

Academic Integrity Procedures

Policy Document number: AC-25/02B

1. Pūtake | Purpose

- 1.1. These procedures operationalise and should be read in conjunction with the Academic Integrity Policy, Te Kawa Maiororo, and the Academic Integrity Guidelines.

2. Ngā Hātepe | Procedures

2.1. Educating ākonga about academic integrity

1. Programmes are designed to give ākonga multiple opportunities to develop the knowledge and skills to maintain academic integrity. Ākonga have access to learning resources and support services to help them understand and apply principles of academic integrity.
2. To minimise academic integrity breaches, all kaimahi are expected to:
 - ensure they understand how to comply with Wintec's expectations for academic integrity.
 - ensure all non-original information, ideas, designs, and promotional and teaching materials fully acknowledge the original source using correct APA referencing when applicable.
 - model ethical behaviour, reflection, enquiry, and best academic practice.
 - communicate Wintec's expectations for academic integrity to ākonga.
3. In addition, all kaiako are expected to:
 - engage with resources for kaiako on how to maintain academic integrity.
 - provide ākonga with consistent, regular messages about academic integrity, what constitutes a breach, and the steps to take to support their learning and produce work that acknowledges all sources.
 - provide ākonga with feedback that supports an educative approach to maintaining academic integrity.
 - refer ākonga who need further academic support to academic learning advisors for academic writing support and their liaison librarian for referencing and research support.
 - act on suspected breaches when they are detected.
4. In addition, all programme leads, course coordinators, and/or kaiako are expected to:
 - ensure courses include learning activities and assessment that support an educative approach to maintaining academic integrity.
 - ensure the design of assessment tasks that are less likely to lead to breaches.
 - ensure that ākonga are provided with clear expectations for assessment, including parameters for the use of technology and/or AI tools, and the specific referencing requirements for the course.
 - ensure ākonga have access to similarity detection software (e.g., Turnitin) where appropriate.
 - follow the practices to maintain the integrity of examinations and tests stated in the Wintec Conduct of Tests and Examinations.
 - ensure all kaiako teaching or supervising ākonga in their programme and/or course are aware of the requirements of this procedure
 - ensure they are available to ākonga who are seeking support or advice about maintaining academic integrity.

2.2. Breaches of academic integrity

A breach of academic integrity occurs when a person seeks to gain for themselves, or to assist another person to gain, an academic advantage by deception or other unfair means.

Dishonest practice in assessment that breaches academic integrity includes but is not limited to misrepresentation of identity, plagiarism, unauthorised use of technology, including generative AI, cheating, fabrication, recycling, collusion, contract cheating, and unauthorised collaboration. Refer to the Wintec Academic Integrity Guidelines for expanded definitions and examples.

2.3. **Classifying breaches of academic integrity by level**

Wintec classifies breaches of academic integrity in three levels based on the type and severity of the breach and the apparent intent of the ākonga. The levels are intended to guide kaimahi in considering the approach to investigating a suspected breach or deciding the outcome for a proven breach to ensure it is appropriate to the identified level and consistent with similar breaches at the same level. Guidance in determining the level of breach, choosing an appropriate sanction, and managing the breach is provided in the Wintec Academic Integrity Guidelines.

1. **Level one breach**

A level one breach of academic integrity is a **minor** breach. It reflects no dishonest intent and is generally due to inexperience or a lack of knowledge of academic integrity principles and their application. A level one breach is not considered to be academic misconduct; however, repeated level one breaches may be classified as a level two breach.

2. **Level two breach**

A level two breach of academic integrity is a **moderate** breach. It may reflect dishonest intent or can't be explained by inexperience or a lack of knowledge of academic integrity principles and their application. A level two breach may or may not be treated as academic misconduct; however, repeated level two breaches are classified as a level three breach.

3. **Level three breach**

A level three breach of academic integrity is a **major** breach. A level 3 breach shows clear signs of dishonest intent and is treated as academic misconduct.

2.4. **Investigating a suspected breach of academic integrity**

The principles of natural justice apply to all investigations of suspected breaches and in all outcome decisions to ensure ākonga are treated fairly. If kaiako believe or are notified that there has been a breach of academic integrity, they must consult with the programme team lead.

1. Suspected **level one** breach of academic integrity

Suspected level one breaches are managed by the programme team lead and kaiako. The programme team lead and kaiako determine if there is sufficient evidence to confirm the level one breach. If there is insufficient evidence, no further action is taken.

If there is sufficient evidence to proceed, the ākonga is advised in writing within three working days of the breach being identified. The programme team lead or kaiako emails the ākonga to advise of the allegation and to set up a time to meet to discuss the matter and allow the ākonga to offer an explanation. This may be conducted by email if the ākonga chooses not to meet in person.

The programme team lead and kaiako decide on an appropriate outcome and response and the programme team lead advises the ākonga in writing of the outcome and response and, where appropriate, their right to appeal. The discussion and decision process is completed within ten working days of the ākonga being advised of the allegation. The programme team lead reports the breach, outcome, and response to the relevant Te Rōpū Āpiti Akoranga-a-Kura (TRĀAK) and ensures it is logged in the Wintec Academic Integrity Register.

2. Suspected **level two** breach of academic integrity

Suspected level two breaches are managed by the programme team lead. The programme team lead and kaiako determine if there is sufficient evidence to confirm the level two breach and proceed with an investigation. If there is insufficient evidence, no further action is taken.

If there is sufficient evidence to proceed, the ākonga is advised in writing within three working days of the breach being identified. The programme team lead advises the ākonga in writing of the allegation, the investigation, the timeframe, and their rights through the process. Level two breach investigations are undertaken by the programme team lead or a delegate.

Once the investigation is complete, the programme team lead with the kaiako decide on an appropriate outcome and response and the programme team lead notifies the ākonga in writing of the outcome and response and, where appropriate, their right to appeal the decision. The investigation, decision-making process, and notification to the ākonga is completed within ten working days of the ākonga being advised of the allegation. The programme team lead reports the breach, outcome, and response to the relevant TRĀAK and ensures it is logged in the Wintec Academic Integrity Register.

3. Suspected **level three** breach of academic integrity

Suspected level three breaches are managed by the relevant group director or the Faculty Office. The group director and programme team lead determine if there is sufficient evidence to confirm a level three breach and proceed with an investigation. If there is insufficient evidence, the Faculty Office is advised and no further action is taken, but a refresher on academic integrity should be provided to all ākonga.

If there is sufficient evidence to proceed, the group director and Faculty Office decide who will manage the breach and the ākonga is advised in writing by the breach manager (group director or Faculty Office) within three working days of the breach being identified. The breach manager advises the ākonga in writing of the allegation, the investigation, the timeframe, and their rights through the process, and appoints a delegate who is unconnected to the programme to undertake the investigation.

Once the investigation is complete, the breach manager decides on an appropriate outcome and response and notifies the ākonga in writing of the outcome and response and, where appropriate, their right to appeal the decision. The investigation, decision-making process, and notification to the ākonga is completed within ten working days of the ākonga being advised of the allegation.

The breach manager communicates the outcome and response to the group director and Faculty Office, and to the programme team lead and kaiako. The programme team lead reports the breach, outcome, and response to the relevant TRĀAK and ensures it is logged in the Wintec Academic Integrity Register.

2.5. **The investigation process**

If a suspected breach of academic integrity involves a research component such as a research project or dissertation or thesis, Wintec Research and Rangahau team should be consulted regarding the seriousness of the allegation and the appropriate process or responsibility for dealing with the matter.

If the suspected breach of academic integrity involves ākonga in contracted block teaching, the breach is managed in line with this procedures document in conjunction with the ākonga learning or training advisor.

Suspected breaches of academic integrity are investigated in a way that ensures:

- ākonga are provided enough details of the allegation to enable them to understand and properly consider it.
- ākonga have an opportunity to respond to the allegation, either in person or in writing, and are allowed enough time to do so.
- ākonga have the right to have a support person of their choice present with them at any meeting.
- the confidentiality of all parties is respected.

- a decision is made promptly and without bias.

The programme team lead ensures all documentary evidence is provided to the investigator as soon as the investigation is launched. All documentary evidence and written records of discussions are to be retained in the appropriate SharePoint file.

Investigations take into consideration any evidence relevant to the allegation, the level and extent of the breach, the experience level of the ākonga, any relevant past behaviours, and, where it can be determined, the intent of the ākonga.

The outcome for a suspected breach is:

1. **confirmed**, there is sufficient evidence that a breach has occurred, or
2. **no breach**, there is no or insufficient evidence that a breach has occurred.

2.6. Responses to confirmed breaches of academic integrity

Potential responses to **confirmed** breaches may be either in the form of an educative response or a sanction response depending on the level, severity, and/or recurrence of the breach.

1. Educative responses

Educative responses may be applied to Level 1 (**minor**) or Level 2 (**moderate**) breaches of academic integrity (e.g., poor citation or referencing, the use of sentences or short sections from a source rather than whole passages, collusion that is inadvertent, unknowing file sharing, etc.).

A decision to address a minor or moderate breach in an educative manner does not result in a finding of academic misconduct. The breach is recorded in the Wintec Academic Integrity Register and on the ākonga record but should not be recorded in either place as 'academic misconduct'.

Educative responses are non-punitive and should not include a deduction of marks beyond any marks assigned for referencing if that is the breach. Educative responses may include:

- Providing verbal or written feedback to the ākonga.
- Providing the opportunity to redo and resubmit the assessment.
- Deducting marks allocated for referencing, with explanation of the reasons.
- Referring the ākonga to learning support or library services.
- Providing the ākonga with examples of plagiarised and non-plagiarised texts to assist them in understanding the difference.

2. Sanction responses

A sanction response is appropriate for more serious breaches of academic integrity (Level 2, **moderate**, to Level 3, **major**) such as intentional plagiarism, contract cheating, intentional file sharing or collusion, bribery, fabrication, unauthorised use of technology, including gen AI, and test or exam cheating, or for any breach that is deemed to be academic misconduct.

A decision to apply a sanction response to a **moderate** breach does not automatically result in a finding of academic misconduct and, where it is not considered to be academic misconduct, it should not be recorded as such on the ākonga record or on the Wintec Academic Integrity Register.

A **major** breach is deemed academic misconduct and is recorded as such on the ākonga record and on the Wintec Academic Integrity Register.

Sanction responses may include:

- a written reprimand.
- requiring ākonga to repeat the assessment task or impacted part of the assessment task.
- a maximum mark of 50% for a repeated assessment task or impacted part of the assessment task.
- a reduction of marks or lowering of a grade for all or any part of the assessment task.

- recording a fail or zero mark or result for all or any part of the assessment task.
- requiring resubmission of one or more assessment tasks.
- requiring ākonga to undertake an alternative assessment.
- recording a fail or zero mark or result for the course.
- suspension from the course and/or programme, and/or Wintec for a specified period.
- exclusion from the programme or from Wintec.

A sanction response does not come into effect until the expiration of the appeal period as set out in the Ākonga Appeals Policy (seven working days from the date the ākonga is sent the decision) or, where an appeal has been made, until the appeal process has run its course.

3. Response decision-making matrix:

In deciding on the appropriate response to a confirmed breach, kaimahi will consider:

- other work that the ākonga has submitted.
- the nature and level of the breach.
- the extent of the breach.
- the experience level of the ākonga.
- any relevant past behaviour of the ākonga.
- where it can be determined, the intent of the ākonga.

A decision matrix in the Wintec Academic Integrity Guidelines provides examples regarding decision making for a sampling of academic integrity breach types.

Kaimahi should use judgement in assessing the appropriate mix of factors to consider in line with the guidance provided in the decision matrix. Decision-makers and available responses are indicated in the decision matrix, and it is essential that kaimahi do not apply a response that is excessive to the level or type of breach or that is outside of their authority.

A sanction response of suspension or exclusion can only be applied by the Faculty Office.

2.7. **Notice of decision to ākonga**

Ākonga are informed of the decision in writing within ten working days of the ākonga being advised of the allegation. Where a breach of academic integrity is confirmed, ākonga must also be informed of the educative or sanction response to be imposed, the reasons for the decision, including the findings on material facts, and their right to appeal in accordance with the Ākonga Appeals Policy and the timeframe in which an appeal may be made (i.e., seven working days from the date the ākonga is sent the breach decision).

2.8. **Recording academic integrity breaches**

The group director ensures a record of all breach of academic integrity matters is maintained and updated with all contacts from initial discussion through to outcome and, where appropriate, the educative or sanction response applied.

Confirmed breaches and outcomes are recorded in the ākonga account in Arion.

All breaches of academic integrity are logged in Wintec Academic Integrity Register on completion recording the details of the breach, the outcome, the response decision, and any actions taken.

When logging breaches of academic integrity in Wintec Academic Integrity Register:

- A '**confirmed breach**' decision includes the name and ID of the ākonga.
- A '**no breach**' decision is anonymous, i.e., does not include the name and ID of the ākonga.

2.9. **Monitoring and reporting academic integrity breaches**

The Quality and Academic Unit (QAU) is responsible for maintaining and monitoring the Wintec Academic Integrity Register, managing kaimahi access, and maintaining a record of approved users.

The Faculty Office, group directors, and kaimahi in learning and teaching leadership roles have access to ākonga academic integrity breach data to monitor and improve practices for educating ākonga about academic integrity and detecting and responding to suspected breaches.

To maintain ākonga confidentiality in accordance with Wintec’s Privacy Policy, reports that include ākonga academic integrity breach data will not include any ākonga identifying information. Additionally, breach data will not be reported for a cohort of ākonga if the number of ākonga in the cohort is small enough to make it likely that individuals could be identified.

QAU uses the Wintec Academic Integrity Register to report annually to Komiti Akoranga on academic integrity trends and ākonga and kaimahi uptake of academic integrity training and support.

3. Ngā Haepapa | Responsibilities

- 3.1. Refer to the Academic Integrity Policy for information on responsibilities relating to these procedures.

4. Ngā Whakamāramatanga | Definitions

- 4.1. Refer to the Academic Integrity Policy for definitions relating to these procedures and the Wintec Academic Integrity Guidelines for definitions and examples of different types of academic breaches.

5. Mokamoka whakaaetanga | Approval details

Title	Academic Integrity Procedures
Policy Document Number	AC-25/02B
Governing Policy	Academic Integrity Policy AC-25/02A
Category	Academic
Subcategory	AC: Academic Delivery
Approval Date	December 2025
Effective Date	January 2026
Review Date	October 2026
Policy Sponsor	Executive Director Academic Delivery
Policy Manager	Quality and Academic Unit
Approving Authority	Komiti Akoranga
Amendment History	Refer to the Academic Integrity Policy for amendment history.