

1. Purpose

Assured Learning Australia (RTO# 52765) recognises that the open exchange of ideas plays a vital role in the academic endeavour, as often it is only through discussion with others that one is fully able to process information or to crystallise an elusive concept. Therefore, learners generally are encouraged to engage in conversations with their trainers and peers about their courses, training and even their assignments. It is important for all learners to acknowledge clearly when they have relied upon or incorporated the work of others, to ensure the proper use of sources while at the same time recognising and preserving the importance of the academic dialogue.

Plagiarism, collusion, cheating and other forms of academic misconduct can undermine the authenticity of assessment evidence and prevent an assessor from making an accurate judgement of competency. Learners must acknowledge the ideas, words and work of others, follow the collaboration requirements specified for each assessment task and ensure that any assistance they receive does not replace their own contribution.

Artificial intelligence (AI) tools may support training, learning, research, accessibility and current industry practice when used appropriately. However, AI must not be used in a way that replaces a learner's development or demonstration of the skills and knowledge required by the relevant training product. The use of AI must comply with the instructions and conditions established for each learning or assessment activity.

The purpose of this policy and procedure is to:

- define plagiarism, collusion, cheating, unauthorised AI use and other forms of academic misconduct;
- establish expectations for the responsible, ethical, transparent and secure use of AI by learners, staff, contractors and third parties;
- explain when collaboration and AI assistance are permitted, restricted or prohibited;
- ensure qualified staff retain human oversight and accountability for decisions affecting learners;
- provide processes for verifying the authenticity of assessment evidence;
- ensure suspected academic misconduct is investigated consistently, fairly and confidentially; and
- explain the possible outcomes and appeal rights that apply when a breach is substantiated.

2. Compliance

This policy relates to the following RTO Standards: 1.4 Rules of Evidence: Authenticity

- (i) authenticity – the assessment evidence presented is the VET learner's own work

3. Definitions

For the purposes of this policy and procedure, the following definitions apply.

Academic integrity means acting honestly, responsibly and fairly when participating in training and assessment. It requires learners to submit authentic evidence, acknowledge sources and comply with the collaboration and AI-use conditions applicable to each assessment.

Artificial intelligence (AI) means a computer-based system or tool capable of performing tasks that ordinarily require human intelligence, such as interpreting information, recognising patterns, generating content, providing recommendations or assisting with decisions.

Generative AI means an AI system that generates new content in response to user instructions or prompts. Generated content may take the form of text, images, audio, video, presentations, computer code or other material.

AI-assisted work means work created by a learner where AI has been used to support part of the process, but the learner retains responsibility for reviewing, verifying, adapting and completing the work.

AI-generated content means text, images, audio, video, code, data or other material substantially produced by an AI system.

Authorised AI use means using AI consistently with the assessment instructions, this policy and any directions provided by the trainer or assessor.

Unauthorised AI use means using AI in a way that:

- is prohibited or inconsistent with the assessment instructions;
- exceeds the level of assistance permitted by Assured Learning Australia;
- replaces the learner's own demonstration of required skills or knowledge;
- is not declared or acknowledged where disclosure is required;
- misrepresents AI-generated content as the learner's independent work; or
- otherwise prevents the assessor from confirming the authenticity of the assessment evidence.

For the purposes of this policy, unauthorised AI use may be managed as plagiarism, academic misconduct or serious academic misconduct, depending on the nature, extent and circumstances of the conduct.

AI-use declaration means a statement provided by a learner that identifies the AI tool used, how it was used, the part of the assessment it supported and how the learner reviewed, verified and modified the output.

Authentic assessment evidence has the meaning from the RTO Standards 1.8

Plagiarism means presenting another person's words, ideas, images, designs, code, data or other work as one's own without appropriate acknowledgement. Plagiarism may involve copying material

directly, inadequately paraphrasing material or submitting AI-generated content as independent work contrary to this policy or the assessment instructions.

Collusion means unauthorised collaboration between two or more people when completing assessment work that is required to be completed individually. Collusion may involve:

- jointly developing answers for an individual assessment;
- sharing completed assessment responses;
- allowing another learner to copy assessment work;
- copying another learner's work;
- dividing individual assessment questions between learners; or
- helping another learner to conceal plagiarism, cheating or unauthorised AI use.

A learner who knowingly provides their assessment work to another person for unauthorised use may also be found to have engaged in collusion.

Permitted collaboration means discussing ideas, practising skills, undertaking approved group activities or providing general peer support where this is allowed by the assessment instructions. Each learner must still produce and submit their own assessment evidence unless the task specifically requires a group submission.

Cheating means acting dishonestly to obtain or provide an unfair advantage in training or assessment. This may involve using unauthorised materials, obtaining assessment answers, communicating with another person during an individual assessment or deliberately circumventing assessment conditions.

Contract cheating means arranging for another person, business, website, AI system or other service to complete all or part of an assessment on the learner's behalf, whether or not payment or another benefit is provided.

Serious academic misconduct means deliberate, substantial, repeated or coordinated conduct that significantly undermines the integrity of training or assessment. It may involve a clear intention to cheat or defraud, contract cheating, impersonation, falsification, substantial plagiarism, deliberate collusion or repeated unauthorised AI use.

Source means the original person, publication, website, legislation, standard, organisation, dataset or other material from which information or ideas have been obtained.

Acknowledgement or attribution means clearly identifying a source or declaring assistance received so that the origin of information, ideas or content is transparent.

4. Responsible AI Principles

Assured Learning Australia supports the responsible use of AI where it enhances training, learning, assessment and workplace relevance without undermining the quality or integrity of nationally recognised training.

The following principles apply to learners, staff, contractors and third parties using AI in connection with Assured Learning Australia's services.

4.1 Quality and integrity

AI must be used purposefully and must not undermine the quality, integrity or validity of training and assessment.

AI must not replace a learner's development or demonstration of the skills and knowledge required by the relevant training product. Assessment evidence must enable the assessor to determine the learner's individual competency.

4.2 Human oversight and accountability

People remain responsible for decisions and work supported by AI.

Qualified trainers and assessors retain responsibility for training and assessment decisions. AI must not independently make competency judgements, determine that academic misconduct has occurred or make final decisions affecting a learner's progression, enrolment or access to support.

Learners remain responsible for the accuracy, authenticity and quality of work submitted with AI assistance.

4.3 Responsible handling of information

AI must be used in accordance with applicable privacy, confidentiality, information security and recordkeeping requirements.

Personal information, sensitive information, confidential workplace information, protected assessment materials and other restricted information must not be entered into an AI system unless its use has been authorised.

Further requirements are established in Assured Learning Australia's [Privacy, Confidentiality and Information Security Policy and Procedure](#).

4.4 Fair and accessible use

AI use must not create unnecessary barriers or unfairly disadvantage learners because of their background, disability, digital literacy, location or access to technology.

Where AI is required for a training or assessment activity, Assured Learning Australia will consider appropriate learner support, reasonable adjustment and access arrangements.

Further requirements are established in Assured Learning Australia's [Access and Equity and Learner Support Policy and Procedure](#).

4.5 Training-product and industry alignment

AI use must be consistent with:

- the requirements and assessment conditions of the relevant training product;
- the skills and knowledge the learner is required to personally demonstrate;
- current and emerging industry practice;
- the workplace context and expected qualification outcome; and
- the needs and capabilities of the relevant learner cohort.

AI may be used in an assessment where its use reflects appropriate workplace practice, provided it does not prevent the learner from demonstrating the required competency.

4.6 Transparency

The use of AI must be transparent where it materially contributes to training, assessment or submitted work.

Learners must declare AI use where required by this policy or the assessment instructions. Staff must be open about material AI use where it affects training resources, assessment processes or decisions concerning learners.

AI-generated information must be reviewed and verified before it is relied upon or communicated as accurate.

5. Scope

This policy pertains to all learners enrolled at Assured Learning Australia and is applicable for the trainer and assessors' considerations in deeming competency.

This Policy should be read in conjunction with the Learner Code of Conduct.

This policy should be read in conjunction with the Effective Training, Assessment and Validation Policy and Procedure.

6. Use of AI and machine learning applications

Artificial intelligence (AI) tools can support learning, research, accessibility and the development of digital skills. Generative AI tools can explain concepts, suggest research pathways, provide feedback, assist with planning and generate text, images, audio, code or other content.

AI must be used as a learning support and not as a substitute for a learner's own skills, knowledge, judgement or practical performance. Learners remain responsible for the accuracy, relevance, authenticity and quality of all work they submit, regardless of whether AI has been used.

AI use must comply with the instructions for the particular learning or assessment activity. The fact that AI use is permitted for one assessment does not mean that it is permitted for every assessment.

6.1 Determining when AI may be used

Assured Learning Australia will aim to clearly identify within each assessment task whether AI use is permitted, restricted or prohibited and any conditions that apply. Where an assessment contains specific instructions about AI, learners must follow those instructions.

Some existing assessments may not contain specific instructions about AI use. Where an assessment is silent, Assured Learning Australia's general position is that AI may be used where:

- using AI would be accepted and appropriate in the workplace relevant to the qualification or occupational outcome;
- AI use does not conflict with the requirements or conditions of the training product;
- AI does not replace the learner's own skills, knowledge, judgement or practical performance being assessed;
- the learner follows the responsible use requirements in section 4.2; and

- the learner declares and appropriately acknowledges their use of AI.

If a learner is uncertain about whether AI may be used, they should ask their trainer or assessor before using it.

Knowledge assessments

For knowledge assessments, learners may use AI to support their understanding of the assessment. This may involve:

- explaining unfamiliar terminology;
- restating a question in simpler language;
- explaining a concept;
- identifying topics that require further research;
- suggesting reliable sources to investigate; or
- providing feedback on a response the learner has already developed.

Assured Learning Australia does not generally encourage learners to use AI to generate or complete answers to knowledge assessment questions. Submitted answers must demonstrate the learner's own understanding and must be written in the learner's own words.

Where AI has been used to help locate information, the learner must review the original and authoritative sources, verify that the information is accurate and current, and reference those sources where required.

Projects and workplace documents

AI use is generally more appropriate for project-based assessments where using AI reflects current workplace practice. Examples may include:

- planning or developing a presentation;
- brainstorming ideas;
- creating an initial structure for a workplace document;
- supporting the development of a policy, procedure, report or communication;
- reviewing the clarity and organisation of a draft;
- generating design or formatting suggestions; or
- assisting with research.

The learner must still review, verify, adapt and contextualise any AI-generated material. The final submission must demonstrate the learner's own judgement, decisions and ability to meet the assessment requirements.

AI must not complete a project on the learner's behalf where doing so would prevent the assessor from determining whether the learner possesses the required skills and knowledge.

Practical assessments

AI must not replace the learner's practical performance. Where an assessment requires the learner to personally demonstrate a workplace skill, the learner must perform that skill under the conditions specified in the assessment.

AI may be used during a practical assessment only where:

- the assessment instructions permit its use;
- its use reflects appropriate workplace practice; and
- the learner can still personally demonstrate all skills, knowledge and decisions required by the training product.

Declaring AI use

Where a learner uses AI in an assessment, they must clearly acknowledge its use in accordance with section 4.6. Declaring AI use does not remove the learner's responsibility to ensure the submitted evidence is accurate, authentic and demonstrates their own competency.

6.2 Responsible use requirements

When using AI for an authorised purpose, learners must:

- follow the conditions stated in the assessment instructions;
- use AI to support, rather than replace, their own learning and work;
- critically review and edit AI-generated content;
- check factual statements against reliable and current sources;
- verify legislation, standards, codes and regulatory information through official sources;
- ensure links, references and quotations are genuine;
- contextualise information to the assessment task, workplace and jurisdiction;
- use Australian spelling and appropriate workplace terminology;
- declare how AI was used where required;
- retain relevant prompts, outputs and drafts where required for authenticity verification; and
- be able to explain, apply and demonstrate the knowledge and skills presented in their assessment evidence.

Learners must not enter another person's personal information, sensitive information, confidential workplace information, assessment materials or commercially protected information into an AI system unless specifically authorised by Assured Learning Australia and the owner of the information.

6.3 Example 1 – Developing workplace documentation

You are required to develop a workplace policy. The assessment instructions state that limited AI assistance is permitted.

You may use AI to:

- identify the types of sections that may appear in a workplace policy;
- create a checklist of matters you may need to research;
- explain unfamiliar policy terminology;
- suggest official government or regulator websites to investigate; or
- provide feedback on the clarity of a draft you have already written.

You must then:

- confirm that the suggested structure is appropriate for the assessment task;
- conduct your own research;
- verify legislation and regulatory requirements using official sources;
- write and contextualise the policy in your own words;
- check the information for accuracy and currency;
- correct grammar, spelling and workplace terminology;
- identify and correct invented or misleading references;
- declare the authorised AI assistance you used; and
- be able to explain and justify the content of the completed policy.

It would be unacceptable to ask AI to complete the entire policy and submit the output without meaningful research, review, contextualisation or personal contribution. Depending on the assessment instructions and circumstances, this may constitute unauthorised AI use, plagiarism or another form of academic misconduct.

If the assessment is specifically designed to assess the learner's ability to independently research, structure and write a policy, using AI to generate the structure or content may be prohibited.

6.4 Example 2 – Understanding an assessment question

You are completing a series of short-answer questions. You understand most of the questions, but you are unsure what one question is asking. The assessment instructions allow AI to be used to clarify terminology but not to generate assessment answers.

An appropriate prompt may be:

"I am completing an assessment that must be my own work. Do not answer the question for me. Please explain the key terms and what the question is asking in simple language so I can develop my own answer."

For example:

Learner: What does "simplify an equation" mean? Please explain the term without completing my assessment question.

AI tool: Simplifying an equation means rewriting it in a clearer or shorter form while keeping the same mathematical meaning. This may involve combining like terms or carrying out permitted mathematical operations.

The learner must then return to the assessment and develop their own answer. If the AI tool provides a direct answer despite being instructed not to, the learner must not copy or submit that answer.

A carefully written prompt does not, by itself, make the use of AI acceptable. The learner must still follow the assessment conditions and ensure the submitted response demonstrates their own understanding.

6.5 Example 3 – Locating legislation

You are asked to identify legislation relevant to work health and safety in your state. The assessment instructions permit AI to help locate possible sources but do not permit AI to write the final answer.

An appropriate prompt may be:

"I live in New South Wales. Please identify official government websites where I can research current work health and safety legislation. Do not write my assessment answer."

The AI tool may direct you to sources such as:

- the NSW legislation website;
- SafeWork NSW; or
- another relevant government or industry regulator.

You must open and review the official sources yourself. You must confirm:

- the exact title of the legislation;
- the relevant jurisdiction;

- whether the legislation is current;
- whether it applies to the assessment question; and
- whether the AI-generated link and information are accurate.

Your final response must be based on the official sources and written in your own words. You must reference the official legislation or regulator material rather than relying on the AI tool as the source of the legal information.

6.6 Declaring AI use

Where AI use is permitted or required, the learner may be required to provide an AI-use declaration identifying:

- the AI tool used;
- the purpose for which it was used;
- the part of the work it assisted with;
- how the output was checked and modified;
- the sources used to verify the information; and
- confirmation that the submitted evidence reflects the learner's own skills, knowledge and decisions.

Assured Learning Australia may request relevant prompt and output extracts, drafts, version history or other information reasonably required to verify the authenticity of assessment evidence. Assured Learning Australia will not require a learner to provide their account password or unrestricted access to private AI conversations.

An assessor may also use supplementary questioning, practical demonstration, supervised reassessment or another appropriate assessment method to confirm that the evidence reflects the learner's own competency.

A concern about AI use will be managed under the investigation and procedural fairness requirements of this policy. An AI-detection result or difference in writing style will not, by itself, establish that misconduct has occurred.

In the above, the user has set proper prompts in place to allow for authentic learning and understanding the concept. Direct copy and paste answers would be considered plagiarism.

Assured Learning Australia reserves the right to ask to see your ChatGPT or Google Bard log, as well as confirming your understanding through verbal questioning.

7. How we check for Plagiarism and unauthorised use of AI

Assured Learning Australia may use a combination of professional judgement, source comparison, similarity-checking software and other appropriate methods to identify possible plagiarism or unauthorised AI use.

Indicators that may require further review include:

- text that is identical or substantially similar to published material or another learner's work;
- sources, legislation, quotations or links that cannot be verified;
- significant and unexplained differences in language, writing style, terminology or demonstrated ability;
- generic responses that do not address the assessment context;
- assessment evidence that contains inaccurate, invented or irrelevant information commonly associated with unreviewed AI-generated content;
- identical or unusually similar errors across different learners' submissions;
- an AI-use declaration that indicates the assessment conditions may not have been followed; or
- information suggesting that another person or an AI system completed a substantial part of the assessment on the learner's behalf.

These indicators do not, by themselves, establish that plagiarism or unauthorised AI use has occurred. AI-detection and similarity-checking tools may assist an assessor to identify material requiring review, but their results must not be treated as conclusive evidence or used as the sole basis for an adverse decision.

Where a concern is identified, the assessor will review the assessment evidence and any matched or suspected sources. The learner will be given an opportunity to explain how they developed the work and identify any sources, assistance or AI tools they used.

Assured Learning Australia may ask the learner to provide information reasonably relevant to the assessment, such as:

- an AI-use declaration;
- relevant prompt and output extracts;
- research notes;
- drafts or version history;
- details of the sources consulted; or
- an explanation of how AI-generated material was reviewed, verified and modified.

The learner will not be required to provide an account password or unrestricted access to private AI conversations.

The assessor may also use supplementary verbal questioning, require the learner to explain or apply the submitted information, or arrange another appropriate assessment activity to determine whether the evidence reflects the learner's own skills and knowledge.

A concern about plagiarism or AI use will be managed under the investigation and procedural fairness requirements of this policy before a finding is made.

Further information about Assured Learning Australia's broader processes for verifying the authenticity of assessment evidence is provided in the [Effective Training, Assessment and Validation Policy and Procedure](#).

8. Consequences for Identifying Plagiarism, Collusion and Unauthorised Use of AI

Consequences under this section will only be applied after the concern has been reviewed in accordance with section 5 and the learner has been given an opportunity to respond.

Assured Learning Australia will consider the nature and extent of the conduct, the learner's explanation, the assessment instructions, previous substantiated breaches and any applicable funding or contractual requirements.

Assured Learning Australia may apply a progressive response. However, it is not required to begin with a first warning where the conduct constitutes serious academic misconduct or demonstrates a clear intention to cheat or defraud.

8.1 Initial discussion with the learner

Where a trainer and assessor identifies possible plagiarism, collusion or unauthorised AI use, they will discuss the concern with the learner before making a final determination.

The learner will be:

- advised of the specific concern;
- provided with, or given an explanation of, the relevant evidence;
- asked to explain how they completed the assessment;
- given an opportunity to identify the sources, assistance or AI tools they used; and
- given a reasonable opportunity to provide relevant drafts, research notes, prompt extracts, version history or other supporting information.

Following the discussion, the trainer and assessor may determine that:

- no breach occurred and the assessment can be marked in the usual way;
- the concern resulted from poor referencing, misunderstanding or an honest mistake;
- plagiarism, collusion or unauthorised AI use occurred; or
- the matter may constitute serious academic misconduct and must be referred to management.

Where a breach is substantiated, evidence that is not the learner's original and genuine work will not be accepted as valid assessment evidence.

8.2 First warning

A first warning will generally apply where plagiarism, collusion or unauthorised AI use is substantiated for the first time, and the conduct is not considered serious academic misconduct.

The learner will:

- receive a written warning explaining the breach and the evidence relied upon;
- receive a Not Yet Satisfactory outcome for the affected assessment task;
- be advised that the inauthentic evidence cannot be used to support a competency judgement;
- be provided with guidance on referencing, collaboration or responsible AI use, as relevant;
- be advised of any resubmission or reassessment requirements; and
- be advised of the consequences of any further substantiated breach.

The learner may be required to correct and resubmit the assessment, complete an alternative assessment, undertake supervised assessment, participate in verbal questioning or demonstrate the relevant skills and knowledge directly to the assessor.

Any reassessment opportunity will be provided in accordance with the Effective Training, Assessment and Validation Policy and Procedure, applicable funding requirements and Assured Learning Australia's published assessment arrangements.

Failure to complete an approved reassessment opportunity, or failure to provide satisfactory and authentic assessment evidence, may result in a Not Competent outcome for the unit.

8.3 Second and final warning

Where a learner commits a second substantiated act of plagiarism, collusion or unauthorised AI use, the learner may receive a second and final written warning.

The affected assessment evidence will be rejected, and the assessment task will be recorded as Not Yet Satisfactory.

Where the learner has:

- used the available assessment attempts;
- repeatedly failed to provide authentic assessment evidence;
- failed to demonstrate the required competency through an approved alternative assessment method; or
- committed a further breach after being clearly advised of the required conduct, the trainer and assessor may determine that the learner has not met the assessment requirements for the unit and recommend a Not Competent outcome.

Before the unit outcome is finalised:

- the trainer and assessor must document the assessment evidence, previous opportunities and reasons for the proposed outcome;

- management must review and confirm that the policy and applicable assessment processes have been followed; and
- any additional reassessment opportunities required under an applicable State or Territory funding contract or program requirement must be provided.

Where another assessment opportunity is required or approved, Assured Learning Australia may require it to be completed under supervision or through another controlled assessment method.

If a Not Competent outcome is confirmed and the learner wishes to attempt the unit again, the learner may be required to re-enrol in the unit. Re-enrolment, reassessment fees and any other applicable fees or penalties will be managed in accordance with Assured Learning Australia's published Fees and Charges arrangements, the learner's enrolment agreement and any applicable funding requirements.

8.4 Serious academic misconduct

Serious academic misconduct may be found where the available evidence demonstrates a clear intention to cheat or defraud or where the conduct significantly undermines the integrity of the assessment process.

Examples may include:

- purchasing or obtaining completed assessment answers;
- arranging for another person to complete an assessment;
- impersonating another learner or allowing another person to impersonate the learner;
- submitting another learner's work as one's own;
- using AI to generate all or a substantial part of an assessment where this prevents the learner from demonstrating the required competency;
- deliberately falsifying workplace evidence, records, signatures, observations or third-party reports;
- deliberately sharing completed assessment material so another learner can submit it as their own;
- coordinating responses with other learners where individual work is required;
- repeatedly submitting plagiarised or AI-generated evidence after previous warnings; or
- deliberately attempting to conceal plagiarism, collusion or unauthorised AI use.

Serious academic misconduct does not need to be managed through the first and second warning stages before action is taken.

The matter will be referred to management and may be considered by an academic misconduct panel that includes the Chief Executive Officer or their authorised delegate.

Depending on the seriousness of the conduct, the learner's response and the available evidence, the outcome may include:

- rejection of the affected assessment evidence;
- a Not Yet Satisfactory outcome for the assessment task;

- a Not Competent outcome for the unit;
- completion of an alternative or supervised assessment;
- a final written warning;
- suspension of enrolment;
- cancellation of enrolment;
- exclusion from further assessment for a specified period; or
- other fees or penalties authorised by the learner's enrolment agreement and Assured Learning Australia's published policies.

8.5 Decision-making authority

The trainer and assessor is responsible for:

- initially reviewing the assessment concern;
- discussing the concern with the learner;
- determining whether the submitted evidence is valid, sufficient and authentic;
- determining the assessment-task outcome; and
- documenting any recommendation for a Not Competent unit outcome.

The trainer and assessor remains responsible for the competency judgement.

Management is responsible for:

- reviewing and confirming proposed Not Competent outcomes arising from repeated academic misconduct;
- ensuring applicable funding and assessment requirements have been followed;
- determining serious academic misconduct matters;
- approving suspension or cancellation of enrolment; and
- ensuring decisions and reasons are documented and communicated to the learner.

8.6 Appeals, records and continuous improvement

A learner may appeal an assessment outcome, academic misconduct finding or disciplinary decision under the [Complaints and Appeals Policy and Procedure](#).

Records of concerns, discussions, evidence, warnings, assessment outcomes, management decisions and appeals will be retained securely in accordance with Assured Learning Australia's recordkeeping and privacy requirements.

Assured Learning Australia will monitor plagiarism, collusion and unauthorised AI-use matters to identify recurring risks, unclear assessment instructions, required staff development and opportunities to improve assessment practices. Relevant improvements will be managed through the [Quality and Continuous Improvement Policy and Procedure](#).

Further information about assessment judgements, reassessment and authenticity requirements is provided in the [Effective Training, Assessment and Validation Policy and Procedure](#).

9. Harvard Referencing Guide

The below information is taken in full, from the Harvard Referencing Guide and some contextualised examples from RMIT University.

HARVARD REFERENCING EXAMPLES

Important: This is a guide only.

To avoid losing marks:

1. Confirm referencing requirements with your lecturer, and
2. Use Snooks & Co 2002, [Style manual: for authors, editors and printers](#), 6th edn, John Wiley & Sons, Milton QLD. to clarify referencing rules or if you need more examples. This guide is based on this publication.

Harvard is an author-date referencing style. You need to follow this style when acknowledging your information sources.

Harvard style requires in-text references and the reference list. In-text references appear within the body of the document. They include the author(s) family name and the year of publication, with extra details if required, such as page numbers. A reference list provides full details of all in-text references at the end of the document.

IN-TEXT REFERENCES

You must acknowledge each author or source of information (print or online) either by paraphrasing or using a direct quote.

Paraphrasing is when you are expressing the ideas of the author(s) in your own words. When paraphrasing, use round brackets to add the author(s) family name and the year of publication at the end of the sentence. Or use the author's name as part of your sentence, followed by the year of publication in round brackets.

Direct quote is when you are using the exact words of the author(s). Put direct quotes between single inverted commas (quotation marks), and add a page number. Do not overuse direct quotes.

Single author (paraphrasing)

It is argued that... (Carroll 2012).

Carroll (2012) argues that...

Single author (direct quote)

'A major criticism of business is that it abuses its power' (Carroll 2012, p. 26).

Carroll (2012, p. 26) argues that 'a major criticism of business is that it abuses its power'.

Two or three authors (paraphrasing)

It is suggested that...(Cabrera & Unruh 2012).

Kuratko, Goldsby and Hornsby (2012) suggest that...

Remember: use an ampersand (&) when listing authors in round brackets. Use the full word 'and' when mentioning authors in a sentence.

Four or more authors (paraphrasing)

It is recommended that... (Chalkley et al. 2012).

Chalkley et al. (2012) recommend that...

Multiple citations in a single sentence

List all citations alphabetically, separated by a semi-colon (;).

It has been claimed that... (Carroll 2012; Chalkley et al. 2012; Kuratko, Goldsby & Hornsby 2012).

Two or more publications by the same author(s) and in the same year

Insert a letter (starting with the letter 'a') after the year. In the reference list, include the same letter after each year of publication.

It is argued that... (Jamison 1991a).

Jamison (1991b) argues that...

Secondary citations

When you refer to the work of one author cited by another, include the original source of the information and where you read it. In the reference list, only include the text you read, not the original source.

For example, if an article by Hosany and Martin you are reading cites Heath and Scott, put the Hosany and Martin reference in the reference list. Your in-text references should look like these:

Early research indicated... (Heath & Scott, cited in Hosany & Martin 2012).

Heath and Scott (cited in Hosany & Martin 2012) claim that...

Encyclopedia or dictionary entry without an author

Add the publication title (in italics) and the date. Do not include these references in the reference list.

The ABO system is... (*Dictionary of biology* 2014).

Encyclopedia or dictionary entry with an author

Add the author's family name and the date. Include the full reference in the reference list.

The characteristics of action research include... (Adams 2010).

Personal communication

Add an in-text references for personal communication, such as interviews, phone conversations and letters, as per below example. Do not include these references in the reference list.

My field placement supervisor commented '... ' (CM Burns 2014, pers. comm., 20 April).

Ms Merrick (Melville Shire Council CEO) confirmed the details by email on 25 April 2014.

Publications without authors

Publications without authors do not need to be included in the reference list. Here are some examples:

Dictionary or encyclopedia entries, and newspaper articles The ABO system is ... (Dictionary of biology 2014).

The Age (21 May, p. 12) reports that ...

Legal material (case or legislation) and streaming or YouTube videos

The Australian Copyright Council initiated a test case against the University of NSW (*University of New South Wales v Moorhouse and Angus & Robertson (Publishers) Pty Ltd* (1975) 133 CLR 1).

Section 55 of the *Competition and Consumer Act 2010* (Cth) states that ' ... there is a guarantee that the goods are reasonably fit for any disclosed purpose, and for any purpose for which the supplier represents that they are reasonably fit ... '.

Often designers think in terms of products and services rather than about the vision of a company or organisation (*Design & thinking: a documentary on design thinking* 2012).

Learn more about what is a Library subject guide (*What's a library subject guide* n.d.).

Publications without page numbers

If quoting from a document without page numbers, include the location of the quote using the paragraph number, or section heading.

'Optimal immunisation schedules...' (World Health Organisation 2014, para. 3).

'Deaths due to malaria...' (World Health Organisation 2013, Reported deaths section).

REFERENCE LIST

General rules

List publication details of all your in-text references at the end of the document. Use a 'References' or 'Reference List' heading on a new page.

Check with your teacher/lecturer or supervisor if you need to provide a bibliography. The bibliography lists research sources you have read but not referenced in your document.

List references alphabetically using the author's family name. An author can be an individual, a company or an organisation, such as a government department.

Include an appropriate format for each publication. The format could be a book, book chapter, journal article, website, etc.

Punctuation and the order of elements in a reference are important. Here is how you order and punctuate elements in a printed or PDF publication:

Author's family name, initial(s) year of publication, Title (in italics), Publisher, Place of Publication.

Young, JK 2014, *My very important book*, University Press, Melbourne, Vic.

And this is how you reference online sources:

Author's family name, initial(s) year, Title (in italics), source type, viewed date, <URL>.

Webber, S & Boon, S 2006, *Information literacy blog*, blog, viewed 10 January 2008, <<http://informationliteracy.blogspot.com>>.

Here are more examples:

Books

Book with single author

Carroll, AB 2012, *Business & society: ethics, sustainability, and stakeholder management*, 8th edn, South-Western Cengage Learning, Mason, OH.

Book with multiple authors

List all authors as they appear on the title page of the book. Use an ampersand (&) to separate the last two authors.

Chalkley, T, Brown, A, Goodman, M, Cinque, T, Warren, B, Hobbs, M & Finn, M 2012, *Communication, new media and everyday life*, Oxford University Press, South Melbourne, Vic.

Book with no author

Style manual for authors, editors and printers 2002, 6th edn, John Wiley & Sons, Milton, Qld.

Edited book

Lubkin, IM & Larsen, PD (eds), *Chronic illness: impact and interventions*, 8th edn, Jones & Bartlett Learning, Burlington, MA.

Book with an edition number

For a book with an edition number, add the number and the abbreviation 'edn' after the title of the book. There is no need to include edition information if a book is a first edition, or if no edition is mentioned.

Carroll, AB 2012, *Business & society: ethics, sustainability, and stakeholder management*, 8th edn, South-Western Cengage Learning, Mason, OH.

Chapter in an edited book (book chapter)

For a book chapter, include page numbers after the place of publication.

Schirm, V 2013, 'Quality of life', in IM Lubkin & PD Larsen (eds), *Chronic illness: impact and interventions*, 8th edn, Jones & Bartlett Learning, Burlington, MA, pp. 183-206. e-Book e-Books with full-page format/imaging (PDF) are cited the same way as printed books.

Encyclopedia and dictionary entries

Adams, P 2010, 'Action research', in *Encyclopedia of Research Design*, NJ Salkind (ed.), Sage Publications, Thousand Oaks, CA.

Encyclopedia or dictionary entries without an author do not need to be included in the reference list.

Journal and newspaper articles

Journal/magazine article (print and PDF)

Include page numbers after the volume and issue details (if supplied).

Taylor, CM, Karunaratne, CV & Xie, N 2012, 'Glycosides of hydroxyproline: some recent, unusual discoveries', *Glycobiology*, vol. 22, no. 6, pp. 757-767.

In-text references for journal articles without an author need date and page number. But these articles do not need to appear in your reference list.

Inspire (June 2012, p.14) states that...

e-Journal article (HTML format only) Add the viewed date and the URL.

Ogilvy, J 2011, 'Human enhancement and the computational metaphor', *Journal of Evolution & Technology*, vol. 22, no. 1, viewed 11 June 2012, <<http://jetpress.org/v22/ogilvy.htm>>.

e-Journal article from a library database (HTML format only) Add the viewed date and the database name.

Hosany, S & Martin, D 2012, 'Self-image congruence in consumer behavior', *Journal of Business Research*, vol. 65, no. 5, pp. 685-691, viewed 27 May 2012, Elsevier SD Freedom Collection.

Newspaper article (print newspaper)

Martin, P 2014, 'Melbourne tops nation's growth', *The Age*, 7 April. p. 2.

In-text references for newspaper articles without an author need date and page number. But these articles do not need to appear in your reference list.

The Age (18 May 2012, p.3) states that...

Newspaper article from a library database (HTML format only) Add the viewed date and the database name.

Carney, S 2012, 'Gillard paying price for gamble on the numbers', *The Age*, 26 May, p. 23, viewed 29 May 2012, Factiva database.

Newspaper article (an online newspaper)

Banks, D 2010, 'Tweeting in court: Why reporters must be given guidelines', *The Guardian*, 15 December, viewed 25 November 2015, <<http://www.theguardian.com/law/2010/dec/15/tweeting-court-reporters-julian-assange>>.

Internet sources and social media

Blog

Webber, S & Boon, S 2006, *Information literacy blog*, blog, viewed 10 January 2008, <<http://information literacy.blogspot.com>>.

Blog post

For a blog post, include the 'title of post'.

Thesis Whisperer 2013, 'Wormhole literature', *The Thesis Whisperer*, blog post, 3 April, viewed 8 January 2014, <<http://thesiswhisperer.com/2013/04/03/the-wormhole-incident/>>.

Facebook

Smith, P 2015, *Rethinking higher education the team is everything*, Facebook, 25 April, viewed 16 June 2015, <<https://www.facebook.com/pages/Peter-P-Smith/196037770427320>>.

Podcast/vodcast

Isherwood, B 2012, *Where ideas come from*, podcast, 12 September, viewed 5 June 2014, <<http://itunesu.rmit.edu.au/node/862>>.

Streaming video

Design & thinking: a documentary on design thinking 2012, streaming video, Muris Studio, viewed 23 March 2014, <<https://rmit-kanopystreaming-com.ezproxy.lib.rmit.edu.au/video/design-andthinking>>.

Twitter

Obama, B 2016, *It's time for Senate leaders to put politics aside ...*, Twitter, 17 May, viewed 19 May 2016, <<https://twitter.com/BarackObama/status/732589315478290432>>.

YouTube video

RMIT University 2014, *What's a library subject guide*, YouTube, 8 October, RMIT University, viewed 18 April 2016, <<https://youtu.be/IXo58MojuKI>>.

Website document

If a website document doesn't have an author (individual or corporate), start with the title of the document in italics followed by the date. If there is no date, use n.d.

World Health Organisation 2014, *WHO recommendations for routine immunisation - summary tables*, World Health Organisation, viewed 1 May 2014, <http://www.who.int/immunisation/policy/immunisation_tables/en/>.

Reports and standards

Company report

Wesfarmers Limited 2015, *Sustainability report 2015*, Wesfarmers Limited, viewed 18 April 2016, <<http://sustainability.wesfarmers.com.au/>>.

Industry report

Schulman, C 2012, *Internet service providers in Australia*, industry report, IBISWorld, viewed 9 August 2013, retrieved from IBISWorld Database.

Standard from a database

Standards Australia 2010, *Residential timber-framed construction - non-cyclonic areas*, AS 1684.22010, viewed 28 September 2012, SAI Global database.

Legal material and patents

Legal material – Case

University of New South Wales v Moorhouse and Angus & Robertson (Publishers) Pty Ltd (1975) 133 CLR 1.

Legal material – Legislation

Competition and Consumer Act 2010 (Cth).

Patent

Gupta, BB & Kasapis, S 1997, *Water-continuous spread*, US Patent 5614245.

Other sources

Lecture notes

Sample, S 2016, 'Introduction to your course', lecture notes, COURSECODE, RMIT University, viewed 18 April 2016, <<https://my.rmit.edu.au/portal/myStudies/#/lecturenotes/week1>>.

Video, film, DVD

Specify the multimedia format after the date, e.g. video recording. Add any other useful information after the citation, e.g. directed by...

Coco Chanel & Igor Stravinsky 2010, video recording, Madman Entertainment, Australia. Directed by Jan Kounen.

Personal communication (interview, phone conversations, letters)

Information obtained from personal communication does not need to be included in the reference list.

Conference Proceedings

Gudmundsson, A & Laing, L 2011, 'Facilitating learner self-reflection in a blended learning environment', in *ATN Assessment Conference 2011 Proceedings*, Curtin University, Perth, 20 – 21 October, viewed 5 August 2016, <http://ctl.curtin.edu.au/events/conferences/atna2011/files/ATNA_2011_Proceedings.pdf>.

Dataset

Bureau of Meteorology 2011, *High-quality Australian daily rainfall dataset*, Australia's high-quality climate change datasets, data file, Australian Government, Bureau of Meteorology, viewed 17 November 2011, <<ftp://ftp.bom.gov.au/anon/home/ncc/www/change/HQdailyR>>.

Table

Melbourne Water 2012, *Weekly water report 5 January 2012: Chart view Daily residential water use in Melbourne*, Melbourne Water, Victoria, viewed 12 January 2012, <<http://www.melbournewater.com.au/waterdata/waterstorages/Weekly-waterupdate/Pages/Weekly-water-update-archive.as>>.

For more examples on how to reference visual materials, go to the [Library's guide on Harvard Referencing for Visual Materials](http://rmit.libguides.com/harvardvisual) [rmit.libguides.com/harvardvisual].

10. Policy review

This policy will be reviewed each year and as a standing item, include details of the date it was reviewed and any changes.

- Jan 2021 - General annual review, minor changes to wording only (L Hollows).
- March 2021 - Updated information on services used to check for plagiarism
- July 2023 - Updated to reflect implementation of AI across sector
- Jan 2025 – Updated to reflect new RTO Standards.
- Sept 2025 – Reference to previous standards removed.
- August 2026 – Updated in line with ASQA, DEWR & TEQSA Responsible Use of AI Guidance

11. Policy additions or amendments

Separate to the mandated annual review, the policy may be varied at any time due to legislative changes or to fall in line with widely accepted best practices in the workplace. In the event of any changes, the policy will be updated and relevant stakeholders advised.

Lyle Barrett - CEO

First Warning - Exemplar Notification

Subject: Concerns Regarding Your Recent Assessment

Dear [Learner's Name],

I am writing to discuss a matter of concern regarding your most recent assessment. It has come to our attention that there are strong indications of potential plagiarism in your work, suggesting that the content has been entirely generated by an AI system. I would like to emphasise that this is a serious offense and goes against the academic integrity standards outlined in our Plagiarism and Collusion Policy.

While we acknowledge the advancements in AI technology, it is crucial to remember that academic assessments are meant to showcase your own understanding, critical thinking, and originality. By relying solely on AI-generated content without proper attribution or personal input, you undermine the purpose of the assignment and compromise your own learning experience.

We are committed to providing a fair and supportive educational environment for all learners. In light of these concerns, I kindly request that you present yourself for a verbal questioning session to discuss your assessment. This will allow us to gain a better understanding of the situation and provide you with an opportunity to explain the content and sources used in your work.

Please note that this is not an accusation of wrongdoing but rather a necessary step to address the suspicions raised. Our goal is to ensure the integrity of the academic process and provide you with the chance to clarify any misunderstandings or unintentional errors.

I encourage you to approach this conversation with honesty and openness. It is important that we address this matter promptly to prevent any further consequences that could affect your academic standing. We genuinely believe in your potential and hope to resolve this issue amicably.

If you have any concerns or questions regarding this matter, please do not hesitate to reach out to me. I am here to assist you and provide the support you may require throughout this process.

Thank you for your attention to this matter, and I look forward to meeting with you for the verbal questioning session.

Best regards,

[Your Name]

[Your Position], [Name of Institution]

Second and Final Warning Example Email

Subject: Final Warning - Reassessment Required Under Observation

Dear [Learner's Name],

It is with deep regret that I am following up on our previous communication regarding concerns about potential plagiarism in your assessments. After careful consideration and consultation, it has been determined that further action is necessary to address this matter appropriately.

Given the serious nature of the allegations, we have decided that a reassessment is required to ensure the integrity of the academic process. To maintain transparency and fairness, the reassessment will take place in a controlled environment under observation.

Therefore, I hereby inform you that you are required to redo the assessment in a supervised setting. This means that you will need to attend a designated session where an assessor will oversee the entire process. The purpose of this observation is to ensure the authenticity and originality of your work.

Please be advised that there may be associated fees for the administration of the reassessment. These fees are in place to cover the costs of organising the observation and maintaining the academic standards of our institution. The details regarding the timing, location, and fees, if applicable, will be communicated to you separately.

It is essential to emphasise that this reassessment is not intended as a punishment but as a means to address the concerns raised and to uphold the principles of academic integrity. We believe in your capacity to learn from this experience and demonstrate your true abilities.

I urge you to take this opportunity seriously and approach the reassessment with utmost honesty, integrity, and personal effort. Remember that the purpose of this exercise is to showcase your own understanding, critical thinking, and originality. If this behaviour continues it can result in your units being deemed not competent and risk your progression and enrolment status.

As always, you can appeal this decision, refer to our complaints and appeals policy for more information on how to access this process.

If you have any questions or concerns regarding the reassessment process, fees, or any other related matters, please do not hesitate to contact me. I am here to assist you and provide the necessary support throughout this process.

Please acknowledge receipt of this email and confirm your understanding of the requirements and expectations by replying to this message.

Thank you for your attention to this matter, and I look forward to your cooperation in ensuring the academic integrity of our institution.

Best regards,

[Your Name]

[Your Position], [Name of Institution]

Subject: Final Notice - Academic Misconduct and Not Competent in Unit

Dear [Learner's Name],

It is with deep regret that I am writing to inform you of the final decision regarding the concerns raised about potential plagiarism in your recent assessments. Despite the previous warnings and opportunities provided to address the issue, it has been determined that you have not demonstrated the necessary authenticity in your work.

After careful consideration and consultation with the relevant parties, it has been concluded that your actions constitute a serious breach of academic integrity. Therefore, I regret to inform you that you are being charged with academic misconduct for the aforementioned offense.

[Assured Learning Australia to outline the reasons and evidence related to the academic misconduct.](#)

As a result of this charge, it is our decision that you will be deemed "not competent" in the unit associated with the assessment in question. This outcome reflects the gravity of the misconduct and the failure to meet the expected standards of academic integrity.

I understand that this may come as disappointing news, and you may have concerns or wish to contest the decision. In such cases, I encourage you to familiarise yourself with our institution's Complaints and Appeals Policy. This policy outlines the process through which you can raise your concerns and initiate an appeal. It provides a structured framework to ensure your rights are protected and your case is fairly considered.

You have the right to appeal the decision within the specified timeframe outlined in the policy. The policy will provide guidance on the appropriate channels, procedures, and documentation required to initiate the appeals process. I strongly recommend reviewing it thoroughly to understand your options moving forward.

Please be aware that while the appeals process is underway, the academic misconduct charge and the "not competent" outcome in the unit will remain in effect. It is essential to address the situation promptly to prevent any further consequences that could impact your academic record.

If you have any questions or require further clarification regarding the appeals process, academic standing, or any other related matters, please do not hesitate to reach out to me. I am here to provide support and assist you throughout this challenging period.

Thank you for your attention to this matter, and I wish you the best in navigating the appeals process.

Sincerely,

[Your Name]

[Your Position], [Name of Institution]