THE INDEPENDENT INSTITUTE OF EDUCATION

PDIIE 023: INTELLECTUAL INTEGRITY CRITERIA, MINIMUM STANDARDS AND PROCEDURES

Principle 1: Intellectual Integrity is the Foundation of all Academic Work at The IIE
Intellectual Integrity Criteria:
1. Intellectual integrity in academic work is demonstrated when individuals act with honesty, trust, fairness, respect, responsibility, and courage; and when they uphold all ethical standards of The IIE.

Intellectual Integrity Minimum Standards	Intellectual Integrity Procedures
1.1 Individuals are expected to conform to all intellectual integrity rules.	1.1.1 Students are expected to familiarise themselves with all institutional information concerning intellectual integrity. 1.1.2 Academics are expected to familiarise themselves with all institutional information concerning intellectual integrity and to actively develop and manage the intellectual integrity practices of their students. 1.1.3 Researchers are expected to familiarise themselves with all institutional information concerning intellectual integrity and ethical research practice.
1.2 Individuals must present work that they have created.	1.2.1. Students must present their own work and acknowledge the ideas of others, including Generative Artificial Intelligence (GenAI), in response to assessment tasks. 1.2.2. Researchers must present their own work and acknowledge the ideas of others, including GenAI, in response to research tasks.
1.3 Intellectual integrity is based on a set of beliefs	1.3.1 Education means engaging with the ideas of others to develop one's own ideas. Failure to engage with the ideas of others means that educational opportunities are curtailed. 1.3.2 The academic project relies on credible sources of information. There are conventions and standards regarding what makes a source credible, most notably, review and acceptance by peers in the academic community.

		1.3.3	The academic project relies on methods of citing, or referencing, the work of others. These conventions are followed to share meaning and to be a part of a disciplinary community of practice.
		1.3.4	Intellectual integrity is a teaching and learning practice. This means that it is an ongoing collaborative project that requires reflection, discernment, and development.
		1.3.5	All students, lecturers, and researchers have a moral responsibility to act ethically and responsibly and uphold The IIE's vision of ethical practice.
1.4	Legitimate cooperation is not a breach of intellectual integrity.	1.4.1	Legitimate cooperation is writing, researching, or presenting joint work, discussing general concepts and themes, participating in discussions or collaborative groups, developing reading and writing skills with peers, and working collaboratively on a group assessment.
		1.4.2	Collaboration is not legitimate if it involves the mutual construction of responses to assessment tasks that require an individual response.
		1.4.3	Collaboration is not legitimate if it advantages an individual or group of individuals over another, and if the resulting work does not acknowledge the source of intellectual contribution.
1.5	Allowable assistance from a human is not a breach of intellectual integrity.	1.5.1	Students and researchers are expected to develop their writing skills as part of their learning. This development may be impeded using an editor.
		1.5.2	If an editor or proofreader is used, then they must be provided with and adhere to this Policy.
		1.5.3	An editor or proofreader should only be used to enhance clarity by addressing elements such as spelling, grammar, clarity, conciseness and formality of language, vocabulary, response structure, syntax, punctuation, voice, tone and minimising repetition and verbosity.
		1.5.4	Students and researchers must acknowledge assistance aligned with point 1.5.3. above in the preparation of work. Thus, acknowledgment must be made in writing on the front of the work submitted, and must include: a) The name of the person. b) A brief description of the nature of assistance.
1.6	Allowable assistance from enhancing software is not a breach of intellectual integrity	1.6.1	Students and researchers are expected to develop their writing skills as part of their learning. This learning includes the use of enhancing software.
		1.6.2	Enhancing software can be leveraged to improve the piece of work's spelling, grammar, clarity, conciseness and formality of language, vocabulary, response structure, syntax, punctuation, voice, tone, and minimising repetition and verbosity; managing references; or any other enhancement functionality of the software.

	1.6.3 Students and researchers are not required to disclose such assistance.
1.7 Individuals who work for or at The IIE are not permitted to engage in any practices that detract from the intellectual integrity of the institution.	1.7.1 These individuals are not permitted to inappropriately: 1.7.1.1 Access any assessment, learning, or research material. 1.7.1.2 Distribute any assessment, learning, or research material. 1.7.1.3 Alter any assessment marks. 1.7.2 Lecturers and supervisors are responsible for enabling and monitoring the ethical practices of their students.
1.8 Intellectual integrity must be upheld in any community engagement practices.	1.8.1 All community engagement initiatives must promote intellectual democracy and should not disregard or undermine existing and indigenous knowledge frameworks in communities. 1.8.2 Condescending and patronising attitudes, as well as any other form of abuse of power, must not be present in community engagement projects. 1.8.3 Any abuses of power must be reported. 1.8.4 Communities must not be subjected to poorly planned and below-standard community engagement initiatives.

Principle 2: The IIE has Zero Tolerance for Cheating
Intellectual Integrity Criteria:
2.   Cheating is academic dishonesty that involves pre-planned, intentional, and deliberate deception.

Intellectual Integrity Minimum Standards	Intellectual Integrity Procedures
2.1. Cheating in assessments is not tolerated.	2.1.1. Cheating in assessments is defined as any attempt to gain an unfair advantage in, or to minimise the quality of, an assessment. 2.1.2. Contract cheating, or engaging or enabling a third party or service to contribute to all or part of an assessment, is not permitted.
2.2. Collusion in assessments is not permitted.	2.2.1. Collusion comes in many forms and essentially includes offering or accepting a bribe or any other inducement to gain an unfair advantage.

Intellectual Integrity Minimum Standards	Intellectual Integrity Procedures
	2.2.2. Submitting work that is the same as, or substantially similar to, the work of another individual is not permitted. 2.2.3. Accepting assistance from another individual with the production of an assessment response is not permitted. 2.2.4. Inappropriately assisting (including sharing answers, providing drafts, or completed assessments) with another individual with the production of an assessment response is not permitted.

2.3.	Cheating before invigilated assessments is not permitted	2.3.1. Any attempt to obtain the assessment and/or the memorandum for an assessment before the scheduled date and time of that assessment is cheating. 2.3.2. Any attempt to share the assessment and/or the memorandum for an assessment before the scheduled date and time of that assessment is cheating.
2.4.	Cheating during invigilated assessments is not permitted	2.4.1. Engaging a third party to complete the assessment is not permitted. 2.4.2. Completing an assessment on behalf of another student is not permitted. 2.4.3. Students are not permitted to attempt to share or share their work with other students.
2.5.	Cheating during invigilated assessments completed in person is not permitted	2.5.1. Only material permitted to be used in an assessment may be taken into an assessment venue. 2.5.2. Students are not permitted to attempt to view the work of other students in an assessment venue. 2.5.3. Students are not permitted to attempt to allow other students to view their work in an assessment venue.
2.6.	Cheating during invigilated assessments completed online is not permitted.	2.6.1. Only course material permitted to be used in an assessment may be in the physical space used by the student. 2.6.2. Students must adhere to all proctoring requirements.
2.7.	Cheating is not permitted in non-invigilated assessments	2.7.1. In assessments that are not invigilated, cheating is defined as presenting work that is not their own as if it were their own. 2.7.2. Students are not permitted to upload assessment questions and/ or memoranda to any website or application (App). 2.7.3. Students are not permitted to download assessment answers from any website or app.

		2.7.4. Students are not permitted to share their assessment responses with any other student.
		2.7.5. Students are not permitted to copy the work of another student.
		2.7.6. Students are not permitted to complete an assessment on behalf of another student.
		2.7.7. Students are not permitted to co-create an assessment response requiring individual work.
		2.7.8. Students are not permitted to use GenAI in assessments in which the use of AI is not permitted.
2.8.	Cheating in research is not tolerated.	2.8.1. Fabrication, or the invention of data and results, is not permitted.
		2.8.2. Falsification, or manipulating, changing, or omitting data or results, is not permitted.
		2.8.3. Any falsification or fabrication of research will result in immediate dismissal and/or any other sanction determined by the offices of research and the registrar.
2.9.	There are standard disciplinary procedures for the management of cheating.	2.9.1. The standard disciplinary processes, as outlined in the Student Conduct and Discipline Policy (IIE015), must be adhered to.
		2.9.2. All decisions concerning cheating are made using the burden of proof that the alleging party must prove that, on the facts, the act is more likely to have occurred than not (balance of probabilities).
		2.9.3. All parties involved in investigations must be treated with respect, dignity, and impartiality.
		2.9.4. All investigations and investigating officers must have due regard to confidentiality throughout the process.
		2.9.5. The academic leader in a programme on a campus and/or the campus intellectual integrity office serves as the Investigating Officer in alleged cases of cheating.
2.10.	There are severe penalties for any individual who cheats.	2.10.1. Cheating is a violation of The IIE's ethical code, strategic intent; thus, the consequences of such behaviour are necessarily punitive.
		2.10.2. All instances of cheating must be recorded on the student information system (student) and staff management system (researchers, lecturers, administrative staff).
		2.10.3. Students found guilty of cheating may be suspended or expelled.
		2.10.4. Students found guilty of cheating will have this recorded on their academic transcripts.
		2.10.5. Staff found guilty of cheating will have their contracts terminated.
		2.10.6. The IIE reserves the right to divulge the cheating behaviour to any future employer of the staff member who is found guilty of cheating.

Principle 3: Plagiarism is a Major Breach of Intellectual Integrity[1]
Intellectual Integrity Criteria:
3. Plagiarism is the presentation of another individual's intellectual output as one's own intellectual output by presenting or reproducing it without the appropriate acknowledgment of the source of the intellectual output

Intellectual Integrity Minimum Standards	Intellectual Integrity Procedures
3.1. Plagiarism reflects a deficit in writing, coding and design skills	3.1.1. Students and academics who plagiarise have not developed the ability to analyse, interpret and evaluate information. 3.1.2. Students and researchers who plagiarise have not developed a personal academic writing or creative style. 3.1.3. Students and researchers who plagiarise have not developed an independent voice that presents information in an authentic and original way.
3.2. Plagiarism can take many forms	3.2.1. Intellectual output includes, but is not limited to, the words, phrases, clauses, paragraphs, longer extracts, ideas, concepts, data, code, digital images, printed images, oral presentations, music, videos, diagrams and designs. 3.2.2. Direct representation is the reproduction of another's intellectual output as one's own work/ intellectual output, by not correctly and appropriately acknowledging the source of the information. In this form of plagiarism, the same or similar ideas are presented without appropriate acknowledgement, and/or the order or form of the words is changed, but the original idea is retained, without correct and appropriate acknowledgement. 3.2.3. Close identification is paraphrasing or close borrowing of intellectual output without clearly acknowledging, by providing an accurate source reference and quotation marks, that the intellectual output was created by another individual. This form of plagiarism also includes direct extracts without the use of quotation marks and the correct and appropriate source of information.

---

[1] University of Johannesburg, (2021), Plagiarism Policy; University of Sydney (2022) Academic Integrity Policy.

Intellectual Integrity Minimum Standards	Intellectual Integrity Procedures
	3.2.4. Unacknowledged use of GenAI. The acknowledgement of GenAI includes acknowledging AI as the source of information in the piece of work, the inclusion of the details about GenAI platform on the reference list, and the AI log (including the human prompts and the AI output) included as an Annexure. 3.2.5. Presenting a source of information that is incorrect also constitutes plagiarism. 3.2.6. Self-plagiarism, or recycling, is the resubmission of assessment or research work that is the same, or substantially the same, as work previously submitted for the same or another module, or research publication. 3.2.7. The use of common language, or common knowledge in a particular discipline, does not constitute plagiarism. 3.2.8. The use of automated writing tools and enhancement software does not constitute plagiarism. Automated writing tools are digital tools that improve academic writing by checking spelling, grammar, phrasing, style, and clarity; and generating and formatting references, footnotes, and reference lists/ bibliographies. 3.2.9. The student or researcher's intention is not relevant in the determination of whether work is plagiarised.
3.3. Firstly, the management of plagiarism offenses considers the nature of the offence.	3.3.1. The nature of the offence falls into two categories, namely: a) Issues relating directly to the development of authorial voice. b) issues that violate the standards of academic honesty. 3.3.2. For written text, transgressions relating to the development of authorial voice include: a) Editing tools have been used in an attempt to rewrite the words of others, even if the correct source has been appropriately given. For example, the insertion of inappropriate synonyms. b) Superficial changes have been made to the words/ phrases/ clauses of others c) Less than 25% of the work is referenced. 3.3.3. For written text, except when required by the assessment task, transgressions relating to the violation of academic honesty include: a) 5% or more of the submission is direct quotes, even if referenced correctly. b) The use of a paraphrasing tool to compile the work c) Sources of information are incorrectly acknowledged. For example, largely unchanged material is lifted from a source, but the reference is incorrect

Intellectual Integrity Minimum Standards	Intellectual Integrity Procedures

	d) Less than 5% of the work is referenced.
	3.3.4. For code, transgression relating to the development of authorial voice includes:
	    a) Less than 20% of the code is unoriginal, even if it has been correctly attributed.
	    b) The application (for example, open-source coding) used when coding is not referenced.
	3.3.5. For code, transgression relating to the violation of academic honesty includes:
	    a) The code is entirely unoriginal and has been correctly attributed to the source.
	    b) The code is entirely unoriginal and has been incorrectly attributed to the source.
	3.3.6. For images, transgression relating to the development of authorial voice includes:
	    a) An unoriginal image has been used, even if it has been correctly attributed to the source.
	3.3.7. For images, transgressions relating to the violation of academic honesty include:
	    a) An unoriginal image has been used and not referenced.
	    b) An unoriginal image has been used and has been incorrectly attributed.
	
	3.3.8. For unacknowledged GenAI use, transgressions relating to the development of authorial voice include:
	    a) GenAI has been used to generate or substantially rewrite portions of text, code, images, designs, or other content, and while the use of GenAI is disclosed and fully acknowledged in accordance with institutional requirements (in-text acknowledgement, reference list entry, and complete AI log provided as an Annexure), the submitted work nevertheless contains extensive GenAI-produced material that limits the demonstration of the student's independent analysis, original expression, or personal academic voice
	
	3.3.9. For unacknowledged GenAI use, transgressions relating to the violation of academic honesty include:
	    a) Any use of GenAI output (text, code, images, designs, data, or other intellectual content) that is not fully and correctly acknowledged by (i) clear in-text indication that the material was generated by GenAI, (ii) inclusion of the specific GenAI platform in the reference list, and (iii)submission of a complete AI log (containing all human prompts and corresponding GenAI outputs) as an Annexure.
	    b) Partial, incomplete, or misleading disclosure of GenAI use. For example, only) mentioning AI was used but omitting the required AI log, falsifying prompts, or failing to identify which specific sections were GenAI-produced.

Intellectual Integrity Minimum Standards	Intellectual Integrity Procedures

3.4. Secondly, the management of plagiarism considers the circumstances of the transgressor.	3.4.1. Both mitigating and aggravating circumstances are considered.
	3.4.2. Mitigating circumstances include:
	   a) Length of time in higher education study - students in the first semester of the first year of study are to be provided with developmental, and not punitive consequences.
	   b) Length of time in higher education study – postgraduate students who are returning to study after an absence of three years or more be provided with developmental opportunities.
	   c) Students from other institutions are to be provided with developmental opportunities
	   d) The institution's failure to flag previous instances of plagiarism is not a mitigating circumstance.
	3.4.3. Aggravating circumstances include:
	   a) Length of time in higher education study – students in their second, third, and then fourth (and so on) years should have more familiarity with intellectual integrity conventions.
	   b) Previous plagiarism and cheating transgression(s).
	   c) failure to complete the online plagiarism SLP/ any online developmental opportunities.

3.5. Thirdly, the level of the transgression is determined.	3.5.1. The level of transgression is determined by an analysis of the nature of the transgression and the circumstances of the transgressor. 3.5.2. There are three levels of transgression, which are distinguished by the nature of the remediation and the penalty for the transgression.
3.6. There are standard procedures for the management of plagiarism	3.6.1. All decisions concerning plagiarism are made using the burden of proof that the alleging party must prove that on the facts, the act is more likely to have occurred than not (balance of probabilities). 3.6.2. All parties involved in investigations must be treated with respect, dignity, and impartiality. 3.6.3. All investigations and investigating officers must have due regard for confidentiality throughout the process. 3.6.4. Lecturers and supervisors are responsible for the identification of all plagiarism transgressions. 3.6.5. Lecturers and supervisors are expected to present reports from anti-plagiarism detection software, or any other available and relevant evidence of the transgression. 3.6.6. Students are expected to present all actual sources of evidence, drafts of submitted work and explain their process of assessment construction to refute the allegation. 3.6.7. Should students introduce previous instances of plagiarism that were undetected, then the institution reserves the right to investigate these and use this evidence in the determination of the circumstances in

Intellectual Integrity Minimum Standards	Intellectual Integrity Procedures
	the current plagiarism transgression. Depending on the circumstances, previously published marks may be changed. 3.6.8. The academic leader in a programme on a campus and/or the campus intellectual integrity office is responsible for the determination of the circumstances of the transgressor, with support from the lecturer/supervisor. 4. The academic leader in a programme on a campus and/or the campus intellectual integrity officer is responsible for the determination of the level of the plagiarism offense, with support from the lecturer/supervisor.
3.7. Level 1 plagiarism is developmental in nature.	3.7.1. The remediation for level 1 plagiarism is: (a) Students are given an opportunity to resubmit the plagiarised assessment. (b) Before resubmission, the student must consult with a relevant academic. For example, the lecturer/information specialist/ teaching and learning specialist. (c) This consultation must include a discussion of reports generated by anti-plagiarism detection software and any other evidence deemed relevant by the relevant academic. (d) The resubmission may be reworked, but no new content may be added. (e) The student has 5 working days from the time of notification of the offense to resubmit the work. No late submissions will be accepted. (f) The resubmission must include the reworked assessment, original submission, evidence of consultation, and all reports from the anti-plagiarism detection software. (g) Students must complete the online plagiarism SLP, which does not have to occur before resubmission. 3.7.2. The penalties for level 1 plagiarism are: (a) Failure to resubmit within five working days will incur a mark of 0% for that assessment. (b) Resubmitted work that still has plagiarised sections will be given a mark of 0%. (c) There will be no penalty if a student resubmits all work on time and the work is not plagiarised. 3.7.3. It is incumbent on the student to understand that the plagiarism offence will have a direct effect on module marks and consequent progression. 3.7.4. Level 1 plagiarism must be recorded on the student information system on the student's record.

Intellectual Integrity Minimum Standards	Intellectual Integrity Procedures
3.8. Level 2 plagiarism is a balance between remediation and consequences.	3.8.1. The remediation for level 2 plagiarism is: a) Students are given an opportunity to resubmit the plagiarised assessment. b) Before resubmission, the student must consult with a relevant academic. For example, the lecturer/supervisor/information specialists/teaching and learning specialist. c) This consultation must include a discussion of reports generated by anti-plagiarism detection software and any other evidence deemed relevant by the relevant academic. d) The resubmission may be reworked, but no new content may be added. e) The student has 5 working days from the time of identification to resubmit the work. No late submissions will be accepted. f) The resubmission must include the reworked assessment, original submission, evidence of consultation, and all reports from the anti-plagiarism detection software. g) Students must complete the online plagiarism SLP, which does not have to occur before resubmission. 3.8.2. The penalties for level 2 plagiarism are: a) Failure to resubmit within five working days will incur a mark of 0% for that assessment. b) Resubmitted work that still has plagiarised sections will be given a mark of 0%. c) The resubmission mark is capped at 50%. 3.8.3. It is incumbent on the student to understand that the plagiarism offence will have a direct effect on module marks and/or consequent progression. 3.8.4. Level 2 plagiarism must be recorded on the student information system on the student's record.
3.9. Level 3 plagiarism is a serious offence	3.9.1. There is no remediation for level 3 plagiarism offences. 3.9.2. The student is expected to present all sources of evidence, all drafts of submitted work and explain the process of how the piece of work was created. 3.9.3. The campus representative must review all evidence used to determine (i) the nature of the offence, (ii) the circumstances of the offence. 3.9.4. If the student admits guilt or is found guilty, the penalties for level 3 plagiarism are: a) First Offence (Level 3 Plagiarism): First Written warning and 0% for the assessment. b) Second Offence (Level 3 Plagiarism): Second Written warning and failure of the module. c) Third Offence (Level 3 Plagiarism): Final Written warning and exclusion from a course.

Intellectual Integrity Minimum Standards	Intellectual Integrity Procedures
	3.9.5. It is incumbent on the student to understand that the plagiarism offence will have a direct effect on module marks and/or consequent progression.
	3.9.6. Level 3 plagiarism must be recorded on the student information system on the student's record.

Principle 4: The Acknowledgment of Sources of Information is Consistent and Congruent	
Intellectual Integrity Criteria:	
4. Weak referencing practice (an attempt to reference that is not technically correct) is not plagiarism but does demonstrate that an author has failed to master the skills required.	

Intellectual Integrity Minimum Standards	Intellectual Integrity Procedures
4.1. There are two components to correct referencing	4.1.1. Consistency is the use of the same referencing format (either The IIE Harvard, APA, IIELaw Referencing Guide, or IEEE) for all in-text references, footnotes, and in the bibliography/reference list. If the correct referencing guide does not include details about how to reference AI sources, then The IIE Harvard must be used, and this will not be considered inconsistency. 4.1.2. Congruence is the alignment between in-text references, footnotes and those included in the bibliography/reference list, i.e., all sources are accurately reflected in the bibliography/reference list.
4.2. There are mechanisms to manage the correctness of referencing in assessments	4.2.1. Students are encouraged to leverage referencing support provided in Word software to manage the correctness of referencing. 4.2.2. Weak referencing is handled through the referencing rubric, which is attached to all relevant assessments. 4.2.3. Referencing skills must not be included in assessment memos and rubrics as it is unfair to penalise a student twice for the same type of error. 4.2.4. The penalty for incorrect referencing practice is either 5% or 10%, depending on the nature and scale of the errors made. 4.2.5. Weak referencing is managed in all relevant assessments, including plagiarism resubmissions.
4.3. There are mechanisms to manage the correctness of referencing in research	4.3.1. All researchers are expected to have mastered the correctness of referencing sources of information in their disciplines. 4.3.2. Postgraduate research projects must conform to accepted referencing conventions. 4.3.3. Researchers are expected to conform to all the referencing requirements of their publishers. 4.3.4. Researchers are encouraged to leverage referencing software to manage the correctness of referencing.

Principle 5: All stakeholders have responsibilities to uphold intellectual integrity

Intellectual Integrity Criteria:

5. Students, academics, sites of delivery, support staff, and the Office of the Registrar have responsibilities in ensuring that The IIE is characterised by intellectual integrity.

Intellectual Integrity Minimum Standards	Intellectual Integrity Procedures
5.1. Students have intellectual integrity responsibilities	5.1.1. Students are required to act in ways that demonstrate intellectual integrity. 5.1.2. Students must provide all relevant information to the institution as requested, or if they are aware of the breaches of intellectual integrity of others. 5.1.3. Students must meet all the intellectual integrity requirements of all assessments. 5.1.4. Students must submit all relevant assessments through similarity detection software. 5.1.5. Students must be able to provide the sources that were used to construct all assessment submissions. If students are unable to produce these sources and drafts, then it is assumed that the student has breached intellectual integrity. 5.1.6. Students must be able to produce all copies and drafts of assessments that have been submitted.
5.2. Academics have intellectual integrity responsibilities.	5.2.1. Academics are expected to model intellectual integrity and respect for the intellectual output of others. 5.2.2. Academics must appropriately acknowledge and reference the work that they have consulted in their intellectual and creative output. 5.2.3. Academics are expected to acknowledge and reference the work that they have consulted in all their teaching materials correctly and appropriately. 5.2.4. Academics are expected to actively develop the intellectual integrity skills of their students. 5.2.5. Academics are expected to actively promote ethical and effective use of AI in academic work where relevant. 5.2.6. Lecturers must monitor and sanction any transgressions in intellectual integrity. 5.2.7. Lecturers must thoroughly review all scores and reports provided by similarity detection software. 5.2.8. The maintenance and development of ethical standards require that lecturers demonstrate discernment, reflect on their own subjective understandings of intellectual integrity, and understand the nuances involved in breaches of intellectual integrity all within the context of the institutional policies and norms.

Intellectual Integrity Minimum Standards	Intellectual Integrity Procedures
5.3. Researchers have intellectual integrity responsibilities	5.3.1. Researchers are expected to model intellectual integrity and respect for the intellectual output of others. 5.3.2. Researchers are expected to appropriately acknowledge and reference the work that they have consulted in their intellectual and creative output.
5.4. Support staff have intellectual integrity responsibilities.	5.4.1. All support staff (including information specialists, programme managers, teaching and learning specialists and administrators) have the responsibility to model intellectual integrity, respect for the intellectual output of others, and maintain high ethical standards on the site of delivery. 5.4.2. Information specialists have the responsibility to actively develop the intellectual integrity skills of students. 5.4.3. Administrators have the responsibility to behave ethically when entering, managing and publishing student marks, learning materials, and assessments.
5.5. National Offices and sites of delivery have intellectual integrity responsibilities	5.5.1. National Offices and sites of delivery must respect the intellectual output of others. 5.5.2. National offices and sites of delivery must promote and maintain high ethical standards. 5.5.3. National offices and sites of delivery are responsible for the appropriate implementation of this policy. 5.5.4. National Offices are responsible for the equitable implementation of this policy across sites of delivery. 5.5.5. Academic Heads on campuses must ensure that those responsible for academic development and the management of programmes develop the intellectual integrity skills of the students and lecturers on their campuses and in their programmes. 5.5.6. Academic Heads on campuses must ensure that regular and relevant intellectual integrity training is provided to students, lecturers, support staff, and researchers. 5.5.7. Intellectual integrity training is iteratively developed so that the learnings from the previous cycles of training can be incorporated into future training.
5.6. The CAT has intellectual integrity responsibilities	5.6.1. All academics and support staff are expected to model intellectual integrity and respect for the intellectual output of others. 5.6.2. Academics are expected to acknowledge and reference the work that they have consulted in all their instructional materials correctly and appropriately. 5.6.3. Academics are expected to design learning materials and assessments that promote the development of intellectual integrity.

Intellectual Integrity Minimum Standards	Intellectual Integrity Procedures
	5.6.4. Academics are expected to actively leverage the ethical and effective use of AI in academic work. 5.6.5. Academics and support staff have the responsibility to maintain high ethical standards. 5.6.6. The Office of the Registrar is expected to model intellectual integrity, respect for the intellectual output of others, and ensure that The IIE is characterised by intellectual integrity and that a high ethical standard is maintained.

Annexure A: Academic Honesty Declaration

I declare that I have conformed to all IIE policies, and assessment rules and have not engaged in any academically dishonest behaviour.

Online non-invigilated assessments (LMS submission): tick box
Online invigilated assessments: tick box
Hardcopy invigilated assessments: signature
Hardcopy non-invigilated assessments: signature