



Australasian College
for Emergency Medicine

Academic Integrity Policy

P1029

September 2026 V1

[acem.org.au](https://www.acem.org.au)

Document Information

Timeframe for review:	Every five (5) years, or earlier if required.
Next major review to be completed by:	September 2031
Content owner:	Council of Education
Approval authority:	Council of Education
Accessibility:	Public (website)

Revision History

Version	Date	Pages revised / Brief Explanation of Revision
V1	Sep 2026	Approved by COE

Copyright

2026. Australasian College for Emergency Medicine. All rights reserved.

1 Purpose and background

This policy outlines the collective responsibilities of all members of the ACEM community to protect, practice and promote academic integrity in all College assessment and examination activities. This includes computer-based examinations, or any future delivery method. The policy details the actions to be taken should a breach in academic integrity be suspected or confirmed by any FACEM, trainee, SIMG, staff member, examination personnel or others involved in assessment across ACEM's training programs.

In line with the College's Core Values, a fundamental principle underpinning the education, training and assessment activities of the College is the expectation that all members of the College community demonstrate commitment to, and behaviour consistent with, high levels of academic integrity.

A breach in academic integrity a serious matter. The College will investigate alleged breaches in academic integrity and will take action where academic misconduct has occurred.

2 Terminology

ACEM/the College

means the Australasian College for Emergency Medicine.

College member

means a person admitted as a member of the College pursuant to the provisions of the ACEM Constitution and associated regulations.

Governing body

means the ACEM Board, the Council of Advocacy, Practice and Partnerships (CAPP), or the Council of Education (COE).

Trainee

means an individual enrolled in an ACEM training program.

Artificial intelligence

digital systems and tools capable of performing complex tasks that typically require human intelligence.

3 Academic integrity and misconduct

Academic integrity is the demonstration of honest, ethical and respectful behaviour in all College interactions, activities and assessments. A breach of academic integrity may constitute academic misconduct. Academic misconduct has occurred when behaviour or action, intentional or unintentional, breaches these principles of academic integrity. Academic misconduct refers to any action that gives a trainee an unfair advantage or undermines the integrity of assessment, learning or the College's processes. It includes dishonest, deceptive or unethical behaviour in a range of ACEM's assessment activities, including, but not limited to, the following.

3.1 Plagiarism

Plagiarism is the presentation of another's work as though it is one's own. All work submitted as a part of the requirements for any form of assessment, including logbooks, workplace-based assessments, examinations, training requirements and the research requirement, must be expressed in the individual's own words and incorporate their own knowledge, ideas and judgements. Self-plagiarism is the presentation of one's own previously submitted work as though it was new.

The College acknowledges that the majority of individuals exercise great care to acknowledge the sources of their work appropriately. Sources may include, but are not limited to, published articles, texts, clinical material, AI software systems such as ChatGPT and CoPilot, or the work of another person.

Direct quotes or extracts from a published or unpublished work of others or one's own must always be identified as such using standard quotation conventions, including quotation marks and italicised text. A full reference to the source must be provided in a standardised format. This also includes material taken directly

from AI software systems. A series of quotations from several different sources, if not clearly identified as such, constitutes plagiarism, as does a single unacknowledged long quotation from a single source.

3.2 Collusion

Collusion is the unauthorised collaboration on work intended to be completed individually, where the collaboration results in shared or substantially similar submitted work.

ACEM acknowledges and indeed encourages trainees to collaborate in their learning by studying together, sharing and clarifying understanding, practising examination-style questions together and/or reviewing each other's work at a high level. However, all assessment undertaken in any one of ACEM's Training Programs must be completed individually and be reflective of the trainee's own knowledge and skills.

3.3 Artificial Intelligence

The use of AI generated material for assessments can only be used when the work of other authors can be clearly identified and acknowledged. An acknowledgement of AI use must include the AI tool name, a description of its use (e.g., brainstorming, drafting, editing, formatting, translating), and a statement affirming that the submitted work has been reviewed by the user and the user takes responsibility for its content.

If a trainee submits AI generated material for an assessment as if it were their own, it is likely to be considered as evidence of academic misconduct.

Use of AI during examinations constitutes a breach of academic integrity, unless the use of AI is expressly permitted by the College.

3.4 Examinations

3.4.1 Academic misconduct in relation to ACEM Examinations includes, but is not limited to:

- a) conduct detrimental to other trainees and/or participants in the examination;
- b) gaining or attempting to gain an unfair advantage before, during or following the examination process.

3.4.2 Academic misconduct in relation to examinations includes, but is not limited to:

- a) Seeking, receiving, accessing, reproducing or circulating unauthorised material during the examination, for example, notes, textbooks, calculators, dictionaries, mobile phones, smartwatches or other similar electronic devices.
- b) Obtaining, receiving, exchanging or passing on examination-related content, or attempting to do so, by any means of communication.
- c) Attempting to solicit information on a forthcoming examination from any examination working group members, examiners, observers, invigilators, role players, or College/venue staff, or from candidates from an earlier examination.
- d) Attempting to gain an unfair advantage by copying the work or seeking the help of others.
- e) Failing to abide by the instructions of invigilators, examiners, observers, or College/venue staff in relation to the examination rules and regulations.
- f) Impersonating someone else with the sole purpose of attempting to sit an examination on behalf of another candidate or arranging for a third party to sit the examination on your behalf.
- g) Misuse of examination material, e.g., by passing or attempting to pass such material or content to a third party after the examination. This includes posting information about the content of an examination on the internet, social media, or any other method of information dissemination.
- h) Bribing or attempting to unduly influence an examination official or any other participant in the examination process.
- i) Taking a screenshot or screen recording of any examination material, sharing examination material, or sharing notes with other candidates in the case of online/computer-based assessments.
- j) Behaving in such a way as to be disruptive, abusive or undermine the integrity of an examination.

3.5 Workplace-Based Assessments and In-Training Assessments

Academic misconduct in relation to ACEM Workplace-based Assessments (WBAs) and In-Training Assessments (ITAs) includes, but is not limited to, the following:

- a) Falsification of WBA and ITA forms, or clinical documentation associated with these, including backdating forms or submitting assessments that did not actually occur.
- b) Misrepresentation of Assessors, including creating/altering signatures, fabricating or altering feedback or assessment outcomes, and altering assessor details to meet assessment requirements

3.6 Other breaches of academic integrity

Other breaches of academic integrity may constitute academic misconduct and will be considered by the College at its discretion.

4 Level of academic misconduct

Breaches of academic integrity will be categorised into one of two levels of misconduct.

4.1 Level 1 academic misconduct

Level 1 academic misconduct is a first breach of academic integrity by an individual where the breach is minor and/or unintended.

4.2 Level 2 academic misconduct

Level 2 academic misconduct is a breach in academic integrity by an individual where the breach is serious, is a second or subsequent breach and/or is intentional.

- A first offence that is serious and deemed intentional in nature can be treated as a Level 2 breach.
- A breach that cannot be clearly identified as either Level 1 or Level 2 can be categorised as a Level 2 breach.
- A breach that occurs during a Fellowship examination (either Written or OSCE) is categorised as a Level 2 breach.

5 Allegations and investigation of academic misconduct

5.1 Academic Integrity Officer

The Executive Director of Education and Training (ED E&T) is the designated Academic Integrity Officer (AIO) responsible for the investigation of alleged breaches of academic integrity.

When the ED E&T is unable to investigate breaches of academic integrity, the Chief Executive Officer (CEO) will assume the responsibility of AIO.

The Censor-in-Chief (CIC) and Deputy Censor-in-Chief (DCIC) will be consulted during investigations and be involved in decision-making.

5.2 Allegations, Notifications and Investigation of Academic Misconduct

- 5.2.1 Actual and potential breaches of academic integrity are to be reported to the ED E&T as soon as the breach is identified or suspected.
- 5.2.2 The ED E&T will document the alleged breach, including a summary of evidence supporting the allegation. The ED E&T, CEO, CIC and DCIC will jointly determine if the information available supports the allegation that a breach has potentially occurred, the level of the alleged academic misconduct, and decide on the actions to be taken by the College.
- a) Allegations identified as Level 1 academic misconduct will normally be managed by the ED E&T with a focus on correction/mediation and education. First instances of Level 1 academic misconduct do not usually result in a sanction.
 - b) Allegations identified as Level 2 academic misconduct will be subject to a detailed investigation to establish the circumstances of the alleged misconduct. At the conclusion of the investigation, the AIO will provide a full report detailing the findings of the investigation.
- 5.2.3 The individual who is alleged to have breached academic integrity will be informed of the allegation and the College process for managing such allegations. The individual will be given a *Notification of Alleged Academic Misconduct*, including a written description of the alleged breach and details of the evidence supporting the allegation. The individual will be invited to respond in writing within seven (7) days of the Notification being sent by the ED E&T. Where the allegation is investigated by the AIO, the individual will receive the full report at the conclusion of the investigation. The individual will be given fourteen (14) days to respond to the investigation report.
- 5.2.4 The College reserves the right to withhold assessment and examination results while investigations are ongoing. Depending on the outcome of the investigation, results may be released or permanently withheld. This applies to the results of one or more individuals involved in the academic breach.
- 5.2.5 The full *Alleged Academic Misconduct Investigation Report* will be provided at the conclusion of the investigation and will include a description of the alleged misconduct, summary of the evidence supporting the alleged misconduct, the nature, scope, extent and intention (deliberate/intentional) of the misconduct, any response received from the individual to the allegation and any past history of misconduct.

6 Outcomes of Academic Misconduct Investigations

- 6.1 After consideration by the ED E&T, CEO, CIC and DCIC of the *Alleged Academic Misconduct Investigation Report*, the finding may be that no academic misconduct has occurred. In this circumstance, no further action is required. The individual subject to the investigation will be given the investigation report and notified of the outcome in writing.
- 6.2 If the investigation findings substantiate the allegation(s) of academic misconduct, and in consideration of the response from the individual to the investigation findings, the ED E&T will take the following actions:
- a) Level 1 academic misconduct: The College will take educative and, when appropriate, corrective and/or remediation action.
 - i. The individual concerned will be supported in developing a better understanding and practical application of the behaviours associated with academic integrity.
 - ii. In the case of academic misconduct by trainees, an 'unsuccessful/fail' result will be recorded for the individual's assessment or examination and the assessment in question must be resubmitted or reassessed. A period of Additional Training Time may be required in order to complete the assessment. In the case of an examination, it will be recorded as an attempt contributing to the maximum possible attempts for that examination type. Wherever possible, resubmission or reassessment should be completed prior to the next progression milestone, or in the case of examinations, prior to the due date of the relevant Training Stage.
 - iii. In the case of academic misconduct by FACEMs, other consultants, examination personnel and College/venue staff, actions will include one or more of the following:
 - formal written warning
 - required training
 - performance review/notation

- removal from any position in the College, including removal from the DENT position or as a member of a COE entity
 - iv. A written response detailing the breach, action taken and warning that any further breach will be treated as a Level 2 academic misconduct with the associated penalties will be provided to the individual concerned.
- b) Level 2 academic misconduct: The College will take corrective action and/or remediation action to address the specifics of the breach, as deemed appropriate. When determining the response to the misconduct, consideration will be taken with respect, but not limited to, the extent, intent and context of the misconduct, any history of previous misconduct, and any mitigating factors/circumstances.
 - i. In the case of Level 2 academic misconduct by trainees, an 'unsuccessful/fail' result will be recorded for the individual's assessment or examination in question and in the case of an examination, it will be recorded as an attempt contributing to the maximum possible attempts for that examination type, and
 - The individual may be permitted to resubmit the corrected work or re-sit the examination, completed prior to the next progression milestone, or in the case of examinations, prior to the due date of the relevant Training Stage. A trainee may be awarded a 'pass' for the reassessment, or
 - Be referred to the Pathway to Fellowship Review Committee (PFRC) for consideration and recommendation to COE for removal from the FACEM Training Program (as applicable), or
 - Be referred to COE for removal from the relevant Associateship Training Program (as applicable), or
 - be immediately removed from the relevant training program and disqualified from re-entry.
 - ii. In the case of Level 2 academic misconduct by FACEMs, other consultants, examination personnel and College/venue staff, actions will include one or more of the following:
 - When observed during the conduct of an assessment, immediately relieve the person of their duties and arrange a replacement. In the case of standardised patients used in the examinations, these incidents will also be reported to the relevant employer.
 - Removal of the individual from their ACEM role (DEMT, LWBAC, Assessor, examiner), if applicable,
 - Removal of membership of any ACEM entities, if applicable,
 - In situations of deliberate and serious misconduct and/or repeated offences, the individual may have their membership with the College suspended or terminated, or in the case of College staff, have their employment terminated.
 - Will consider notification to AHPRA or MCNZ as appropriate
 - iii. A written response detailing the breach and action taken will be provided to the individual concerned.

7 Reconsideration, Review and Appeals

Applicants have the right to seek reconsideration, review and/or appeal of a decision pursuant to the College's Reconsideration, Review and Appeals Policy, and associated processes, as applicable. These processes are handled confidentially and are conducted in accordance with the principles of natural justice and procedural fairness. Additionally, they serve to provide a mechanism by which any individual who is dissatisfied with a College decision can seek redress without fear of reprisal.

8 Related Documents

Doc #	Document Name
	Regulations C, D, F, G
P809	Selection into the FACEM Training Program Policy
P142	Former Trainees Applying for Selection into the FACEM Training Program
P800	Former FEMTP, IEMTP and AEMTP Trainees Re-entering the FEMTP, IEMTP and AEMTP Training Programs Policy
P646	Trainee Agreement
P148	Trainee Enrolment Policy
TBC	Fellowship OSCE: Candidate confidentiality agreement
P235	Code of Conduct
P233	Examinations Conflict of Interest Policy
TBC	Procedures for the Recruitment, Training and Appraisal of Non-Examiner Personnel
P116	Examination Observers Policy
P355	Reconsideration, Review and Appeals Policy



Australasian College for Emergency Medicine

34 Jeffcott Street
West Melbourne VIC 3003
Australia
+61 3 9320 0444
admin@acem.org.au

acem.org.au