SOUTHERN ACADEMY OF HIGHER EDUCATION

Southern Academy Of Higher Education (SAHE)

Assessment Policy and Procedure (Effective Date: 7 August 2026)

Table of Contents

Table of Contents 1
1. Policy Statement 3
2. Scope 3
3. Policy Principles 3
4. Assessment Design 4
5. Submission of Assessments 5
6. Examinations 6
7. Assessment Moderation 7
8. Grading and Results 9
9. Publication of Results 10
10. Academic Integrity 10
11. Record Keeping 11
12. Review of Assessment Grades 11
13. Appeals 11
14. Policy Implementation and Monitoring 11
Version Control 12
Version History 12
Appendix A: Academic Integrity Procedure 13
A.1 Purpose and Background 13
A.2 Definitions 13
A.3 Responsive Regulation 13
A.4 Culture and Foundation — Prevention 13
A.5 Detection and Early Intervention 14
A.6 Investigation 14
A.7 Determination and Outcomes 14
A.8 Support, Education and Continuous Improvement 15
A.9 Responsible AI Use — Guidance for Students 15
A.10 References 15

1. Policy Statement

The Assessment Policy and Procedure is an essential and integral part of the Southern Academy of Higher Education's (SAHE's) teaching and learning framework. Assessment content and management strongly influence what and how students learn in their chosen courses. Authentic, valid and reliable assessment is the primary method by which SAHE validates the quality and extent of student achievement of the learning outcomes of a unit, course and qualification.

1.1 Regulatory Context

SAHE designs, administers, moderates and reviews assessment in accordance with the Higher Education Standards Framework (Threshold Standards) 2021 (HESF), in particular Standard 1.3 (Orientation and Progression), Standard 1.4 (Learning Outcomes and Assessment) and Standards 5.2 and 5.3 (Institutional Quality Assurance), and taking into account the Higher Education Standards Framework Amendment (Threshold Standards) Instrument 2026. SAHE also has regard to the Australian Qualifications Framework (AQF) in setting the standard of achievement associated with each award grade.

SAHE complies with the ESOS Act 2000 and the National Code of Practice for Providers of Education and Training to Overseas Students 2018 (National Code 2018), which require overseas students to make satisfactory course progress and maintain attendance as a condition of their student visa. SAHE monitors overseas students' course progress and attendance to identify and support students assessed as being 'at risk' of not meeting course progress or attendance requirements and will only extend the duration of an overseas student's enrolment in the circumstances, and subject to the visa impact advice.

2. Scope

This Policy applies to all students and staff of SAHE, and to every unit of study and course offered by SAHE. It governs the design, weighting, submission, marking, moderation, grading, feedback, publication and review of all forms of assessment, including examinations, and the maintenance of academic integrity in assessment.

3. Policy Principles

This Policy is designed to validly and reliably determine student progress within and between units of study and, in the case of formative assessment, to provide students with timely feedback that assists their achievement of learning outcomes, in accordance with the HESF and the Australian Qualifications Framework.

The aims of SAHE's assessment methodology are that assessment:

- is authentic, addresses diverse student needs, and prepares students for a wide range of organisational settings;
- is designed and mapped so that grades awarded validly and reliably reflect the level of student attainment of the specified learning outcomes, consistent with HESF Standard 1.4;
- assesses the needs and preparedness of individual students and cohorts, including through early formative assessment that identifies students at risk of unsatisfactory progress, consistent with HESF Standard 1.3;
- provides direct, insightful and timely feedback that enhances and facilitates subsequent learning;
- is reviewed, remarked and moderated in a fair, transparent, equitable and timely manner;

- provides access to informed advice and timely referral to academic or other support;
- incorporates feedback from students, where applicable, into teaching and learning strategies and future assessments;
- is subject to moderation, at both the design and marking stages, to ensure consistency of standards between assessors, cohorts and offerings, and to provide the evidence of validity and reliability that SAHE must be able to demonstrate under HESF Standard 1.4; and
- is conducted, and academic integrity is maintained, in accordance with the Academic Integrity Procedure (Appendix A).

4. Assessment Design

4.1 Assessment Types

Assessment is the formal means by which SAHE validates student learning processes and outcomes. It generally comprises formative and summative assessment, which may draw on a variety of methods and tools, including essays, tests, quizzes, reports, practical work and examinations.

a. Formative assessment provides early and progressive feedback to students. It helps students identify their academic strengths and weaknesses, target areas for development, and build self-assessment strategies. Early formative assessment (normally in weeks 3–5 of each unit, across all levels of study) is used to identify and support 'at-risk' students throughout their course of study.

b. Summative assessment is a formal, highly structured process that evaluates achievement against a set standard, and is used to assess student learning, skill acquisition and academic achievement at the end of a topic, project, unit, course or study period.

4.2 Assessment Aims

Assessment tasks are aligned with the teaching and learning outcomes of the unit and course. SAHE's assessments across units within a course are mapped, aligned and scaffolded to:

- ensure students have the opportunity to achieve the learning outcomes of the course;
- ensure consistency in SAHE's expectation of workload across courses;
- spread assessment load and intensity across the study period;
- provide different types of assessment for the overall development of knowledge and skills; and
- develop, support and monitor students' readiness to undertake more advanced course requirements and practice-based learning activities.

4.3 Assessment Task Guidelines

Course Directors will ensure that Unit Outlines are provided before the commencement of the study period. In relation to assessment, Unit Outlines will include, but are not limited to:

- specific details of each assessment task in the unit;
- the percentage weighting of the task as part of the final grade;
- the related unit learning outcomes addressed by the assessment; and
- the due date for submission of each assessment task.

4.4 Weighting of Assessment Tasks

a. Each unit will include more than one assessment task contributing to the final mark and grade. A specific percentage weighting must be nominated for each task (for example, 25% of the final grade). The maximum weighting for any one assessment task will not exceed 50%.

b. Where specified in the Unit Outline, particular assessment tasks must be passed to attain an overall pass grade for the unit, irrespective of the total weighted mark achieved.

c. The Unit Coordinator must liaise with the Course Director to revise or amend assessment weighting.

5. Submission of Assessments

5.1 Submission Requirements

Written assessments will be submitted through the Learning Management System (LMS). Instructions for submission will be included in the Unit Outline.

5.2 Text-Matching and Similarity Checking

All written assessments will be analysed by text-matching detection software. Students must submit their assessments for checking, and consent to that checking, before any assessment is marked. Where the outcome of a check gives rise to a suspected breach of academic integrity, the matter will be managed in accordance with the Academic Integrity Procedure (Appendix A).

5.3 Late Submission Penalties

The submission deadline for written assessments is specified in the Unit Outline. Late submission penalties apply as follows:

a. a penalty of 5% (or, where specified in the Unit Outline, 10%) of the total available marks will be deducted for each calendar day the assessment is late, up to a maximum of 10 calendar days;

b. an assessment submitted more than 10 calendar days late, without an approved extension, will receive a mark of zero; and

c. where an approved revised submission date falls more than 10 calendar days after the scheduled submission date, a modified (supplementary) assessment will be given.

5.4 Deferment, Extension and Special Consideration

Students must apply for deferment, extension or special consideration; it will be granted only in the following circumstances:

c. Short-term illness — validated by a medical certificate from a registered medical practitioner, stating the period of illness and identifying the assessment tasks affected.

d. Long-term illness — a medical report stating the impact of the condition on the student's academic studies and the period of illness. Special support will be provided where indicated.

e. Unforeseen circumstances — such as a personal or family crisis or an accident, supported by a Statutory Declaration or other evidence submitted prior to the absence, or within three working days of the student's return to study.

f. Disability adjustments — to allow full learning access for students with disability. Students should consult the Learning Support Officer to arrange suitable adjustments; use of the appropriate form assists this process.

Students will be advised of the outcome of an application within seven working days

6. Examinations

6.1 Confidentiality and Security

- Hard copy and digital copies of examination questions will be securely stored prior to the examination, to prevent cheating.
- After the examination, papers will be stored and disposed of in accordance with the Data and Record Integrity Policy.
- The dates of the examination period will be included in SAHE's academic calendar, and students will have access to a comprehensive examination timetable at least two weeks prior to the examination period.

6.2 Examination Venue

SAHE will ensure the examination environment is appropriate in terms of temperature control, lighting, seating and desk arrangements, and sound, and facilitates student achievement.

- The venue will be arranged so that invigilators have a clear view of students, and students have a clear view of a clock.
- Students will be seated far enough apart that they cannot see the work of others undertaking the same examination.

6.3 Invigilation

- Invigilators will be provided with a position description and will be mentored and trained.
- All examinations will have a minimum of two invigilators; larger student numbers require a greater number of invigilators.
- Any misconduct by an invigilator will be reported to the Registrar and Course Directors.

6.4 Rules for Attendance

- Students must bring identification to the examination and display it clearly on their desk for the invigilator to check.
- Students should arrive at the examination venue at least 10 minutes prior to the examination.
- Students who arrive late will be permitted to sit the examination but will not be granted additional time.
- Students who fail to attend will be awarded 0% unless extenuating circumstances apply, as set out at section 6.9.
- Students will not be permitted to leave the examination in the last 15 minutes. Once a student leaves the venue, they will not be re-admitted for any reason.

6.5 Rules for Exam Papers

- Examination papers will provide clear instructions for students, including a clear indication of any permitted extrinsic materials and equipment.
- Examination booklets will include a front page requiring students to record their student number, course, unit, and booklet number.

6.6 Materials and Equipment

Items brought into an examination may be inspected by invigilators. Students are permitted to bring: a bottle of water; stationery required for writing; a calculator, if applicable; for an open-book examination, the book, text or other material specified by the Course Director; and food or medication required for medical reasons. Devices that are connected or connectable to the internet are strictly prohibited.

6.7 Student Conduct

Students are expected to behave in a way that does not cause disturbance during the examination. Students will meet the material and equipment requirements above, follow all instructions given by invigilators promptly, and communicate with invigilators quietly by raising a hand. Students will not obtain or attempt to obtain assistance, give or attempt to give assistance to another student, or communicate with anyone other than an invigilator. Students behaving disruptively will be asked to leave the examination and may face disciplinary measures.

6.8 Sudden Disruptions

A sudden disruption to an examination (for example, severe illness of a student, a natural disaster or accident affecting the venue, or another event at the discretion of the invigilators) may require a student or students to leave the venue. Where examination integrity has not been lost, the examination may proceed; where integrity has been lost, alternative arrangements may be made.

6.9 Examination Deferral or Resitting

Under the extenuating circumstances set out at section 5.4 (short-term illness, long-term illness, unforeseen circumstances, or disability adjustment), and on submission of a Special Consideration application and supporting evidence, a student may be permitted to defer an examination or multiple examinations.

Once unit results have been finalised, examination results will be published and released to students no later than two weeks after the conclusion of the examination period. Students may make an appointment with the relevant academic staff member to discuss their examination performance following release of results. Consistent with section 7, all examination papers are moderated before results are finalised and released.

7. Assessment Moderation

Assessment moderation is an essential element of SAHE's quality assurance and is fundamental to the validity and reliability of the grades SAHE awards. Moderation develops consistency between assessors' marking, builds a shared understanding of the standard of student achievement expected at each grade, and provides evidence of the credibility of assessment outcomes that SAHE must be able to demonstrate under HESF Standard 1.4.

7.1 Purpose and Principles

Moderation at SAHE has three purposes: to validate that an assessment task and its marking guide or rubric are capable of producing valid, reliable and fair evidence of achievement of the relevant learning outcomes; to ensure that marking is applied consistently across markers, tutorial groups, modes of delivery and campuses; and to benchmark the standard of student achievement against comparable programs, consistent with the requirements of HESF Standards 1.4 and 5.3.

Moderation is undertaken at two stages of the assessment cycle: before an assessment task is released to students (pre-assessment moderation), and after marking is complete but before results are released (post-assessment moderation).

7.2 Pre-Assessment (Design) Moderation

- Before an assessment task, examination paper or marking guide/rubric is released to students, it is reviewed by at least one academic other than the Unit Coordinator who set it (normally the Course Director or a peer with relevant discipline expertise).
- The review confirms that the task is aligned with the specified unit learning outcomes; that instructions, weighting and submission requirements are clear and consistent with the Unit Outline; that the marking guide or rubric will support consistent judgements between markers; and that the level of difficulty is appropriate to the AQF level of the qualification.
- For examinations, design moderation additionally confirms that the paper is confidential, free of error, and consistent with the approved examination timetable and rules set out in section 6.
- Design moderation is documented and retained in accordance with section 11.

7.3 Post-Assessment (Marking) Moderation

- Where a unit has more than one marker, a sample of marked assessments — normally a minimum of 10%, or five scripts, whichever is greater, spread across the range of grades awarded — is cross-marked or second-marked by another qualified assessor before results are finalised.
- Markers meet, where practicable, before marking commences and again on completion of marking, to calibrate their application of the marking guide or rubric against sample or benchmark scripts, so that a common understanding of the standard for each grade is reached.
- Where cross-marking or moderation identifies a material discrepancy between markers, the Unit Coordinator will review the affected scripts and may direct that some or all of the cohort's assessments be remarked.
- The Unit Coordinator, with the Course Director, is responsible for ensuring that all assessment tasks contributing 20% or more to the final grade for a unit, and all examinations, are moderated in accordance with this section before results are released.
- As set out at section 8.2, students will normally receive feedback on an assessment task within 10 working days of the submission deadline; where a task requires moderation, feedback will normally be provided within 15 working days.

7.4 Moderation of Borderline and At-Risk Grades

- Results falling within five marks of a grade boundary (in particular the pass/fail boundary) are reviewed by the Course Director prior to finalisation, to confirm the mark has been correctly calculated and consistently applied.
- Final marks resulting in an overall fail grade for a unit are reviewed by the Course Director before release, consistent with SAHE's obligations to identify and support students at risk of unsatisfactory progress under HESF Standard 1.3.
- Where moderation results in a change to a student's mark, the moderated mark is the mark released to the student; a Result Pending (RP) grade may be recorded on the student's file while moderation is completed.

7.5 Cross-Institutional Benchmarking

SAHE periodically benchmarks the standard of its assessment tasks, marking guides and student outcomes against comparable Australian higher education providers as part of the periodic comprehensive course review conducted under HESF Standard 5.3 and the Quality Assurance Policy. Benchmarking outcomes are reported to the Academic Board and inform continuous improvement of assessment design.

7.6 Moderation Records and Reporting

Records of pre- and post-assessment moderation, including moderation panel membership, samples reviewed, discrepancies identified and action taken, are retained by the Course Director in accordance with section 11 and are reported to the Academic Board in accordance with the Governance Calendar and section 14.

7.7 Relationship to Academic Integrity

Moderation is distinct from, but works alongside, the academic integrity checks described at section 5.2 and Appendix A. Where moderation of a script or cohort raises a concern that goes to the authenticity or authorship of a student's work, rather than to the accuracy or consistency of marking, the matter is referred for management under the Academic Integrity Procedure (Appendix A).

8. Grading and Results

8.1 Grading Scale

Grades awarded for a unit of study are based on the total marks obtained across all assessment tasks, as follows:

Grade	Description	Result Range	Included in Average Mark
HD	High Distinction — outstanding work demonstrating a high level of understanding across the entire content of the unit.	85 – 100	Yes
D	Distinction — a high standard of work demonstrating originality and insight from a number of perspectives.	75 – 84	Yes
C	Credit — a proficient level of attainment and the ability to think analytically and contextually about the unit and its assessment requirements.	65 – 74	Yes
P	Pass — the assessment requirements of the unit have been addressed and an acceptable understanding of the unit content demonstrated.	50 – 64	Yes
SP	Supplementary Pass — a pass achieved via a supplementary assessment offered to a student who did not satisfy the pass mark criteria on the first attempt, having completed all assessments for the unit.	50	Yes
F	Fail — unsatisfactory performance, below the minimum expected level, or inability to demonstrate one or more unit learning outcomes.	0 – 49	Yes
W	Withdrawn from Program / Withdrawn without Penalty — formal withdrawal from a unit prior to the administration date (Start Date or the Census Date) of the unit.	No mark	No
WD	Withdrawn without Fail — formal withdrawal without academic penalty after the administration date (Start Date or the Census Date) from a unit, on the basis of accepted compassionate or compelling circumstances.	No mark	No
WF	Withdrawn Fail — formal withdrawal after the administration date (Start Date or the Census Date) from a unit with academic and financial penalty.	No mark	No
RP	Result Pending — the mark is in the process of release, including as a result of moderation, an approved extension, or an appeal in progress.	No mark	No
AS	Advanced Standing — credit granted on the basis of successful completion of equivalent study, or of an individual's prior formal, non-formal or informal learning.	No mark	No

S	Satisfied Requirements — a pass/fail unit in which the required standard was achieved.	No mark	No

8.2 Feedback

The timing and quality of feedback have a significant impact on student learning. Consistent with HESF Standard 1.3, feedback must be timely and must assist students to achieve the learning outcomes of their unit and program. SAHE ensures feedback:

- is constructive and specific, identifying areas of strong performance and areas for improvement;
- relates the grade awarded to the stated assessment criteria and standards;
- is provided within 10 working days of the submission deadline, or within 15 working days where the task requires moderation; and
- for tasks that assess learning outcomes common to a subsequent task, is provided, at least in part, prior to the due date of that subsequent task, so students can apply what they have learned.

1. All markers will normally complete marking within seven working days. Early feedback helps identify 'at-risk' students and enables timely referral to support services. Peer evaluation tools may be used to assess group work.
2. Students will receive early feedback in each unit, in every teaching period, to allow them to assess their academic progress and identify any need for additional support. This feedback may be formal or informal, and directed to individuals or to a group.
3. Students are expected to read, reflect on and act on feedback provided in a timely manner, whether provided generally to the unit or individually. Self-regulation and responsibility for one's own learning are key factors in student success.
4. Where a student believes feedback is unclear or does not explain the grade awarded against the stated assessment criteria and standards, the student may request clarification and further feedback from the marker.

9. Publication of Results

The official examination timetable and the date of release of result statements are published on the SAHE Learning Management System and communicated by email and/or SMS.

Marks for individual assessment tasks are published for each student on the SAHE Learning Management System. Individual student marks are accessible only to that student and relevant teaching staff.

10. Academic Integrity

Valid and reliable assessment depends on academic integrity being maintained by staff and students alike. SAHE identifies, responds to and manages breaches of academic integrity — including plagiarism, contract cheating, collusion and unauthorised use of generative artificial intelligence — in accordance with the Academic Integrity Procedure at Appendix A, which is issued under, and forms part of, this Policy. The Academic Integrity Procedure sets out SAHE's prevention, detection, investigation and determination processes, consistent with HESF Standard 5.2 (Academic and Research Integrity) and the TEQSA Academic Integrity Toolkit.

11. Record Keeping

SAHE is committed to best practice in records management. Records of student assessment tasks, and of pre- and post-assessment moderation undertaken under section 7, will be created, stored and disposed of in accordance with the relevant regulatory requirements set out in the Records Management Policy.

12. Review of Assessment Grades

A student who believes there are grounds for a review or remark of an assessment task may request one as follows:

a. A student may request a meeting with the Course Director to discuss the assessment task and mark. The Course Director will explain the reasons for the grade awarded;

b. A student can request a review or remark within five working days of the results being released, on the grounds that: (i) the Assessment Policy and Procedure has not been followed; (ii) the grading criteria have been incorrectly applied; or (iii) an administrative error has occurred;

c. where a request for review is granted, the Course Director may arrange for the assessment task to be graded again by another qualified assessor, or take any other reasonable action; and

d. timelines in the Student Grievance Management Policy apply, except that, where locating an alternate marker is difficult, the timeline for notifying the student of the outcome may extend up to four weeks.

Where a grade is amended as a result of a review, the revised mark becomes the final grade for that assessment task and replaces the original. A review may result in the mark increasing, decreasing or staying the same; in every case, the mark obtained on review replaces the original mark. Where the assessment is a group assessment, all students in the group must consent to a review before it can take place.

13. Appeals

A student may appeal the outcome of a review of an assessment grade in accordance with the Student Grievance Management Policy and Procedure.

14. Policy Implementation and Monitoring

The Academic Board will review periodic reports from the Teaching and Learning Committee at the end of each study period, in accordance with the Governance Calendar, including reports on moderation outcomes under section 7.6. The Academic Board will also review student and staff concerns, and instances of student or staff misconduct.

The Academic Board will report to the Corporate Governance Board and ensure findings are taken into account in planning, quality assurance and continuous improvement processes.

Version Control

Version	3.0
Category	Academic
Approving Body	Academic Board
Approval Date	7/08/2026
Policy Owner	Dean
Details of Changes	This version is a consolidated rewrite of the Policy, aligned to the structure and drafting conventions of the Admissions Policy and Procedure, including: elevation of Assessment Moderation to a standalone, fully specified section covering pre-assessment (design) moderation, post-marking moderation, moderation of borderline and at-risk grades, cross-institutional benchmarking, and moderation record-keeping; incorporation of the Academic Integrity Procedure as Appendix A, and a new Academic Integrity section cross-referencing that Procedure; realignment of the Policy against HESF 2021 Standards 1.3 (Orientation and Progression), 1.4 (Learning Outcomes and Assessment) and 5.2/5.3 (Institutional Quality Assurance), taking into account the Higher Education Standards Framework Amendment (Threshold Standards) Instrument 2026; consolidation of examination procedures, results and feedback requirements, and grievance and appeal pathways into a single, cross-referenced structure; and removal of superseded content and correction of drafting errors.

Version History

Version	Approved by	Approval date	Revision notes	Next review
1.5	Governing Council	4 May 2023	Approved original version.	
2.0	Academic Board	2023	Added detail to fill gaps and clarify language; added exam and withdrawal date requirements; added governance and continuous improvement requirements.	
3.0	Academic Board	7 August 2026	Consolidated rewrite aligned to the Admissions Policy template. Assessment Moderation elevated to a full section. Academic Integrity Procedure added as Appendix A. Realigned against HESF 2021 Standards 1.3, 1.4 and 5.2/5.3, and the HESF 2026 amendments.	[Sep 2027]

Appendix A: Academic Integrity Procedure

This Appendix reproduces the Academic Integrity Procedure, which is issued under, and forms part of, this Policy. It applies whenever a question of academic integrity arises in the design, submission, marking or moderation of assessment under this Policy.

A.1 Purpose and Background

This Procedure supports this Policy and aims to help academic staff and students uphold academic integrity and mitigate risks posed by existing and emerging threats, such as generative AI and commercial academic contracting. It draws on the TEQSA (2026) Academic Integrity Toolkit and combines academic integrity education, assessment security and enforcement in a responsive regulation approach (Ellis & Murdoch, 2024).

A.2 Definitions

Academic Misconduct is any conduct that breaches academic integrity — any action, attempted action, or omission that may create an unfair academic advantage or disadvantage for a student or others, including but not limited to:

- plagiarism;
- cheating;
- fabrication or falsification of data or citations;
- unauthorised collaboration or collusion;
- contract cheating;
- unauthorised use of generative Artificial Intelligence (AI);
- ghost writing;
- using another person's work without permission;
- misrepresentation;
- fraud or theft of another person's work; and/or
- violation of examination rules, including use of unauthorised materials or devices.

A.3 Responsive Regulation

SAHE applies a balanced, responsive approach combining academic integrity education, assessment security and enforcement (Ellis & Murdoch, 2024). This approach is based on a pyramid structure: most students sit at the base of the pyramid, where they are low risk and respond to support, education and clear expectations; confused or careless students sit in the middle, and require monitoring, feedback and remediation; and serious, usually intentional, misconduct sits at the top of the pyramid, requiring strong penalties and formal investigation. Student behaviour can move between levels of the pyramid depending on context, and SAHE aims to apply the response that fits the behaviour.

SAHE applies a whole-of-institution response reflecting existing and emerging risks, including assessment design and security, policy, process, benchmarking and risk management (TEQSA, 2026).

A.4 Culture and Foundation — Prevention

SAHE builds a culture that promotes self-regulation and student capability by mandating an academic integrity module, explaining academic integrity at student orientation, providing clear guidance to students

on academic integrity — particularly regarding contract cheating and generative AI — and scaffolding assessment design and learning support. Students are supported with checklists and tools for best practice, including a Responsible AI Use Checklist available to students through the Learning Management System.

A.5 Detection and Early Intervention

Many assessments are completed in class, and all written assessments are submitted through text-matching software. Any monitoring or detection output is treated as a single data point: where a potential breach is suspected, the lecturer uses that data, together with academic judgement, to investigate further. The focus at this stage is an educational response, which may include an informal warning, a resubmission opportunity, or mandatory integrity training.

A.6 Investigation

Where a potential breach proceeds beyond early intervention, the facts are established and the student is given the opportunity to respond, as follows:

5. the lecturer gathers the available evidence — for example, similarity reports, an AI-detection indicator, or authorship checks — which may also include a marked difference in writing style from a student's previous work, statistically improbable or inconsistent data, an inability of the student to explain or defend the submitted work, or missing, incorrect or non-existent citations;
6. the allegation is formally documented;
7. the student is given an opportunity to respond to the allegation: the student is contacted by email within three working days of the assessment results being released, through Student Services, to attend an interview with the Course Director. The interview is normally held within five working days of that notification (earlier is acceptable). If the student does not attend, the decision is made by the Course Director, Unit Convenor or Lecturer on the available evidence. The student is informed of the decision by email through Student Services, and advised that they may access the SAHE grievance policy.

A.7 Determination and Outcomes

Once a breach is confirmed, the penalty is aligned with its severity, indicatively as follows:

Type of Breach	Indicative Threshold	Possible Outcomes	Process
Minor	AI/similarity indicator of 25–49%	Warning or penalty	The lecturer may issue a warning or impose a penalty where warranted.
Moderate	AI/similarity indicator of 50–74%	Mark reduction or re-submission	The lecturer must conduct a student interview and determine between a 50% mark deduction or requiring the assessment to be redone.
Major	AI/similarity indicator of 75–100%	Mark reduction, fail, or referral for suspension/expulsion	The lecturer must conduct a student interview, assess the situation, and inform the Course Director. The preferred outcome is zero marks for the assessment.

These thresholds are indicative and are applied together with academic judgement and the individual circumstances of the case. A student subject to a Major breach determination, or a repeated Moderate

breach, may be referred for consideration of suspension or expulsion under the Student Conduct and Misconduct processes.

A.8 Support, Education and Continuous Improvement

SAHE ensures adequate academic and wellbeing support is available so that students can learn from, and change, their behaviour, strengthening the culture of learning and integrity. SAHE monitors TEQSA guidance and resources, including the Academic Integrity Toolkit, collects data on academic integrity trends for report to the Teaching and Learning Committee, redesigns assessments where appropriate, and benchmarks its practices against other institutions to continually improve its approach to academic integrity.

A.9 Responsible AI Use — Guidance for Students

Students are provided with a Responsible AI Use Checklist through the Learning Management System (based on Turnitin's Responsible AI Use resources) to help them use generative AI tools, where permitted, without risk of academic misconduct. Before submitting an assessment, students are encouraged to confirm that they:

- can produce artefacts of their writing process (for example, notes, outlines, drafts or version histories);
- have followed their instructor's guidance on exactly how, and which, generative AI tools may be used for the assessment;
- are satisfied their own writing style and voice are evident in their work; and
- have cited any AI tool used to complete the assessment, in accordance with instructor or institutional guidance.

After submission, students are encouraged to be ready to explain, calmly and clearly if asked, how and why they used AI in their assessment, their writing process, and the writing choices they made — including the sources they relied on and how they selected and used evidence. The full checklist, including additional prompts and worked examples, is available to students and staff via the LMS.

A.10 References

Ellis, C. & Murdoch, K. (2024). The educational integrity enforcement pyramid: a new framework for challenging and responding to student cheating. Assessment & Evaluation in Higher Education, 49(7), 924–934.

TEQSA (2026). Revised Academic Integrity Toolkit (19 March 2026). Tertiary Education Quality and Standards Agency.