



POLICY NUMBER OLT 26/01

Academic Integrity Policy

Prepared by	OLT AI Taskforce
Approving Authority:	FNU Council
Date Approved:	
Date Revised:	N/A
Next Review:	Annually
Version Number:	01

1. Purpose

This policy sets out the principles, expectations, and responsibilities for maintaining and promoting academic honesty, trust, fairness, respect, and responsibility in all aspects of learning, teaching, and research at Fiji National University (FNU).

The policy aims to:

- Uphold FNU's commitment to high academic and ethical standards.
- Promote an educative and preventive approach to academic integrity.
- Define responsibilities of students, academic staff, and the University.
- Provide transparent and fair processes for addressing academic misconduct.

2. Scope

This policy applies to:

- All FNU students (undergraduate, postgraduate, and continuing education).
- All academic and professional staff involved in learning, teaching, assessment, or supervision.
- Partner institutions delivering FNU-accredited programs under third-party agreements.

This policy does not apply to professional training programs governed by external regulatory bodies, which may have their own integrity requirements.

3. Policy Principles

FNU is committed to fostering a culture of integrity across all academic activities. The following principles guide the policy:

- Honesty – Presenting one's own work truthfully and acknowledging the work of others.
- Fairness – Ensuring equal academic opportunities and impartial assessment.
- Respect – Valuing intellectual contributions of others.
- Responsibility – Taking ownership of one's learning and conduct.
- Trust – Building confidence in FNU's academic standards.
- Ethics- being professionally ethical in all aspects of academic practices, learning, writing, researching and teaching.

Academic integrity must be modelled by all staff and students through ethical and responsible scholarly practices.

4. Policy Standards

4.1 University Responsibilities

- Establish and maintain policies, procedures, and guidelines to support academic integrity.
- Ensure awareness through orientation, workshops, and online integrity modules.
- Support staff through professional development and access to detection tools (e.g., Turnitin, AI detection tools).
- Provide students with resources to develop academic writing, referencing, and research ethics.
- Maintain an Academic Integrity Register for recording and monitoring breaches.

4.2 Staff Responsibilities

- Educate students about academic integrity standards.
- Design authentic assessments that minimise risks of misconduct.
- Model ethical academic practices and maintain awareness of detection tools and methods.
- Report and investigate suspected breaches in accordance with FNU procedures.
- Participate in academic integrity training as required.

4.3 Student Responsibilities

- Complete required academic integrity training at the start of their program.
- Uphold honesty and fairness in all academic work.
- Seek clarification when unsure about academic requirements.
- Acknowledge all sources of information and ideas, including AI-generated content where permitted.
- Ensure all submitted work is their own unless group collaboration is explicitly authorised.
- Avoid sharing assessment materials or using unauthorised aids.
- Ethical in research referencing.

5. Addressing Academic Integrity Concerns

5.1 Academic Integrity Concerns

Minor issues, often arising from misunderstanding or inexperience, are treated as academic integrity concerns.

These are managed through educative interventions, such as additional academic skills support or mandatory workshops.

5.2 Academic Misconduct

Serious or repeated breaches constitute academic misconduct, defined as behaviour that intentionally or recklessly seeks an unfair academic advantage.

Examples include but are not limited to:

- Plagiarism
- Cheating in examinations or tests
- Collusion (unauthorised collaboration)
- Resubmission of previous work
- Contract cheating
- Data falsification or fraud
- Unauthorised/unethical use of artificial intelligence tools
- Unauthorised distribution of course materials

6. AI Assessment Guidelines & Processes

6.1 Assessment Categories

The assessment can include one of the following AI usage spectrums:

a) Restricted Use

Students are strictly prohibited from using generative artificial intelligence (AI) to generate any materials or content related to the assessment. The use of AI-generated content is not permitted and may be considered a breach of academic integrity. Please ensure that all work submitted is the result of your own human knowledge, skills, and efforts.

b) Selective Use Allowed

Students are permitted to use generative artificial intelligence (AI) for a selective part of the

assessment [Coordinators to indicate where and the extent]. To assist with maintaining academic integrity, you must appropriately acknowledge any use of generative AI in your work. Please include a [statement of acknowledgement/AI declaration] with your work, clearly indicating which AI tools were used and how they contributed to your assessment. Students may be required to document all the prompts and submit them with their assessments.

c) Unrestricted Use

Students are permitted to use generative artificial intelligence (AI) to assist them in any way within the bounds of academic integrity. You must appropriately acknowledge any use of generative AI in your work. Please include a [statement of acknowledgement/AI declaration] with your work, clearly indicating which AI tools were used and how they contribute to your assessment. Students may be required to document all the prompts and submit them with their assessments.

6.2 Designing of Assessments

a) Authentic and AI-Resilient Assessment Design

Assessments shall be designed to evaluate higher-order cognitive skills, including analysis, evaluation, and application, to ensure that student performance constitutes a valid and reliable measure of learning outcomes. Assessment tasks must be structured to minimise susceptibility to generic AI-generated responses and to require demonstration of genuine student understanding.

b) Process-Based and Verifiable Assessment

To safeguard academic integrity, major assessments shall incorporate verifiable components that capture the student learning process. Such components may include staged submissions, iterative development, and reflective elements, which collectively provide evidence of the student's reasoning, methodology, and individual contribution.

c) Contextualised and Applied Learning

Assessments shall, where appropriate, be grounded in real-world and context-specific applications, including local and Pacific contexts. Students shall be required to demonstrate achievement of learning outcomes through the application of theoretical knowledge to defined regional, institutional, or industry-related challenges.

d) Transparency and Ethical Use of AI in Assessment

A commitment to ethical academic conduct is upheld through the requirement for clear disclosure of AI tool usage, ensuring that any technological assistance is transparent and does not compromise the original intent or integrity of the assessment.

e) Diversified Assessment Methods

To mitigate risks of misconduct and ensure a comprehensive evaluation of student capability, programs shall utilize a balanced mix of assessment formats, including oral, written, and supervised tasks, to verify that learning outcomes are met across various dimensions of performance.

f) Interaction and Verification of Student Learning

The verification of authorship shall be achieved through direct academic engagement, such as oral questioning, presentations, or demonstrations, to confirm the student's genuine understanding and ownership of the submitted work.

g) Fairness, Equity, and Access

Equitable assessment practices are ensured through the provision of consistent guidance on AI use and transparent marking criteria, preventing disadvantage to students based on differential access to technological tools.

h) Assessment Quality, Validity, and Reliability

Academic standards are maintained through rigorous alignment between assessment tasks and learning outcomes, supported by periodic quality assurance reviews that verify the reliability and validity of student achievement data.

i) Continuous Improvement and Review

A proactive approach to quality assurance involves the regular review of assessment practices and misconduct trends to ensure that academic rigor remains effective and responsive to evolving technological landscapes.

j) Academic Integrity in the Use of AI

The principles of honesty and accountability are upheld by treating undisclosed AI generation or the fabrication of content as a formal breach of academic integrity, ensuring students remain strictly responsible for the authenticity of all work.

6.3 Marking and Grading of Assessments

a) Principles of Marking and Academic Judgement

Marking must be conducted with informed academic judgement to ensure that awarded grades accurately reflect the extent to which students have achieved learning outcomes, prioritizing evidence of understanding, reasoning, and application over mere fluency of output.

b) Criteria-Based and Transparent Marking

All assessments shall be evaluated using clearly defined rubrics and criteria that distinguish between surface-level responses and higher-order performance, ensuring that marking explicitly assesses the depth of understanding and critical analysis required by the learning outcomes.

c) Marking in the Context of AI Use

Where AI use is permitted, marking shall focus on the student's ability to critically engage with, verify, and add value to AI-generated content, ensuring that the final grade represents the student's own mastery of the learning outcomes rather than the technical quality of the AI output. Ensure that original sources of information are to be referenced and not the AI generated reference list only.

d) Verification of Authorship and Student Voice

The evaluation process shall prioritize the identification of a consistent 'student voice' and individual perspective, requiring markers to utilize viva voces or comparative analysis of previous work where necessary to verify that the student has personally met the learning outcomes.

e) Feedback and Learning Development

Markers shall provide constructive feedback that highlights the gap between current performance and the intended learning outcomes, offering guidance on how students can improve their critical thinking and ethical engagement with AI tools in future tasks.

f) Consistency and Moderation in Marking

To ensure fairness and reliability, faculties must implement robust moderation processes that verify the consistent application of marking standards across all student cohorts, confirming that learning outcomes are assessed with equal rigor regardless of the marker.

g) Evidence-Based Decisions on Potential Misconduct

Determinations regarding potential academic misconduct must be based on a holistic review of evidence—including professional academic judgement and contextual analysis—ensuring that AI detection tools are never used as the sole basis for grading or disciplinary referrals.

h) Fairness and Student Rights

The marking process shall protect the rights of students to a fair and transparent evaluation, ensuring that cases of suspected AI misuse are handled in accordance with University procedures and that marks are not arbitrarily reduced without documented evidence of a breach.

i) Integrity of High-Stakes Marking

For high priority assessments, the University requires rigorous verification of authorship and learning outcome attainment, utilizing diverse evidence and professional oversight to ensure the credibility of grades awarded in an AI-enabled environment.

j) Data-Informed Marking and Review

Marking outcomes and grade distributions shall be systematically analysed to support continuous improvement in assessment design, ensuring that patterns in student performance inform future strategies for aligning tasks with learning outcomes.

k) Staff Capability and Professional Responsibility

Academic staff shall be supported through specialized training to maintain capability in AI-aware marking practices, exercising professional responsibility to ensure that student achievement is accurately and credibly assessed against established benchmarks.

6.4 Disclosure of AI Use in the Submission of Assessments

The disclosure of AI tools by students can be done as follows:

- Always include an “AI declaration” with your submission stating which AI tools were used, their version/date, and a brief description of how they contributed (e.g., brainstorming, drafting, editing, code generation).
- Where AI was used for the content (text, code, data analysis, or images), add an inline note or a footnote at the relevant location: “Generated/assisted by [Tool name]

(version, date).”

For example: APA-style: OpenAI. (2024). ChatGPT (Mar 14 version) [Large language model]. <https://openai.com/chatgpt>.

- Attach/submit the exact prompts and the AI outputs you used (or a representative excerpt), with timestamps

6.5 AI Use in Academic Assessment Submissions – Detection and Suggested Consequences as a Guide

The extent of AI usage in academic assessment submissions, including the percentage of AI use and the applicable deductions or penalties for improper or excessive is defined in the table below as a guide:

AI Usage Percentage (%)	Description	Penalty
0% - 40%	Minimal AI assistance (e.g., grammar checks, citations, exact wording etc)	No penalty, to be assessed based on assessment guidelines.
41%- 75%	Moderate AI assistance (e.g., outlines, explanation of concepts, snippets etc)	To follow assessment guidelines and return for resubmission
76% and above	Heavy AI dependence (major content AI-generated)	Return for resubmission to follow guidelines and with assessment at 75% of the total mark.

NOTE:

The purpose of this guideline is to promote responsible and ethical use of Artificial Intelligence tools in learning, while ensuring academic integrity, fairness, transparency, and consistency in assessment practices.

This table has been developed through benchmarking of practices adopted by other higher education institutions and by considering currently available AI detection tools, particularly the AI detection indicator integrated within Turnitin, which is currently under evaluation.

This table is applicable to Turnitin integrated AI detection tool only, and the percentage ranges should be treated as indicative guidance rather than conclusive evidence of academic misconduct.

This table is intended to be applied to coursework and assessment tasks as a guideline only, and its implementation shall be at the full discretion of the teaching staff responsible for the course. Teaching staff may consider the nature of the assessment, learning outcomes, level of study, and evidence of student understanding before applying any penalty.

Teaching staff are required to carefully review the Turnitin AI detection report in detail, including checking the highlighted paragraphs, sentences, and matching text segments, before

making any decision. Staff must also verify which component or section of the student assessment has generated the higher AI percentage and confirm that the flagged content is part of the student's original work and not template text, references, questions, appendices, or provided materials, before applying this guideline.

The final judgement must not be based solely on the overall AI percentage generated by the system, but on academic evaluation and professional judgement after verifying the content and its relevance to the assessed component.

This table is applicable only when the AI percentage is generated using the Turnitin integrated AI detection tool and should not be applied to results produced by other external AI detection software unless officially approved.

Where penalties require resubmission or revision, the AI detection report can be generated and shared with the student, so that the student is aware of the highlighted sections and can make the necessary corrections before resubmitting the assessment. The decision to allow number of warning and resubmission per course shall be at the discretion of the teaching staff, taking into consideration the assessment requirements, severity of AI use, course regulations, nature of the assessment, frequency of occurrence, and the level of non-compliance with the AI usage guideline and within the assignment deadline.

7. Integrity Review and Investigation

- Integrity Review: Initial review by the academic staff or course coordinator to determine the nature of the concern.
- Formal Investigation: Conducted by the Student Academic Disciplinary Committee (SADC) for serious case.
- Outcomes: The SADC determines whether misconduct occurred and recommends appropriate outcomes, ranging from educative measures to disciplinary penalties (including suspension or exclusion in severe cases).

8. Recording, Reporting, and Confidentiality

- All cases are recorded in the Academic Integrity Register maintained by the Office of the Registrar.
- Data will be used to identify trends, improve training, and inform policy development.
- Student information will be handled in accordance with FNU's Privacy and Data Protection Policy.
- Reports on trends will be submitted to the Senate Academic Committee annually.

9. Appeals

Students may appeal the outcome of an academic integrity decision within 20 working days of notification on the following grounds:

- New or previously unavailable evidence.
- Procedural irregularity.

Appeals will be handled in accordance with the FNU Student Complaints and Appeals Policy.

10. Roles and Responsibilities

Role/Unit	Responsibility
Academic Board	Approval and oversight of the policy
Office of the Registrar	Management of academic integrity processes and records
Academic Integrity Committee (AIC)	Conduct formal investigations and determine outcomes
Deans/Heads of Colleges	Ensure faculty compliance and promote awareness
Teaching Staff	Educate, detect, and report academic integrity matters
Students	Comply with academic integrity principles and requirements

11. Definitions

- Academic Integrity: Commitment to honesty, fairness, trust, respect, and responsibility in learning and research.
- Academic Misconduct: Behaviour that breaches academic integrity standards and seeks unfair advantage.
- Plagiarism: Presenting another's work or ideas as one's own without proper attribution.
- Collusion: Unauthorised collaboration on individual work.
- Contract Cheating: Engaging a third party to complete academic work.
- Generative AI: Tools capable of producing new content (e.g., text, images, code) in response to user prompts.
- Academic Integrity Register: Confidential record of integrity-related cases and

outcomes.

12. FNU Related Documents

- Assessment Policy and Procedures
- Student Personal and academic Conduct and Grievance Policy
- Data Governance and Management Policy
- Code of Conduct Policy

13. Governance and Review

Responsible Office: Office of Learning & Teaching (OLT)

Accountable Officer: Pro-VC L&T

Approval Authority: FNU Council

Review Cycle: Annually

Date Launched: 17/04/26

Effective Date: TBD