



FACT ADELAIDE • STUDENT POLICY

Assessment Integrity and Cheating Policy

Authentic work and fair assessment decisions

FACT-POL-04 | Source revision 2026.1-D01

Proposed effective date: 1 October 2026

Next review: 1 October 2027

Policy owner: Allan Bartlett, Course Director

DRAFT — WORDING REVIEW, FORMAL APPROVAL
AND PUBLICATION PENDING

PDF export cover added 6 September 2026.
Source Word draft D01 and policy wording unchanged.

info@factadelaide.com | (08) 7226 5936

Assessment Integrity and Cheating Policy

Authentic work, fair investigation and defensible assessment decisions

FACT-POL-04 / 2026.1-D01 • Prepared 6 September 2026

Draft for management review — not approved or published

Owner / proposed approver: Allan Bartlett / FACT management

Proposed effective: 1 October 2026 | Next review: 1 October 2027

1. Purpose and expectations

This policy protects the authenticity of assessment at FACT. It applies to written, oral, practical, online, workplace and recognition-of-prior-learning evidence. Read it with POL-11 Assessment, POL-05 Behaviour and POL-07 Appeals. Students must demonstrate their own required skills and knowledge.

Before assessment, the assessor explains permitted resources, collaboration, reference requirements, assistance and technology. Practice and research may be supported; assessment conditions may be more restrictive. Staff must not supply answers or record competency that the evidence does not support.

2. Examples of prohibited conduct

Prohibited conduct includes submitting another person's work as one's own, copying answers, impersonation, contract cheating, falsified records or signatures, sharing confidential assessment answers and using unapproved assistance. Deliberately disguising AI-generated answers as a student's own evidence is also prohibited where the assessment requires unaided or original work.

Permitted accessibility tools, approved interpreters, properly referenced research and authorised collaboration are not automatically cheating. Their use must follow the task's rules and still allow the assessor to judge the student's own competency. Clarify an unclear instruction before treating a misunderstanding as deliberate misconduct.

3. Raising and preserving a concern

A trainer who suspects compromised evidence may pause the affected assessment, protect safety and preserve the relevant work, instructions and observations. Tell management promptly and record what was observed without labelling an allegation as proven.

Use proportionate checks such as asking the student to explain their answer, demonstrate a skill or provide the original work. Do not rely on an automated similarity or AI-detection score alone. Keep evidence securely and do not upload identifiable student work into an unapproved public AI service.

4. Fair investigation

An appropriately impartial person explains the concern, evidence and possible outcomes to the student and provides a reasonable opportunity to respond, with support or an interpreter where appropriate. The proposed normal response period is five business days, with fair extensions and an earlier supported discussion for short courses.

Consider the instructions given, approved adjustments, language barriers, reliability of evidence, intent, severity and previous substantiated incidents. A trainer involved in the allegation should not be the sole reviewer of a contested disciplinary decision. Record the findings and distinguish established facts from remaining uncertainty.

5. Assessment and disciplinary outcomes

Where authenticity is not established, do not award competency for the affected evidence. Explain the evidence gap, feedback, required learning and an appropriate reassessment route under POL-11. A supported reassessment may be a suitable response to misunderstanding; serious or repeated deliberate conduct may justify proportionate disciplinary action.

No automatic full-course rebooking fee, permanent exclusion or loss of already validly earned units follows from an allegation. Any exclusion must be justified and reviewed under POL-05; fees and refunds follow accepted terms and POL-03/POL-13. The assessor, not an administrative penalty, determines competency.

6. Decision, appeal and prevention

Give the student a written outcome identifying the evidence considered, reasons, affected assessments, any conditions or fees and appeal options. An appeal does not require new evidence. Preserve the original and revised evidence and review record under POL-15.

Management reviews incidents for unclear instructions, exposed answers, authentication weaknesses or support gaps. Update tools, staff training and assessment controls. Educational materials must be used under appropriate licences or permissions; this policy does not create a copyright permission.

Management review and release record

Internal appendix — do not publish this page as student-facing policy. Proposed procedures below are not evidence that staffing, contracts, controls or fees have been implemented.

What changed

- Replaces automatic expulsion/full-fee rebooking with evidence, a response opportunity and proportionate outcomes.
- Separates a competency decision from a conduct sanction.
- Adds clear boundaries for AI, accessibility technology and approved assistance.

Decisions and checks before release

- Approve the normal five-business-day response opportunity and impartial investigator arrangements.
- Confirm assessment instructions specify permitted AI, reference tools and collaboration.
- Align reassessment entitlements and any fees with POL-11 and the student's accepted booking terms.

Confirm the legal contracting entity and contact aliases, align linked documents and operational messages, brief staff, and record formal approval and publication separately in FACT-REG-01. Existing bookings retain their accepted terms and legal rights.

Source and amendment record

Uploaded / business source: P04: Cheating Policy.pdf; D03: Cheating Policy 2023.docx; related LLN/Assessment, Behaviour and Appeals sources.

A013 | 6 September 2026 | FACT-POL-04, initial renewed draft. AI-assisted rewrite; management approval, implementation and public release pending.

Approver / date: _____ Actual publication: _____

Current external sources checked 6 September 2026:

[ASQA-assess | ASQA — Assessment, Standards 1.3–1.5](#)

[ASQA-complaints | ASQA — Feedback, complaints and appeals](#)

[OAIC | OAIC — Australian Privacy Principles](#)

These drafts are for review, not legal sign-off or a finding of operational compliance. Recheck relevant requirements before the proposed October release.