



Academic Integrity and Plagiarism Policy (Including AI)

1. Purpose

The purpose of this policy is to uphold academic integrity within the RTO by ensuring all assessments submitted by students are their own work and are free from plagiarism, unauthorised AI use, or collusion. This policy outlines how the RTO monitors, detects, and responds to breaches of academic integrity.

2. Scope

This policy applies to all VET students, trainers and assessors, academic staff, and administrative personnel involved in training and assessment.

3. Definitions

Term	Description
Academic Integrity	Honest and responsible scholarship.
Plagiarism	Presenting someone else's work or ideas as your own without proper attribution.
Collusion	Unauthorised collaboration with another person in preparing work.
AI Misuse	Use of artificial intelligence tools (e.g., ChatGPT, Jasper, etc.) to generate content without disclosure or validation.
Academic Misconduct	Any behaviour that undermines the integrity of academic assessment.

4. Policy Statement

- The RTO is committed to ensuring that all assessment work submitted by students is authentic and meets the requirements of the training package.
- Trainers and assessors are required to apply reasonable methods to confirm the authenticity of a student's work, including verbal questioning and validation techniques.
- Any suspected or confirmed academic misconduct will be managed fairly, consistently, and in line with natural justice principles.

Version	V 3.1	Document Name	Academic Integrity and Plagiarism Policy (Including AI)
CRICOS Code.	03984H	RTO Name	Stanford Institute of Technology
RTO Code.	45808	Page number	1

5. Methods of Detection and Verification

- ✚ **Hard Copy Assessments:** Trainers may select random paragraphs and ask the student random questions about their work, and use online search engines, plagiarism detection tools, or AI detection tools such as Grammarly, QuillBot, Copyleaks or GPTZero, or other approved tools, to check the authenticity of student work. Trainers must also check whether the submission matches an integrated assessment template (i.e. whether a template has been detected within the student's response).
- ✚ **LMS Submissions:** Submissions via the LMS may be checked using the integrated or approved detection software, including plagiarism, similarity, AI detection and template-detection tools, to identify whether an assessment template has been detected within the submission.
- ✚ **Acceptable Similarity and AI Detection Levels:** The RTO recognises that similarity and AI detection results may vary depending on the unit, assessment type and task requirements. A detection result must not be used as the only evidence of academic misconduct. Trainers must review the assessment content, task instructions and student explanation before making a decision.
- ✚ **Maximum Accepted Level:** As a general rule, the maximum acceptable plagiarism, similarity or AI detection level is **10-15% for theory assessments and 30% for practical assessments. Where the result exceeds these levels, the trainer must review the submission further and may conduct verbal validation with the student.**
- ✚ **Numerical, Calculation or Formula-Based Tasks:** For assessments that are mainly numerical, calculation-based, formula-based, technical or require standard answers, the similarity percentage may be higher and, in some cases, may reach **100%**. This may be acceptable where the answers are expected to be the same due to the nature of the task, such as mathematical calculations, formulas, technical specifications, measurements, codes, standards, multiple-choice answers, short factual responses or template-based workplace documents.
- ✚ **Verbal Validation:** During practical assessments, role plays, projects, numerical tasks or where doubts arise, the trainer must ask verbal questions to confirm the student's understanding and authenticity of work. As a minimum, the trainer must ask 2 to 3 theory questions per assessment and use at least one template for each practical assessment.
- ✚ **Collusion Check:** Where multiple students submit very similar work, collusion must be investigated. The trainer must consider whether the similarity is due to the task structure, required template, common calculation method, or unauthorised collaboration. Because all students complete the same required template, the template content will naturally appear as similarity or plagiarism across submissions. This template-driven similarity is expected, is not treated as misconduct, and is included within the acceptable detection levels stated above. The trainer must disregard the template portion and assess only the authenticity of the student's own contributions.

6. Acceptable Similarity, Plagiarism and AI Detection Levels

The RTO understands that plagiarism, similarity and AI detection results are indicators only and must be interpreted carefully. A percentage result from detection software does not automatically confirm academic misconduct.

Version	V 3.1	Document Name	Academic Integrity and Plagiarism Policy (Including AI)
CRICOS Code.	03984H	RTO Name	Stanford Institute of Technology
RTO Code.	45808	Page number	2



The acceptable level may vary depending on:

- the unit requirements;
- the assessment method;
- the type of task;
- whether the task is written, practical, numerical, calculation-based or template-based;
- whether the answer requires standard terminology, formulas, legislation, codes, standards or technical language; and
- whether the student can verbally explain and validate their work.

As a general benchmark, the RTO accepts a maximum similarity, plagiarism or AI detection result of up to **10-15% for theory (written) assessment tasks and up to 30% for practical assessment tasks. Where the result exceeds these levels**, the trainer must review the submission and determine whether further validation is required.

For numerical, calculation-based, formula-based, technical or short-answer assessments, the similarity result may be higher and may reach **100%**, as students may be required to provide the same or very similar answers. This may include calculations, formulas, measurements, technical specifications, industry terminology, legislation, Australian Standards, codes of practice, multiple-choice questions or template-based answers.

Where a result appears high, the trainer must not rely only on the percentage. The trainer must consider the nature of the task, review the student's response, compare it against the benchmark answer where relevant, and conduct verbal validation if required.

7. First and Repeat Offences

- ✚ **First Offence:** Student will be informed, provided support and education, and must re-submit or re-do the assessment.
- ✚ **Repeat Offence:** The student may be required to repeat the entire unit and will receive a formal written warning. Repeated misconduct may result in suspension or cancellation of enrolment.

8. Student and Staff Responsibilities

✚ **Students must:**

- Submit original work.
- Avoid using generative AI unless permitted and declared.
- Acknowledge all sources.

✚ **Assessors must:**

- Validate authenticity using available tools and questioning.
- Keep records of detection activities and outcomes.

Version	V 3.1	Document Name	Academic Integrity and Plagiarism Policy (Including AI)
CRICOS Code.	03984H	RTO Name	Stanford Institute of Technology
RTO Code.	45808	Page number	3

9. Recording and Reporting

- All misconduct cases are documented using the Academic Misconduct Record Form.
- Records are filed in the student's academic record.
- Serious or repeat misconduct is recorded in the Academic Misconduct Register.

10. Step-by-Step Procedure

Step	Action	Responsible Person
1	Educate students on academic misconduct and AI misuse at time of orientation.	Trainer / Support Officer
2	Train staff during induction on using plagiarism/AI tools.	Compliance Manager
3	Review assessment submissions (hard copy or E-copy or LMS).	Trainer
4	Conduct plagiarism, similarity, AI and template-detection checks using approved tools. Review results against the acceptable threshold for the assessment type: up to 10-15% for theory (written) tasks and up to 30% for practical tasks. The 30% similarity is included the template as well.	Trainer
5	If the result is high, unclear, or doubt exists, conduct verbal validation. As a minimum, ask 2 to 3 random theory questions per assessment and use at least one template for each practical assessment to confirm the student's understanding and the authenticity of their work.	Trainer
6	Complete Academic Misconduct Form if misconduct suspected.	Trainer
7	Hold meeting with student for first offence and allow reassessment.	Trainer / Support Officer
8	Require unit repeat for repeat offences.	Compliance Manager / CEO
9	Record in register and notify student in writing.	Admin Officer
10	Add pattern findings to CI Register for future improvements.	Compliance Manager

11. Related Documents

Version	V 3.1	Document Name	Academic Integrity and Plagiarism Policy (Including AI)
CRICOS Code.	03984H	RTO Name	Stanford Institute of Technology
RTO Code.	45808	Page number	4



-  Academic Misconduct Record Form
-  Academic Misconduct Register
-  Student Handbook
-  Trainer/Assessor Induction Checklist
-  Continuous Improvement Register

Version	V 3.1	Document Name	Academic Integrity and Plagiarism Policy (Including AI)
CRICOS Code.	03984H	RTO Name	Stanford Institute of Technology
RTO Code.	45808	Page number	5