

Purpose

Industry Pathways Pty Ltd (ABN 65 153 814 192) operating as Australian Paramedical College is committed to providing clear information surrounding assessment requirements, practices, and expectations to students, while maintaining academic integrity is of utmost importance. This will ensure ongoing consistency and transparency throughout the assessment process and support students in achieving their academic goals, support assessor practices and breaches that may occur when handling breaches under academic Integrity.

Scope

This policy applies to all students undertaking training and assessment with Australian Paramedical College (APC). It outlines the requirements for students in relation to academic Integrity and acceptable use of Artificial Intelligence (AI) in their training and assessment.

Definitions

For the purpose of this policy, see below definitions for terminology used throughout:

- **Regulator(s)** – Various authorised bodies within the Vocational Education and Training Sector that advise on requirements for training and assessment practices.
- **Unit of Competency** – A regulated training component which outlines the compulsory skills and knowledge an individual must demonstrate in order to work effectively in a specific role or function
- **Qualification** – A regulated training product which consists of specific unit of competency in order for an individual to work effectively in a specific role or function at a certain level
- **Satisfactory outcome** – The requirements of an individual assessment have been met in full
- **NYS outcome** – The requirements of an individual assessment have not been met in full
- **Competent** – The requirements of a unit of competency's overall assessment have been met in full
- **Trainer/Assessor** refers to the trainer or assessor for study with APC.
- **Student** refers to an individual who is enrolled with APC for the purpose of study.
- **Academic integrity** refers to the students and APC staff upholding ethical standards in all aspects of study, inclusive of learning, training, assessment, and placement activities. This involves acting with the principles of honesty, fairness, trust, and responsibility and requires respect for learning and its development.
- **Artificial Intelligence (AI)** - is defined as a type of machine learning that creates new, previously unseen data that is similar to existing data. This can include generating new images or text. Often this is called Generative AI.
- **Chat GPT** - is just one of the most recent and popular Generative AI tools. Chat GPT has accessed a massive sample of digital resources on the internet and has the capacity to respond to questions, mimicking knowledge and language it has observed from the original resources.
- **Learning** - is defined as any activity which aims to improve the knowledge, skills, or attitudes of a student. Learning may be initiated by the APC as part of the student's program of study or may be initiated by the student themselves for private study. Examples of learning include the student completing a Student Learner Guide, or a



Assessment and Academic Integrity Policy

student seeking additional information or clarification of any topic relevant to their program of study.

- **Assessment** - is defined as any formal activity which is initiated by and identified as an Assessment Task by the APC, which aims to measure the knowledge, skills of attitudes of a student as part of the student's program of study. Examples of assessment include a student completing an online assessment task as part of a unit of study, or a student performing a task within a face-to-face workshop.

Assessment at APC

Assessment Tasks

The following assessment types are utilised at APC to evaluate a student's knowledge and ability to apply skills throughout their online learning and practical face to face setting:

- Short/long response
- Case Study
- Quiz
- Video Upload
- Workplace documentation
- Simulated scenarios
- Clinical placement

Assessments may be computer marked based on set criteria or may be marked by an Assessor.

Assessment Criteria

Criteria for assessment tasks are written per unit of competency and determined by industry regulators. The unit of competency criteria is allocated to an assessment task(s) and contextualised by the Registered Training Organisation (RTO).

Each unit of competency has differing requirements and conditions that must be considered by the RTO when implementing training and assessment practices for each student. Each assessment task will have differing assessment requirements and conditions that must be considered by the assessor when reviewing completed student assessments.

There two possible assessment outcomes are Satisfactory (S) and Not Yet Satisfactory (NYS)

A unit of competency may have multiple assessment tasks associated with it. When a student is deemed satisfactory across all assessment tasks associated with that unit of competency, they are deemed competent overall.

A qualification is made up of a set number of individual unit of competency that must be deemed competent for a certificate to be issued.

More detailed information about specific qualifications, assessment criteria and requirements can be accessed via training.gov.au - [Home page](#).

Assessment Submission

All assessment tasks are located on the student portal and are released based on progression. Throughout the course, students are given access to one unit at a time, and the next unit will only be available once all assessments in the previous unit are submitted.

Using AI tools to respond to assessment tasks would significantly compromise the student's development of the necessary knowledge, attitudes and skills required to be demonstrated as part of your program of study. When a student uses an AI tool to respond

to an assessment task, the student is not being assessed, rather the AI tool is being assessed.

The APC utilises meaningfully developed assessment tasks for the purpose of ensuring that each student demonstrates they have the required knowledge, attitudes and skills to safely perform future roles which require successful completion of the program of study in question.

All assessment submissions are to be made via the student portal.

This is inclusive of clinical placement documentation.

Assessment Outcomes

Assessment submissions will be graded within 21 business days or less from submission. An outcome will be advised, and feedback provided by an assessor where applicable. Once an assessment has been graded, the student will be notified by email.

Assessment Feedback

When an assessment is marked by an assessor, an outcome and feedback will be provided at the same time.

This outcome will determine the type of feedback received.

- Where a satisfactory outcome is received, the assessor will provide overall feedback.
- Where a Not Yet Satisfactory outcome is received, detailed feedback will be provided regarding specific questions or observation tasks that require additional attention to assist with future assessment attempts.

Please refer to the *Assessor Best Practice Guide* around the expectations and types of feedback permitted.

Assessment Attempts

Online submission:

Students have three (3) attempts at each online assessment task.

Where a NYS outcome is achieved after a first or second attempt, detailed feedback will be left for each question or component requiring additional work. Where a NYS outcome is achieved for a third attempt, detailed feedback will be left and a compulsory call with the assessor is required to address assessment requirements and resubmission requirements. A fourth and final attempt may be granted by the assessor, with a specific fourth attempt resubmission form that must be submitted. Where this final resubmission is deemed NYS, re-enrolment and any fees associated with the unit are required.

Practical observation:

Students have two (2) attempts at each practical observation assessment task.

Where a NYS outcome is achieved after a first attempt, a discussion with the assessor is required to address the assessment requirements and any reattempt requirements. Where a second and final attempt is deemed NYS, reattendance of the full clinical workshop with any fees associated with the additional workshop being payable by the student.

Resubmission Templates

Resubmission templates are to be utilised for all attempts following a NYS outcome, excluding online quizzes or workplace forms (E.g., PCR, incident reports, patient logs)

Where a student uploads a full assessment task as a resubmission, the student must be redirected to utilise the appropriate templates.

As forementioned, a fourth and final attempt will have a dedicated resubmission template, to ensure it is easily identifiable and the student is aware of the additional requirements surrounding the attempt.

Reverting Assessment Tasks

The below occasions will not be classed as an assessment attempt for the student:

- Submission of blank assessment tasks
- Submission of assessment task to incorrect upload location
- Missing name/date as part of assessment declaration
- Submission was made prior to completing assessment accidentally.
- Technical/submission errors

If the above occurs, assessors are permitted to revert the assessment attempt to allow for resubmission from the student. Reverting of any assessment outside of the aforementioned circumstances must be addressed with the Compliance Manager prior to action.

Assessor Calls

An assessor call is conducted for students where they have exhausted all other avenues for assessment help. On this call, the assessor can advise the student on specific resources to assist with completing the task or have educational discussions on the area the assessment surrounds.

The assessor can advise the student if they are on the right track or not but cannot advise of S or NYS outcomes on this call as it would be disregarding the attempt numbers permitted.

Competency Calls

A competency call is a discussion between a student and an assessor where a scheduled assessment takes place on the phone.

Where this method is suited, the questions and student responses must be recorded (visual or written).

Where a recording is not made by the assessor, students need to complete the assessment while online and discussing with the student. At no time will the assessor give students the answer, but ensure they have the knowledge on a particular topic before the student attempts the assessment again. Any detailed notes will be recorded on the student's file.

A comment must be left when grading the assessment task via Moodle that a final attempt was made via competency call.

Assessor Clinical Judgement

Where a student has responded correctly based on the wording of a question, but their particular response does not align with the assessor guide, assessors may utilise their clinical judgement to determine an outcome.

This may be something like a response varying per state, or a change to legislation that is not reflected in our assessor guides.

Where this occurs, please advise the compliance team so we can include the additional responses in the assessor guide.

Responsible and ethical use of Artificial Intelligence in Training and Assessment

Students can only use AI tools in compliance with the APC's ethical standards and values, upholding principles of honesty, integrity, and respect for intellectual property.

What is AI with respect to education?

AI refers to the development of computer systems that can perform tasks that typically require human intelligence, such as learning, problem-solving, and decision-making. In the context of learning and education, AI can play a pivotal role in augmenting traditional teaching methodologies by providing personalised and adaptive learning experiences tailored to individual student needs. AI-powered educational tools and platforms offer interactive and engaging interfaces, fostering student participation and knowledge retention. AI is a powerful tool, and used correctly is a valuable addition to most programs of study. However, AI is also considered to be largely untrustworthy at this stage. AI can generally only repeat what has been said by other sources on the internet, it has very limited capacity to critically interpret data and can be easily tricked. Where limited or incomplete data is available AI is often biased in its responses to questions. AI may also violate intellectual property laws as it could take data or wording from a copyrighted source.

For example, Chat GPT may seem intelligent, but it's just mimicking what it has read on the internet. Chat GPT doesn't understand the question you are asking; it simply responds to the question by copying an existing response it locates on the internet. Chat GPT is designed to provide a unique response, but it cannot know if its response is technically accurate.

While AI like Chat GPT may be very good at providing lists of well-known and established concepts (for example: which direction does blood flow through the heart?), it will regularly return incorrect responses to nuanced or specific questions (for example: Which medication is best to administer to a patient with chest pain?).

Responsible Use of AI

Students are encouraged to use AI tools to augment their **learning** experience. Acceptable uses of AI in learning activities includes:

- Using AI to generate responses to specific *student driven* questions for the purpose of *learning*.
For example, a Student Learner Guide may refer to a specific process, such as learning how the heart pumps blood, it is acceptable for a student to utilise AI to assist with their learning for this topic. The student may consult AI with a question such as "explain to me how the heart pumps blood" or "how do the valves of the heart impact on blood flow?", etc... This is an example of using AI to help a student learn a concept, or to help the student connect multiple related concepts together.
- Using AI to generate practice exams for the purpose of revision.
For example, the student may ask an AI tool to generate a series of knowledge-based questions based on the movement of blood through the heart.

Students are generally prohibited from using AI tools as part of their **assessment** activities. Unacceptable uses of AI in assessment activities includes:

- Using AI to generate responses to written questions asked in assessment tasks.
Example: A student uses AI to generate a response to a written assessment task, and then copies and pastes that response and submits the answer as an attempt.
It is unacceptable to use copy and paste of **any** part of an AI generated response in an assessment task, even if the student rewords sections of the response this would

be unacceptable.

- Using AI to generate responses to multiple choice questions asked in assessment tasks.

Example: A student enters a multiple-choice question into AI to determine what the correct response should be.

It is unacceptable to submit answers to any assessment task that were not generated by the student.

Students are encouraged to seek guidance from the APC Trainers and Assessors on the appropriate use of AI technologies within their respective fields of study.

Consequences of Violations when using AI

Violations of this policy may result in disciplinary actions, including but not limited to academic or monetary penalties, suspension, or expulsion, in accordance with the APC's Student Code of Conduct.

Use of AI technology to assist with submitting assessment tasks is considered a Risk Rating 3 outlined in this policy and may result in the student receiving a Not Yet Satisfactory result for the unit, and they will be required to pay additional fees to undertake the unit again; or the student may be expelled from the APC and not allowed to re-enrol.

The APC reserves the right to investigate any suspected breaches of this policy and take appropriate actions to uphold the integrity of the academic environment.

Academic Misconduct

Academic misconduct is involvement in any of the below acts, which are prohibited by students enrolled with APC:

- **Plagiarism** - The reproduction of original creations of another author (individual, collective, organisation, community or other type of author, including anonymous authors or AI) without due acknowledgment.
- **Fabrication** - The falsification of data or information for assessment purposes.
- **Deception** - Providing false information concerning an assessment activity –e.g. falsely claiming to have submitted work, or allowing another student or individual to complete an assessment task on your behalf.
- **Cheating** - use of another's work to copy and submit as your own (eg. an APC student, a non-APC student, AI, or any other person). This includes whether the person who's work is submitted is aware of the cheating or not.
- **Collusion** – when more than one individual contributes to a piece of work that is then submitted as the work of the individual (e.g. when another student writes an answer to an assessment for you, or any other behaviour from another individual to assist you to cheat). Collusion can also occur when a student does not take reasonable steps to ensure prevention of other students using their work (e.g. providing your completed assessment to another student, placing your answers in an open forum, or allowing someone else to do so)
- **Bribery** - Providing assessment answers or test answers for money or favour.
- **Sabotage** - Acting to prevent others from completing their work. This includes cutting pages out of library books or wilfully disrupting the experiments of others.
- **Trainer/Assessor misconduct** - any acts by APC Trainer/Assessors that equate to academic misconduct.
- **Impersonation** - assuming a student's identity with intent to provide assessments to advantage a student.

Furthermore, it is crucial to highlight that academic misconduct encompasses not only the previously mentioned actions but also any conduct that undermines the integrity of the evaluation process.

Procedural Fairness

APC will apply procedural fairness to their decision making. Procedural fairness is concerned with the procedures used at APC, rather than the actual outcome reached. It requires that a fair and proper procedure be used when deciding on an outcome for an academic issue or complaint. APC will follow a fair procedure as outlined below to reach a fair and correct decision for theoretical and practical components of the enrolled course.

During the clinical intensive workshops, students will be grouped and removed from any assessment scenarios taking place they are not participating in. This ensures no disadvantage or additional preparation for students participating in assessment at a later session or date.

Responsibilities and Obligations

The Quality Practice and Compliance Manager, Training Manager, and Trainers and Assessors operate under the authority and delegation of the Managing Director.

APC ensures that staff and students are aware of their obligations and consequences regarding Academic integrity:

- Apply fair and proper decision-making procedures when making decisions relating to Academic Integrity.
- Comply with the current legislation relating to academic integrity and demonstrate compliance through developed policies, processes, and research information for all stakeholder access.
- Ensure systematic processes to determine breaches and outcomes relating to academic misconduct.
- Provide systematic access and information for trainers, assessors, students, and stakeholders related to academic integrity (what it is, how it occurs, how APC manages not adhering to the same).
- Maintain and review policies and procedures to support compliance and academic integrity information.
- Actively and systematically address identified or reported breaches of academic misconduct with relevant employees and the participants.

APC Responsibilities and Obligations

- Comply with legislation and policies relating to academic misconduct, demonstrating compliance through their own activities and actions.
- Provide information to students regarding their obligations and potential ramifications regarding academic integrity, legislation, and policy.
- Diligence in the detection of academic misconduct.
- Ensure that participants have information regarding obligations and requirements relating to academic misconduct.
- Ensure participants are aware of the requirements regarding their assessments were working with others or independently.
- In the event of identified academic misconduct, provide the student with a formal letter of warning, identifying justification and reference to the breach.

Student Responsibilities and Obligations

- To read, understand and comply with information and obligations relating to the APC academic integrity training module and policy.
- Apply suitable referencing (a genuine attempt to support referencing).
- Appropriately acknowledge work that has been sourced from others.
- Take reasonable steps to avoid work being reproduced by other participants.
- Respond in writing, where relevant via the appeal process to any notification of academic misconduct where the allegation is believed to be unjustified.

Action and Penalties

APC will address academic misconduct with students who do not uphold the principles of academic integrity appropriately, consistently, and fairly.

Where an academic misconduct allegation is supported, the student will be subject to penalties in accordance with the severity of the misconduct and the number of repeat offenses.

Assessment and Academic Integrity Policy

Students under investigation for academic misconduct may not be eligible for the following, in consideration of the severity of the issue and until the issue is resolved:

- Participation in training and assessment activities
- Access to Moodle or other educational resources
- Issuance of qualifications/outcomes
- Clinical Workshop attendance
- Clinical Placement attendance

APC will deter academic misconduct whether minor or substantial by informing students of the need for academic integrity and assisting students to identify and adopt alternate practices to prevent academic misconduct.

Where an assessor has confirmed that an assessment submission involves academic misconduct, the assessor will provide the student with a formal letter identifying areas of concern, inclusive of evidence to support the allegation.

This involves:

- Investigating and gathering facts pertaining to the breach
- Notifying the student in writing of the alleged breach
- Providing details and justification of the breach, inclusive of the decision and action required
- Advising all stakeholders of outcomes

Notification Process

Where academic misconduct has been identified within an assessment task, an assessor will deem the assessment as Not Yet Satisfactory (NYS) and will provide the student with a notification breach via email with a formal letter detailing the breach and actions required.

APC will provide the below Risk Ratings to students who do not comply with this policy, depending on the severity of the misconduct.

Academic Integrity Risk Rating

APC shall provide a risk rating to students found breaching the academic integrity depending on the severity of the breach.

Risk Rating 1 – Student has minorly breached academic integrity.

Examples:

- A single occurrence of failure to reference work appropriately which is deemed to be intentional or occurs through lack of reasonable care
- Evidence of obtaining the answer to a specific assessment task from another individual (regardless of if the answer was used in your assessment response or not), or attempting to seek any other help which would be considered academic misconduct (e.g. posting a request for answers to a specific assessment task on a forum)

When receiving a Risk Rating 1, the student may be required to:

- Reattempt the aforementioned assessment task based on the assessor's feedback
- Review education materials provided within the APC academic integrity training module
- Perform any other penalties deemed appropriate by APC, such as completing a reflective piece

Risk Rating 2 – Student has moderately breached academic integrity, or a second offence occurs

Examples:

- Recurrent occasions of failure to reference work appropriately which is deemed to be intentional or occurs through lack of reasonable care
- Evidence of copying and pasting parts of another individual's work
- Evidence of utilising another student's assessment as a guide to answer assessment tasks
- Failure to take reasonable steps to prevent another student from utilising your work for assistance in completing their own

When receiving a Risk Rating 2, the student may be required to:

- Reattempt the aforementioned assessment task based on the assessor's feedback
- Complete the APC academic integrity training module and assessment on the portal
- Schedule a phone call with a Trainer and Assessor to discuss and ensure understanding of the module and assessment feedback.
- Perform any other penalties deemed appropriate by the APC, such as completing a reflective piece.
- The student may also receive a Not Yet Satisfactory (NYS) for the unit(s) and may be required to pay additional fees to undertake the unit again, which includes resubmission of all assessments. This penalty can also be applied retrospectively (e.g., an assessment decision can be reviewed at any point where academic misconduct has been noted)

Risk Rating 3 – Student has severely breached academic integrity, or a third offence occurs

Examples:

- Submitting another individual's entire assessment (or a substantial part) as your own work
- Colluding with another student to assist with assessment completion
- The use of any AI-generated content in responses to assessments.
- Posting copyrighted APC assessments to online forums (e.g. uploading assessments, either completed or not, to online locations for other individuals use)
- Posting copyrighted APC materials to online resources or third party providers (e.g. uploading learner guides to online sources), or utilising and sharing APC copyrighted materials without approval

When receiving a Risk Rating 3, the student may be required to:

- Reattempt the aforementioned assessment task based on the assessor feedback
- Complete APC academic integrity training module and self-reflection on academic misconduct.
- Schedule a phone call with the Training Manager to discuss and ensure understanding of the breach and its consequences.
- Perform any other penalties deemed appropriate by APC
- The student may also receive a Not Yet Satisfactory (NYS) for the unit(s) and may be required to pay additional fees to undertake the unit again, which includes resubmission of all assessments. This penalty can also be applied retrospectively (e.g., an assessment decision can be reviewed at any point where academic misconduct has been noted)
- The student may be required to complete an alternate unit or assessment the student must complete, for serious or repeated breaches the student may face expulsion from the College entirely and will not be allowed to re-enrol in any APC programs.

Severe breaches of this policy may not receive prior-warning and may be acted upon immediately by the college.

Where a student is discovered to have committed multiple violations of the academic integrity policy in one instance, such as cheating on multiple assessment tasks, they may be immediately deemed to have committed a second or third offense due to each occurrence.

Spot checks

Where a trainer and assessor suspect academic misconduct, a phone call may be made to the student to confirm assessment answers submitted to ensure understanding of concepts.

Release of copyrighted materials

Where a student is identified as sharing any APC copyrighted materials (e.g., Learner Guides, Assessment Tasks, assessment answers) online or offline to third-party organisations or other individuals, direct contact will be made. Action will be taken to address this based on severity, and student enrolment may be impacted.

Appeals and Review of Decisions

All students have the option to make an appeal where the student believes that the consequence for the identified breach is not justified, and/or should they disagree with the breach decision.

Appeals must be submitted within five (5) business days from receipt of the breach. These must be submitted via the appeals form attached to the breach email to compliance@apcollege.edu.au for a formal review.

Your appeal will be reviewed by the management team and will not include the original assessor.

You will be advised of the outcome in writing within five (5) days to support the continuation of studies.

Additional Support

If a student has exhausted all online resources provided by APC and still requires additional support, they may contact an assessor at trainer@apcollege.edu.au. Assessors will also monitor the progress of the students and schedule additional calls from time to time.

Please refer to the *Support Policy* located on the website for further information.

Reasonable Adjustment

APC recognises the importance of providing reasonable adjustments for students with disabilities or other circumstances that may impact their ability to complete assessments. Reasonable adjustments are to be provided on a case-by-case basis and must be approved by the Compliance Department prior to commencement.

An application form can be requested by students where a specific assessment task cannot be demonstrated properly. A completed form and additional documentation must be emailed to compliance@apcollege.edu.au for review. Evidence to support inability to complete the standard assessment task may be required to assist with a student's application for reasonable adjustment such as medical certificates or a workplace letter.

Once an application has a decision, the student will be informed of any adjustments to assessment if applicable.