheating in general can be defined as acting dishonestly or unfairly in order to gain an advantage.

Contract cheating occurs when students employ or use a third party to undertake their assessed work for them.

De-identified data refers to data from which all personally identifiable information has been removed by deleting or masking personal identifiers, such as an individual's name or student ID, and suppressing or generalising quasi-identifiers, such as date of birth.

Ethical and ethics refers to the guiding values, principles and standards that enable people to determine how things should be done and how they should act. Ethics refers to the judgements that people make and the process that determines those judgements. It is the process by which people make value-based decisions which ultimately guides their actions and behaviours.

Generative Artificial Intelligence (AI) refers to systems that generate or substantially transform content in response to user input. This content may include text, code, images, audio, video, designs, two-dimensional or three-dimensional assets, and other creative or technical material. Generative AI may be provided through standalone tools or embedded within other software and services. **Plagiarism** is presenting another person's or source's ideas, designs, words, code, assets, or other work as one's own without appropriate acknowledgement. Plagiarism also includes using generative AI without acknowledging and referencing its use, or using generative AI to undertake work that the student is required to complete themselves to demonstrate the relevant learning outcomes, whether or not the use is acknowledged.

Self-plagiarism is the reproduction of your own work without evolving it and proper acknowledgement.

Substantiated academic misconduct means academic misconduct that a designated decision-maker has determined, on the balance of probabilities, is more likely than not to have occurred.

6 Related documents and references

The following policies and procedures are related to this policy:

- a. Assessment, Moderation and Progress Policy and Procedure
- b. Intellectual Inquiry and Academic Freedom Policy and Procedure
- c. Staff Code of Conduct
- d. Staff Grievance Policy and Procedure
- e. Student Code of Conduct
- f. Student Grievance Policy and Procedure.

6.1 Reference list

Lancaster, T., Clarke, R. (2016). *Contract Cheating: The Outsourcing of Assessed Student Work*. In: Bretag, T. (eds) *Handbook of Academic Integrity*. Springer, Singapore. https://doi.org/10.1007/978-981-287-098-8_17

Tertiary Education Quality and Standards Agency. (2026). *Role-specific guide to promoting academic integrity, and managing and investigating academic misconduct*.

<https://www.teqsa.gov.au/sites/default/files/2026-05/role-specific-guide-to-promoting-academic-integrity.pdf>

7 Review

This policy will be reviewed annually due to increased cheating opportunities, the rapid advancements of AI.

8 Accountabilities

The Academic Board is responsible for review and approval of this policy.

The policy is to be implemented via induction and training of staff and distribution to students and AIE Institute's higher education community via the website and other publications.

Acknowledgement is accorded to the University of Western Australia in the development of the levels and penalties of student academic misconduct, and definitions in the original version of this policy, although they have been significantly adapted in subsequent drafts.

9 Appendices

9.1 Appendix A

The following email template should be used when contacting a student, in the event, we suspect they have breached academic integrity:

Hi <STUDENT NAME>,

AIE Institute has noticed an inconsistent approach in your recent assessment submission for the unit <UNIT CODE, UNIT NAME, ASSESSMENT NAME> that we would like to discuss in more detail with you.

Please confirm by return email your availability to meet with the relevant lecturer, and the AIE Institute Course Coordinator, to review your submission together on <MEETING TIME AND DATE>. The meeting will be held via Teams.

Note that your results for this assessment will be withheld until the meeting has occurred.

Contact studentsupportservices@aieinstitute.edu.au if you are unable to make the meeting time as proposed.

9.2 Appendix B

The following email template may be used when summarising the findings of a meeting between a student, lecturer and other support staff when investigating a case of academic integrity (sent to CC and AD):

<MEETING ATTENDEES> had a validation of learning and confirmation of authorship meeting with <STUDENT NAME> this morning regarding <UNIT CODE, UNIT NAME, ASSESSMENT TITLE>. This email is to summarise my perspective of that meeting and also inform the academic director of the outcomes.

The primary goal of this meeting was to ensure <STUDENT NAME> had met the learning outcomes associated with this task, so the work submitted can be marked fairly.

The following table summarises the issues identified in the student work and the questions asked to the student in the meeting in response to these issues in an attempt to resolve the lecturer's concern. <Add as many new rows as required. Try to be specific with regards to the questions asked to the student and the reasons for asking them>:

Category	Essay content	Query
Overall	<DESCRIPTION OF CONTENT>	<QUESTION POSED TO STUDENT TO FIND OUT IF THEY UNDERSTAND THE CONTENT>
Argument	<DESCRIPTION OF AN ARGUMENT THE STUDENT HAS MADE>	<ASK THE STUDENT TO PARAPHRASE THE ARGUMENT IN A SIMPLER FORM, WHY THEY THINK THE ARGUMENT IS RELEVANT AND WHAT THEIR CONCLUSION WAS>
Specific	<SPECIFIC EXAMPLE OF TERMINOLOGY OR PHRASE THAT THE STUDENT HAS USED>	<ASK THE STUDENT TO REPHRASE SPECIFIC TERMINOLOGY FROM THEIR ESSAY IN THEIR OWN WORDS AND IN A WAY THAT A LAYPERSON WOULD UNDERSTAND>

Summary of responses:

Summarise the student responses to the questions posed in the previous table. Indicate if these responses were satisfactory or not in your opinion and why how you reached that conclusion.

AI / contract cheating usage:

If the student admits to using inappropriate support that reflects plagiarism or cheating then list the specific cases here and the tools / methods they have used.

Outcomes:

List the outcomes from the meeting including any actions the student has agreed to undertake such as submitting earlier drafts of their work.

Conclusion

Summarise your conclusions from the meeting, include the severity level of any breach of academic integrity.

Next steps:

Outline the recommended next steps.