

Procedure for Investigating Suspected Malpractice in School Assessments

Purpose

The purpose of this procedure is to establish a clear, consistent process for investigating and addressing cases where a student is suspected of engaging in academic malpractice. E.g. inappropriately using Artificial Intelligence (AI) or engaging in other forms of academic malpractice in school assessments. This procedure ensures fairness, maintains academic integrity, and upholds the standards of St Joseph's Catholic College Aberdeen.

Scope

This procedure applies to all students at St Joseph's Catholic College Aberdeen and covers all forms of assessments, including but not limited to written tasks, exams, practical works, projects, and oral presentations. It specifically addresses the inappropriate use of AI tools in academic work. ACE rules apply to stage 6.

Responsibilities

- Classroom Teachers: Responsible for detecting potential malpractice, initiating the initial conversation with the student, and escalating the case if necessary.
- Leaders of Learning (LOL): Responsible for conducting formal interviews, further investigating cases, and determining appropriate consequences.
- Assistant Principal Curriculum: Responsible for handling appeals, conducting formal interviews with students and parents, and making final decisions on appeals. Students: Responsible for ensuring all submitted work is their own, following the school's guidelines for AI use, and cooperating during investigations.
- Parents/Guardians: Responsible for supporting students in adhering to academic integrity and participating in the appeals process if necessary.





Step by Step

Step 1: Initial Detection and Conversation

- Malpractice Suspected: If a classroom teacher suspects malpractice, including using Al inappropriately, to complete an assessment task, the teacher initiates an initial conversation with the student to determine whether malpractice occured.
- Viva Voce: The teacher asks the student to complete an on-the-spot viva voce for the assessment task requirements. This may include verbally answering the assessment questions, explaining use of metalanguage and defining key terminology.

Step 2: Determining Student Response

If the Student Admits Fault (Yes):

- The student is immediately provided with re-teaching on the correct referencing techniques, including the traffic light system if AI is the malpractice.
- Classroom teacher emails parent/guardian to outline malpractice and re-teaching provided.
- o The student is required to re-submit the task with appropriate adjustments.
- The task is then marked, and a grade is assigned based on the resubmitted work.
- o In consultation with the faculty Leader of Learning, student may receive a reduction of marks. I.e. you may receive zero for the plagiarised section.
- Stage 5 and 6 refer to ACE guidelines for N-determinations. ACE Manual: ACE 4020 'N' determinations – warnings of non-completion of course requirements

If the Student Does Not Admit Fault (No):

- The teacher compares the student's summative assessment to their formative assessment and recent work samples that assess the same outcomes to identify any significant discrepancies that may indicate malpractice.
- o The teacher escalates the case to the Leader of Learning (LOL) for further investigation.
- o The teacher emails parent/guardian to explain situation and process to the parent.

Step 3: Investigation by Leader of Learning (LOL)

- Interview with Student: The LOL conducts a formal interview with the student to discuss the suspected malpractice.
 - If the Student Admits Fault During the Interview:
 - The student is immediately provided with re-teaching on the correct referencing techniques, including the traffic light system if AI is the







malpractice.

- The student is required to re-submit the task.
- The student receives a reduction in marks.
- Stage 5 and 6 refer to ACE guidelines for N-warnings and Ndeterminations. ACE Manual: ACE 4020 'N' determinations - warnings of non-completion of course requirements

If the Student Does Not Admit Fault and There Is No Clear Discrepancy:

- The LOL evaluates the evidence and, if there is insufficient evidence to support the claim of malpractice, the incident is dismissed, and the task is marked as normal.
- LOL records decision on student compass profile and notifies parents/guardians of the decision

If the Student Does Not Admit Fault but There Is a Clear Discrepancy:

- The student conducts another viva voce with the LOL based on the task outcomes, and a mark is assigned. This is required within a reasonable timeframe from when the classroom teacher escalates concerns to the LOL.
- If the Student Refuses to Participate in the Viva Voce:
 - The student receives a zero for the task.
 - Stage 5 and 6 refer to ACE guidelines for N-determinations. ACE Manual: ACE 4020 'N' determinations - warnings of noncompletion of course requirements

Step 4: Conclusion and Documentation

- All steps taken during the investigation, including interviews and decisions, are documented on the students Compass profile. For Years 10, 11 and 12 it is also entered into the school's Malpractice Register.
- Stage 5 and Stage 6 cases are reported to NESA and placed on the NESA Malpractice register.
- The student's file is updated with the outcome of the investigation and any re-submitted work, ensuring that all instances of malpractice are properly recorded.

Appeals Process

- Students wishing to appeal against the grade(s) in any subject awarded to them by the school should submit a written appeal, together with evidence to:
 - Stage 4: Assistant Principal Curriculum
 - Stage 5 and 6: Principal. (ACE guidelines)
- Stage 4: Assistant Principal Curriculum will assess the appeal, conduct a formal interview with the student and parent/guardian, and issue a final decision. The case will be resolved within 2 weeks of the initial appeal.





- During the interview, students will be required to provide evidence that all unacknowledged work is entirely their own. Such evidence might include but is not limited to:
 - Providing evidence of and explaining the process of their work, which might include diaries, journals or notes, working plans or sketches, and progressive drafts to show the development of their ideas.
 - Answering questions regarding the assessment task, examination, or submitted work under investigation, to demonstrate their knowledge, understanding, and skills.
- Stage 5 and 6 N-determination appeals: Principal to establish a review committee and complete flow chart as per ACE requirements. <u>ACE Manual: ACE 11008 Procedures</u> for appeals against non-completion of course requirements ('N' determinations)
- Stage 5 and 6 Grade appeals: To be successful in such appeals, students need to substantiate that the grade(s) awarded in the course(s) was inconsistent with the progressive reporting from the school. If the appeal is upheld, the principal to send notification of the new grade(s) to NESA.
 - Where possible, all reviews of the grade(s) awarded in any subject should be resolved within the school. However, provision has been made for subsequent appeals to NESA. ACE Manual: ACE 11009 Record of School Achievement and Higher School Certificate appeals against 'N' determinations – guidelines for school review
 - o Grade appeal documentation must be submitted to the Principal by:
 - Year 10: Thursday 20 November 2025
 - Year 11: 14 October 2025
 - Year 12: One week after final HSC exam

Definitions

- Academic Integrity: Adhering to ethical standards by producing original work, properly acknowledging sources, and avoiding dishonest practices in all academic activities.
- Malpractice: Any activity that gives a student an unfair advantage in an assessment, including plagiarism, collusion, misrepresentation, and breach of assessment conditions.
- Plagiarism: Using someone else's work, ideas, or words without proper acknowledgment and presenting them as one's own.
- Collusion: Unauthorised collaboration on individual assessment tasks. ACE rules state that both the person who shares their work and the one who copies it will face the same
- **Misrepresentation:** Providing false information or fabricating data in academic work.
- Breach of Assessment Conditions: Violating the rules set for assessments, including bringing unauthorized materials into exams or using unapproved aids.
- Artificial Intelligence (AI): Technologies that simulate human intelligence, such as language generation tools, which can assist in completing academic tasks. Unapproved or unethical use of AI is considered malpractice.







Conclusion

This procedure ensures that all students understand the importance of academic integrity and the ethical use of AI in their work while providing a clear framework for addressing any potential misuse.

References

ACE Manual: ACE 9022 Honesty in HSC Assessment - the Standard (nesa.nsw.edu.au)

ACE Manual: ACE 9023 Honesty in HSC assessment: what constitutes malpractice (nesa.nsw.edu.au)

ACE Manual: ACE 9024 HSC examinations: breaches of procedures (nesa.nsw.edu.au)

ACE Manual: ACE 9025 HSC examinations: non-serious attempts and non-attempts (nesa.nsw.edu.au)

ACE Manual: ACE 8069 Higher School Certificate school-based assessment (nesa.nsw.edu.au)

» Honesty in assessment (nesa.nsw.edu.au)

Rules and procedures | NSW Government

Use of Artificial Intelligence by students | NSW Government

Australian Framework for Generative Artificial Intelligence (AI) in Schools - Department of Education,

Australian Government

All My Own Work | NSW Government