

Student Academic Integrity Policy (MPF1310)

1. Objective

1.1. This policy sets out the principles, requirements and responsibilities for upholding student academic integrity at the University.

2. Scope

2.1. This policy applies to:

- a) all students of the University as defined in Academic Board Regulation, Part 9 – Academic Integrity when involved in University activities
- b) staff in relation to the promotion of student academic integrity standards and the detection and management of alleged student academic integrity breaches.

2.2. Potential misconduct by students in the conduct of research is managed in accordance with the Research Integrity and Misconduct Policy (MPF1318).

3. Authority

3.1. This policy is made under the University of Melbourne Act 2009 (Vic), the University of Melbourne Statute and the Academic Board Regulation.

4. Policy

Principles

4.1. Academic integrity means acting with the core values of honesty, trust, fairness, respect, responsibility and courage in all academic endeavors, ensuring ethical and transparent scholarship.

4.2. All students and staff at the University of Melbourne are expected to conduct themselves in a manner that is consistent with academic integrity values, and principles as set out in this policy.

4.3. The University will promote and foster a culture of academic integrity by implementing effective measures to uphold the integrity of its academic activities.

4.4. The University's approach to academic integrity is underpinned by education and training aimed at furthering the development of proper scholarly practices.

4.5. Maintenance of academic integrity is integral to education and assessment. It enables the fair and valid evaluation of students' learning and achievements and assures the attainment of subject and course learning outcomes.

Responsibilities

4.6. The University will provide effective education, support and resources to ensure that:

- a) students are appropriately inducted into the University community and understand the scholarly practices and standards required to maintain academic integrity
- b) students are aware that failure to maintain academic integrity may constitute academic misconduct, as defined in the Academic Board Regulation, Part 9 – Academic Integrity

- c) staff are empowered to promote ethical scholarly conduct by modelling this behaviour and taking reasonable actions to prevent, identify and respond to breaches of academic integrity.

4.7. Students have a responsibility to:

- a) actively engage with academic integrity education provided by the University and seek advice when required
- b) comply with university policies and procedures related to academic activities and follow reasonable direction by University staff
- c) demonstrate the scholarly practices and standards appropriate to their discipline and future professional practice
- d) not engage in conduct that may lead to an academic advantage or advancement for themselves or any other person by unauthorised, unscholarly, or unfair means.

4.8. The Academic Registrar has a responsibility to:

- a) ensure the provision of effective University-wide services that support the development of academic skills including but not limited to English-language capabilities
- b) ensure effective and appropriate investigation and management of serious academic misconduct (Level 2) matters.

4.9. The Deputy-Vice Chancellor (Academic) has a responsibility to:

- a) ensure the provision of effective University-wide education, detection and prevention strategies that foster an environment that supports academic integrity
- b) ensure that academic integrity breach data is analysed to inform quality assurance, learning and teaching practices, and process improvement
- c) ensure that reasonable steps are taken to assure that academic integrity is maintained in any University subject or course delivered in whole or in part through third-party arrangements
- d) ensure that effective processes are in place to identify and respond to potential or actual risks to academic integrity
- e) approve University wide processes that give effect to the principles and requirements of this policy
- f) report to the Academic Board on trends and strategies to mitigate breaches of academic integrity.

4.10. Deans have a responsibility to:

- a) ensure that their faculty has effective education, detection and prevention strategies to support academic integrity
- b) support faculty staff, through the provision of education and resources, to exemplify and promote good scholarly practices and foster an environment that supports academic integrity
- c) ensure effective and appropriate investigation and management of academic misconduct (Level 1) matters
- d) monitor and respond to trends in academic integrity breaches.

4.11. Academic staff have a responsibility to:

- a) exemplify and promote good scholarly practices and foster an environment that supports academic integrity
- b) ensure that for subjects and courses they are responsible for:

- i. students receive appropriate education and training about disciplinary standards and the expectations of academic integrity
 - ii. assessment tasks are designed to minimise the opportunity for academic misconduct, in accordance with the Assessment and Results Policy (MPF1326)
 - iii. academic integrity requirements are clearly articulated in relevant material such as the handbook, assessment or examination rules, the learning management system and the subject outline.
- c) report suspected breaches of student academic integrity standards in accordance with this policy and corresponding processes authorised by this policy.

Breaches of student academic integrity standards

4.12. Breaches of academic integrity standards by a student include (but are not limited to) attempts to gain, for themselves or another person, an unfair academic advantage or advancement through:

a) Plagiarism	Submitting work or ideas that are not one's own without acknowledging, citing or referencing the original source of the work or ideas.
b) Unauthorised reuse of previous work (self-plagiarism)	Submitting in whole or in part, one's own work for multiple assessments without prior written approval
c) Breach of examination or assessment rules or directions	Failing to comply with rules or directions in relation to examinations or other forms of assessment, including the possession or use of unauthorised and/or prohibited information, technologies or materials
d) Falsification or misrepresentation of data	Falsifying, fabricating or misrepresenting data, results or analysis for assessment
e) Unauthorised use of technology	<p>Utilising generative artificial intelligence software or other technology in assessment or examination where:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • it is permitted but used without proper citation, or • it is not permissible in a subject or course. <p>This includes but is not limited to the unauthorised use of technology to:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • disguise plagiarism or other forms of academic misconduct • generate or modify text or code • translate text between languages • make extensive correction to written expression • create or modify designs and images <p>This does not include the use of software or other assistive technology in assessment or examination under an approved Academic Adjustment Plan.</p>
f) Collusion	<p>Engaging in unauthorised collaboration with one or more students in the production of assessable work. Collusion includes but is not limited to:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • jointly producing or submitting assessable work as independent work when it has been produced in whole or part in collusion with one or more other students, in contravention of the assessment or examination rules. • sharing or using previously submitted assessable work or study notes in collusion with one or more other students for

	the purpose of gaining or providing an unfair academic advantage.
g) Assessment outsourcing ('Contract cheating')	Outsourcing or assisting another student to outsource the production of assessable work in whole or in part or engage in academic activities, including but not limited to: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • purchasing, commissioning, or selling assessable work • engaging another person to complete an examination or any form of assessment • allowing oneself to be impersonated in order to sit examinations, attend classes, engage in academic activities, or gain access to university systems or services • impersonating another student in order to sit examinations, attend classes, engage in academic activities, or gain access to university systems or services • facilitating, promoting, or advertising methods of academic misconduct or academic cheating services
h) Unauthorised access or sharing of intellectual property	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Distributing or attempting to distribute the University's or another person's intellectual property without permission • Gaining or attempting to gain unauthorised access to intellectual property, examination papers or academic materials • Accessing or distributing files that contain answers to exams, quizzes, or other forms of assessment
i) Undue influence ('Coercion')	Exerting undue influence on an assessor or other university staff member, or other student or students. This includes but is not limited to threatening, intimidating or exploitative acts, bribes or inducements that have the purpose or effect of gaining an unfair or unjustified academic advantage or advancement.
j) Academic fraud	Engaging in any fraudulent act which has the purpose or effect of gaining an unfair or unjustified academic advantage or advancement, including but not limited to: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Submitting forged or falsified documents, such as transcripts or medical certificates • Falsely claiming an identity, qualification, prior learning or professional experience
k) Misuse of University resources	Using academic resources, forums, facilities, or systems (including computing and network facilities) to gain an unfair academic advantage or advancement for themselves or another student.
l) Cheating	Otherwise engaging in any other form of conduct that has the purpose or effect of gaining an unfair or unjustified academic advantage or advancement by dishonest means, whether or not the advantage or advancement was obtained.

4.13. Categories of behaviour or conduct which constitute academic misconduct (Level 1) and serious academic misconduct (Level 2) are provided in [Schedule 1: Academic misconduct](#).

Fair Management of Academic Misconduct Allegations

4.14. Academic misconduct proceedings will be transparent, equitable and fair, and consistent with the principles of natural justice.

4.15. Students who are the subject of an allegation of academic misconduct will have the opportunity to:

- a) review any evidence provided to the decision maker
- b) present their own evidence to the decision maker, and
- c) respond to the decision maker verbally and in writing.

4.16. Outcomes of academic misconduct will be determined through a fair investigation and hearing process, ensuring that any breaches of student academic integrity standards are addressed appropriately, proportionately, consistently, and in a timely manner.

4.17. The privacy and confidentiality of all parties will be respected. The University will manage student academic integrity breach data in accordance with the Privacy Policy (MPF1104) and Records Management Policy (MPF1106).

5. Procedural Principles

Detection of academic integrity breaches

5.1. The University will use reasonable means to proactively detect breaches of student academic integrity standards including:

- a) supporting students to:
 - i. report any contact or solicitation from companies or entities that promote cheating, plagiarism, or any other forms of academic dishonesty
 - ii. report, confidentially and in good faith, suspected academic integrity breaches committed by their peers
 - iii. demonstrate honesty and responsibility by self-reporting any personal breaches of academic integrity
- b) the use of technology including but not limited to text-matching software, language analysis software, metadata, investigation software, and remote supervision software
- c) manual review and monitoring by professional and academic staff.

5.2. Following each teaching period, the Academic Registrar or a dean is responsible for examining data related to instances of poor academic practice to identify matters that may warrant further review, including but not limited to:

- i. potential breaches of student academic integrity standards,
- ii. students who are at risk of not successfully completing their course of study, who may require targeted referral to academic and non-academic support services,
- iii. subjects that may require review or modification to assessment design in accordance with 4.38. of the [Assessment and Results Policy \(MPF1326\)](#).

Poor academic practice

5.3. Poor academic practice may occur as part of the learning process. Identification of poor academic practice is not a finding of academic misconduct.

5.4. The relevant subject coordinator may determine an incident is the result of poor academic practice where the activity:

- a) is reasonably judged to be a minor and unintentional departure from accepted scholarly conventions or failure to comply with assessment guidelines
- b) is characterised by inexperience, lack of student knowledge, or poor academic skills

c) occurs in the normal course of learning the techniques, methodologies and presentation conventions that are accepted within a discipline area, and

d) the impact of the incident does not compromise the purpose and/or integrity of the assessment.

5.5. In determining whether a student has engaged in poor academic practice (and the identification, or exclusion, of potential breaches), the subject coordinator may request that the student:

a) discuss or explain components of their assessment tasks to demonstrate authorship, and/or

b) authenticate their learning on the assessment task, for example by showing materials used in the preparation of the task.

5.6. Where the relevant subject coordinator determines the incident is the result of poor academic practice, they:

a) must explain to the student the nature of the poor academic practice,

b) must advise that the same or similar actions in future may constitute a breach of academic integrity, and

c) may, where relevant, refer the student to undertake an educative course of action.

5.7. The subject coordinator may treat the poor academic practice as an assessment matter and:

a) manage the lapses in academic conventions within the marking and assessment guidelines set by the Board of Examiners, in accordance with 4.38 b) of the Assessment and Results Policy (MPF1326), or

b) permit the student to re-submit the assessment item in whole or in part. Where the student would otherwise fail the assessment due to the poor academic practice, the subject coordinator has the discretion to cap the grade for the resubmitted assessment item at 50%.

5.8. The incident, its subsequent classification as poor academic practice and any grade cap applied, must be recorded in the case management system.

5.9. If, during the initiation of a classification of poor academic practice, the subject coordinator becomes aware that the breach may be more substantial, a report or allegation may be raised in accordance with clause 5.10.

Reporting potential student academic integrity breaches

5.10. Any person, or group of persons, may report or raise an allegation of student academic misconduct to the University.

5.11. A report or allegation of student academic misconduct or serious student academic misconduct must be recorded in the case management system.

5.12. Students may self-report to the University that they may have breached the University's academic integrity standards.

5.13. The University investigates external or anonymous reports of student academic misconduct at its discretion, considering:

a) the nature and seriousness of the alleged breach

b) whether there is sufficient information for an investigation to be conducted, and

c) the extent to which the anonymity, confidentiality and privacy of the reporter can be maintained.

5.14. Where a report or allegation of student academic misconduct or serious student academic misconduct appears to involve a potential breach of research integrity, the matter must be reported to the Office of Research Integrity where action may be taken in accordance with the Research Integrity and Misconduct Policy (MPF1318).

Preliminary review and investigation of potential student academic integrity breaches

- 5.15. A faculty case manager appointed by the dean may receive and manage reports or allegations of student academic misconduct (Level 1).
- 5.16. A central case manager appointed by the Academic Registrar (or delegate) may receive and manage reports or allegations of student academic misconduct (Level 1) and serious student academic misconduct (Level 2).
- 5.17. Assessment of a potential breach will commence within 10 University business days of lodgement and be finalised as soon as reasonably practicable.
- 5.18. The case manager will undertake a preliminary review of the suspected academic integrity breach to assess:
- a) the category or categories of the suspected breach
 - b) whether the case has sufficient merit to proceed with a formal allegation of academic misconduct, having due regard to:
 - i. the student's level of knowledge and experience, including the extent of general academic integrity training provided by the University and education as to discipline specific practices,
 - ii. any prior breaches of academic integrity or incidences of poor academic practice, and the outcome and/or educative response taken,
 - c) whether there is sufficient evidence to progress the matter to a hearing by:
 - i. a Faculty Academic Integrity Officer for student academic misconduct (Level 1), or
 - ii. the Student Academic Misconduct Committee for serious student academic misconduct (Level 2).
- 5.19. The case manager may undertake activities to aid in the identification, or exclusion, of potential breaches, including:
- a) inviting a student to respond to any anomalies found in documentation submitted for academic advantage or advancement, including but not limited to assessment, credit, enrolment and academic progress, and explain the circumstances in which the anomalies may have arisen.
 - b) engaging an academic staff member with appropriate expertise to meet with the student to discuss or explain components of their assessment tasks to verify the student's understanding and authorship of the work.
 - c) requesting that the student provide evidence, for review by an academic staff member with appropriate expertise, to authenticate the student's authorship of the assessment task, for example by showing notes, drafts or resource materials used in the preparation of the work.
 - d) referring a request to commission an internal or external investigation, where relevant expertise is required.
 - e) utilising software including but not limited to text-matching software, language analysis software, metadata investigation software and remote supervision software.
- 5.20. A student is not obliged to participate in or contribute to any activities outlined under clause 5.19.
- 5.21. Where a student decides to participate in a meeting under clause 5.19, they may bring a support person provided that the support person is not a qualified legal practitioner.
- 5.22. Where alleged conduct may appear to be serious academic misconduct in light of the severity, scale and potential consequences of the misconduct, the faculty case manager must refer the matter to a central case manager appointed by the Academic Registrar under clause 5.24.b).

5.23. Where there is insufficient or no evidence to support a formal allegation of academic misconduct, the case manager will:

- a) notify relevant University staff that the preliminary review into the report or allegation of academic misconduct has concluded, and
- b) record that there is no case for the student to answer in the case management system.

Formal allegations of student academic misconduct

5.24. The decision to issue a formal allegation of academic misconduct is made by a senior member of the academic or professional staff with relevant subject matter expertise or training:

- a) appointed by the dean for an allegation of student academic misconduct (Level 1), or
- b) appointed by the Academic Registrar for an allegation of serious student academic misconduct (Level 2).

5.25. Where an allegation of academic misconduct against a student or students is to be heard, the relevant case manager must, within 10 University business days of the decision to issue an allegation:

- a) refer the matter to determination by:
 - i. a Faculty Academic Integrity Officer for student academic misconduct (Level 1), or
 - ii. Student Academic Misconduct Committee for serious student academic misconduct (Level 2).
- b) provide a notice to the student, or students, setting out the allegation of academic misconduct and containing the details set out in sections 5.29.

5.26. Where the allegation of academic misconduct involves more than one student, the students' individual cases are heard separately.

5.27. Where both academic misconduct and general misconduct are alleged to have been committed by a student arising from one incident or closely related incidents, the Academic Secretary will decide whether the matter will be heard as academic or general misconduct, or both.

5.28. A written allegation notice must:

- a) set out the regulations and policies which are alleged to have been breached as well as all relevant allegations of fact, action or omission in support of the allegation
- b) attach copies of any primary documents that support or substantiate the allegations of fact
- c) set out the means for the student to:
 - i. provide in writing an explanation or submission or evidence in response to the allegation, and
 - ii. be heard, in person or via video-conference, by the decision maker in relation to it
 - iii. be accompanied at the hearing by a support person
- d) inform the student that they may seek independent advice, including but not limited to, the Student Union Advocacy Services
- e) advise the student of possible outcomes that can include expulsion from the University or suspension and referring them to support services, and
- f) refer the student to the relevant provisions of the Academic Board Regulation and this policy.

5.29. Any notice to a student is emailed to the student's official university email account or last known email address.

5.30. A notice is deemed to have been received on the same day that it is sent by email.

5.31. A copy of any allegation notice sent to the student must be retained in the case management system.

Hearing student academic misconduct allegations

Notice periods

5.32. The hearing may not be scheduled earlier than ten (10) University business days from the date of the written allegation and provision of primary supporting documents relating to the alleged misconduct.

5.33. Any additional documents relevant to the alleged student academic misconduct that could not be provided with the allegation notice must be received by the student no less than five (5) University business days prior to the hearing.

5.34. All papers must be sent to the Faculty Academic Integrity Officer or Student Academic Misconduct Committee and the student no less than five (5) University business days prior to the hearing.

5.35. The Faculty Academic Integrity Officer or Student Academic Misconduct Committee must hear the matter within 25 University business days of the date of the allegation notice.

5.36. The student and Faculty Academic Integrity Officer or chair of the Student Academic Misconduct Committee may agree in writing at any time to extend or shorten the time limits documented in this policy or to reschedule the date, time and place for any meeting of the hearing.

Student attendance and written submission

5.37. If a student wishes to attend the hearing and/or make a written submission or provide evidence, the student must notify the University by email or via the case management system within five (5) University business days of the date of the allegation notice.

5.38. Any written submission or evidence in response to the allegation must be provided by the student no less than 48 hours prior to the matter being heard by the Faculty Academic Integrity Officer or Student Academic Misconduct Committee.

5.39. If a student does not respond to the allegation notice or does not attend a hearing that they have confirmed, the Faculty Academic Integrity Officer or Student Academic Misconduct Committee may hear the allegation in the absence any information supplied by the student.

5.40. The student may not send a representative in their place.

Support at a hearing

5.41. No later than 24 hours before the scheduled commencement of the hearing, the student may notify the Chair that they wish to have a specified person present at the hearing (support person). The support person may not be:

- a) a person who was involved in, associated with, or alleged to have been involved in or associated with the misconduct alleged in the allegation notice, or any other conflict of interest
- b) a qualified legal practitioner unless permitted by the Faculty Academic Integrity Officer or chair of the Student Academic Committee hearing the case.

5.42. The support person accompanying the student in a hearing has no right to be heard, except with the permission of the Faculty Academic Integrity Officer or chair of the Student Academic Misconduct Committee.

5.43. A support person may be excluded from the hearing by the Faculty Academic Integrity Officer or chair of the Student Academic Misconduct Committee if they disrupt or unreasonably impair the conduct of the hearing.

Hearing student academic misconduct (Level 1) allegations

5.44. A Faculty Academic Integrity Officer appointed by the dean under 43(1) of the Academic Board Regulation who has received appropriate University training may hear a formal allegation of student academic misconduct (Level 1).

5.45. Any Faculty Academic Integrity Officer appointed by the dean must be free from bias and any conflict of interest. The Faculty Academic Integrity Officer must:

- a) not have been involved with the investigation or allegation prior to the hearing
- b) not be an examiner of assessment in the subject.

5.46. Following consideration of an allegation of student academic misconduct, a Faculty Academic Integrity Officer must decide, having regard to evidence and on the balance of probabilities – i.e. that a proposition is more likely to be true than not, to:

- a) dismiss the allegation, or
- b) uphold the allegation, in whole or in part, and determine that the alleged conduct constitutes student academic misconduct thereby breaching applicable regulations and/or policies.

Hearing serious student academic misconduct (Level 2) allegations

5.47. A Student Academic Misconduct Committee established by the Deputy Vice-Chancellor (Academic) under 43(1) of the Academic Board Regulation may hear formal allegations of serious student academic misconduct (Level 2).

5.48. The members of each Student Academic Misconduct Committee are:

- a) selected from a pool approved by the Deputy Vice-Chancellor (Academic), and
- b) empaneled for each hearing by the Academic Registrar (or delegate).

5.49. The Student Academic Misconduct Committee must comprise:

- a) a senior member of the academic staff, who will be Chair
- b) one senior member of the academic staff, and
- c) one student nominated by the recognised student organisation.

5.50. Where the student is enrolled in an undergraduate course, subject or group of subjects or program, the student is nominated by the University of Melbourne Student Union (UMSU) President.

5.51. Where the student is enrolled in a graduate course, subject or group of subjects or program, the student is nominated by the University of Melbourne Graduate Student Association (GSA) President.

5.52. The quorum of the Student Academic Misconduct Committee is the Chair and two members.

5.53. All members of the Student Academic Misconduct Committee must have completed appropriate University training.

5.54. All members of the Student Academic Misconduct Committee must be free from bias and any conflict of interest. Members of a Student Academic Misconduct Committee must:

- a) not have been involved with the investigation or allegation prior to the hearing
- b) not be an examiner of assessment in the subject
- c) in regard to the student member, not be a fixed term or continuing member of University staff, or a staff member of a student organisation.

5.55. Notwithstanding requirements set in this section, the President of the Academic Board (or delegate) may vary the composition of a Student Academic Misconduct Committee.

5.56. Following consideration of an allegation of student academic misconduct, the Student Academic Misconduct Committee, having regard to evidence and on the balance of probabilities, must:

- a) dismiss the allegation or
- b) uphold the allegation in whole or in part and determine that the alleged conduct constitutes student academic misconduct or serious student academic misconduct thereby breaching applicable regulations and/or policies.

5.57. The Student Academic Misconduct Committee must dismiss an allegation of academic misconduct or serious academic misconduct unless a majority of the members of the committee are satisfied, on the balance of probabilities, that the allegation has been upheld.

Hearing proceedings

5.58. The Faculty Academic Integrity Officer (Level 1 cases) or chair of the Student Academic Misconduct Committee (Level 2 cases), must appoint a person as secretary to the hearing.

5.59. The secretary will act in an administrative capacity only and does not have voting rights on any matters presented or decided upon during the hearing.

5.60. The Faculty Academic Integrity Officer or chair of the Student Academic Misconduct Committee may adjourn and reconvene any hearing.

5.61. Recording or filming of a hearing is not permitted.

5.62. In determining an allegation of academic misconduct under this section, the Faculty Academic Integrity Officer or Student Academic Misconduct Committee:

- a) may follow any procedure it considers appropriate
- b) is not bound by the rules of evidence or other technicalities or legal forms, and may inform itself in relation to any matter in any manner it deems fit
- c) direct questions to the student and request additional information from any individual whose input is deemed relevant and necessary to enable them to properly determine the matter
- d) must act fairly in all the circumstances, having regard to the requirements of natural justice
- e) may not take into account prior findings of misconduct when deciding whether or not to uphold an allegation of misconduct, and
- f) must allow the student to be accompanied by a support person nominated in accordance with this policy.

5.63. The Faculty Academic Integrity Officer or Student Academic Misconduct Committee must:

- a) make a decision on the evidence before them, ensuring that the determination is made on the balance of probabilities
- b) balance the rights of the individual student with the need for fair and impartial decision-making for all students
- c) preserve the academic integrity of programs and standards on behalf of the University
- d) be scrupulously honest and exercise all due care and diligence in the performance of their duty
- e) avoid any action which could affect their judgement when dealing with the matters under consideration

f) treat each other and University staff and students with professionalism, courtesy, confidentiality and respect.

5.64. Any matters identified in the hearing that may be considered general misconduct must be referred to the Academic Registrar where action may be taken in accordance with the Student Conduct Policy (MPF1324).

Penalties

5.65. A penalty can only be imposed when a student has gone through the disciplinary process in accordance with the Academic Board Regulation, this policy and corresponding processes authorised under this policy.

5.66. Where a Faculty Academic Integrity Officer or Student Academic Misconduct Committee upholds an allegation of academic misconduct or serious academic misconduct against a student, they may impose one or more penalties.

5.67. The Faculty Academic Integrity Officer may impose any penalty outlined in Section 44(1)(a)-(g) of the Academic Board Regulation. The Faculty Academic Integrity Officer is not authorised to impose a penalty of suspension or expulsion.

5.68. The Student Academic Misconduct Committee may impose any penalty outlined in Section 44(1)(a)-(j) of the Academic Board Regulation.

5.69. The hearing secretary must only disclose to the Faculty Academic Integrity Officer or Student Academic Misconduct Committee previous findings of academic misconduct against the student if and when an allegation has been upheld.

5.70. Penalties for academic integrity breaches must reflect consideration of mitigating or exacerbating circumstances surrounding the breach and reflect consideration of the standard penalty range set out in Schedule 1: Academic Misconduct. The following considerations may be used to assist in assessing the proportionality of any penalty imposed:

- a) the extent of the breach, including the severity of the misconduct and its impact on academic integrity
- b) the level of the student's course (graduate or undergraduate), the duration of their enrolment at the University, and the expectations associated with their level of study
- c) the student's knowledge, understanding, and exposure to accepted scholarly practices and cultural norms, including whether discipline practices and requirements have been clearly communicated to the student
- d) any previous breaches of academic integrity, considering only those instances where misconduct has been formally upheld in accordance with the Academic Board Regulation, this policy and corresponding processes authorised under this policy
- e) mitigating circumstances such as personal hardship, illness, demonstrated remorse, and willingness to undertake corrective actions
- f) exacerbating factors such as premeditation, repeat offences, and the negative impact on others within the University community
- g) the potential long-term impact of the penalty on the student's academic and professional future.

5.71. If a student is also a graduate of the University, the Student Academic Misconduct Committee may recommend to Council the revocation of any award where the academic misconduct is:

- a) held to be proven
- b) of a very serious nature, and

c) demonstrated to have occurred in a manner that shows that the award/s already made were obtained because of this misconduct.

5.72. Council may, per the Revocation of Awards Policy (MPF1316):

- a) decide to revoke the award, or
- b) decide not to revoke the award and:
 - i. refer the matter back to the Student Academic Misconduct Committee for further investigation, and
 - ii. instruct the committee to reconsider and substitute the penalty recommended with one or more penalties within the power of the committee to impose, or
 - iii. instruct the committee to take no further action.

Outcome notification

5.73. Within five (5) University business days of the allegation being heard and outcome determined, the student must be provided with written notice of:

- a) the decision of the Faculty Academic Integrity Officer or Student Academic Misconduct Committee
- b) the terms of the decision
- c) any penalty imposed
- d) the reason/s for the decision and any penalty imposed
- e) the right to appeal, and
- f) the availability of independent advice from the Student Union Advocacy Service.

5.74. A copy of any outcome notice sent to the student must be retained in the case management system.

Reinstatement and forfeiture of fees

5.75. A student who has complied with the terms and conditions imposed as part of their suspension will have their enrolment automatically reinstated at the end of the suspension period. Where the student has failed to comply with the terms and conditions of their suspension, the Vice-Chancellor may reinstate the student's enrolment at their discretion.

5.76. No fees paid by a student relating to any period of suspension will be refunded.

5.77. Where a student is expelled under this policy no fees paid by the student will be refunded.

Record keeping

5.78. Academic misconduct must be managed via the case management system. This includes:

- a) all findings of academic misconduct
- b) all penalties imposed in respect of such findings
- c) all records related to allegations, hearings, and outcomes
- d) all cases of poor academic practice, including the details of the nature of any educative response or other outcome arising.

5.79. The records:

- a) form part of the student's disciplinary record

b) are retained in the case management system and the University’s official records management system, but are not retained in the student management system

c) may be made available to persons internal or external to the University per the Privacy Policy (MPF1104).

5.80. Case managers are responsible for ensuring that all records relating to student academic misconduct are managed through the case management system.

Reporting

5.81. On request, the Academic Registrar will issue a student conduct report for graduates seeking admission to the Supreme Court of Victoria to practice law. The report will be submitted to the Victorian Legal Admissions Board.

5.82. The Academic Board will receive academic misconduct reports at least annually identifying:

- a) types of breaches of academic integrity, including outcomes and penalties applied
- b) any issues related to particular assessment types or online assessment tools
- c) strategies put in place to address or mitigate academic integrity.

Appeals

5.83. Appeals against a decision of a Faculty Academic Integrity Officer or Student Academic Misconduct Committee made under this policy must be made in writing to the Academic Secretary within 20 University business days of the date of the outcome of the hearing.

5.84. Where a student chooses not to access the appeal processes within the 20 University business day period or withdraws from the process, the original decision or recommendation will stand.

6. Roles and responsibilities

Role	Responsibility	Conditions or limitations
Academic Registrar	In addition to the responsibilities outlined in cl 4.8: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • appoint central case managers (Level 2) • empanel members to each Student Academic Misconduct Committee 	May delegate to a relevant staff member with responsibility for student academic integrity
Academic staff	Fulfil the responsibilities outlined in cl 4.11:	
Dean	In addition to the responsibilities outlined in cl 4.10: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • provide students with educative materials on academic integrity • appoint faculty case managers • appoint Faculty Academic Integrity Officer in accordance with the Academic Board Regulation 	May delegate to relevant academic staff members with responsibility for student academic integrity
Deputy Vice-Chancellor (Academic)	In addition to the responsibilities outlined in cl 4.9 <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • establish the Student Academic Misconduct Committee in accordance with the Academic Board Regulation • approve the pool from which Student Academic Misconduct 	May delegate to a Pro-Vice Chancellor with responsibility for student academic integrity

	Committee members may be empanelled.	
Faculty Academic Integrity Officers	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ensure appropriate conduct of the hearing make a decision on the balance of probabilities as to whether a breach has occurred may impose a penalty, considering mitigating and exacerbating circumstances 	<p>Must be appointed in accordance with the Academic Board Regulation, this policy and corresponding processes authorised by this policy</p> <p>May not sub-delegate any duties or responsibilities under this policy.</p>
Secretary to the student academic misconduct hearing	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> attend the hearing to provide administrative and professional assistance and support as is required. manage the record of the hearing including outcomes 	
Student Academic Misconduct Committee	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ensure appropriate conduct of the hearing make a decision on the balance of probabilities as to whether a breach has occurred may impose a penalty, considering mitigating and exacerbating circumstances 	<p>Must be appointed in accordance with the Academic Board Regulation, this policy and corresponding processes authorised by this policy</p> <p>May not sub-delegate any duties or responsibilities under this policy.</p>
Students	As outlined in Responsibilities cl 4.7	
Subject coordinator	Determine whether a minor departure from standards may be classified as poor academic practice.	May delegate to a senior tutor with responsibility for student academic integrity

7. Definitions

academic integrity means acting with the core values of honesty, fairness, trust, respect and responsibility in all academic endeavours, ensuring ethical and transparent scholarship.

academic misconduct has the meaning given to it in Academic Board Regulation, Part 9 – Academic Integrity.

assessment means assessment in accordance with the Academic Board Regulation and policies determined by the Board

assessment materials means any resources that support any part of the assessment process.

University business day has the meaning given to it in Academic Board Regulation, Part 9 – Academic Integrity.

case management system means the case management system adopted by the University manage academic misconduct cases

case manager means:

(a) A faculty case manager appointed by the dean may receive and manage reports or allegations of student academic misconduct (Level 1).

(b) A central case manager appointed by the Academic Registrar (or delegate) may receive and manage reports or allegations of student academic misconduct (Level 1) and serious student academic misconduct (Level 2).

computing and network facilities includes, but is not limited to, computers, computer systems, data network infrastructure, dial-in network access facilities, email and other communications and information facilities together with associated equipment, software, files and data storage and retrieval facilities, all of which are owned or operated by the University and form part of the central facilities or the local facilities, as the case may be.

dean means:

(a) where an allegation of academic misconduct relates to a single subject pertaining to or assigned for administrative purposes to a faculty, the dean of that faculty

(b) where an allegation of academic misconduct relates to a group of subjects, a course or research higher degree pertaining to or assigned for administrative purposes to a faculty, the dean of that faculty or, where there is more than one faculty, the dean of the faculty nominated by the president of the Academic Board

(c) where an allegation of academic misconduct relates to a course, subject or group of subjects offered at an affiliated educational establishment, the director or dean of that affiliated educational establishment

(d) where an allegation of academic misconduct relates to any other course, subject or group of subjects, the dean or other person determined by the president of the Academic Board to be the dean for the purpose of this policy.

educative response means an action focused on assisting a student to understand the error and learn better techniques.

expulsion has the meaning given to it in Academic Board Regulation, Part 9 – Academic Integrity.

natural justice means the rules against bias and the right to a fair hearing

revocation of award means the recall and permanent destruction by the University of a degree, diploma, certificate or other award conferred or granted by the University or an antecedent or affiliated institution.

senior member of the academic staff means a member of academic staff appointed at or above classification Level C.

senior member of the professional staff means a member of the professional staff appointed at or above UOM 10 (SM1 or SM2) level.

serious academic misconduct has the meaning given to it in Academic Board Regulation, Part 9 – Academic Integrity.

student has the meaning given to it in Academic Board Regulation, Part 9 – Academic Integrity.

subject means a subject offered on an assessed or a non-assessed basis.

subject coordinator means an academic staff member with overall responsibility for the planning and delivery of a subject.

suspension has the meaning given to it in Academic Board Regulation, Part 9 – Academic Integrity.

teaching period means a defined period of delivery of subjects, such as a semester or term.

termination of enrolment means the termination of a student's enrolment at the University and cancellation of the student's enrolment. "Terminate" and "terminated" have a corresponding meaning.

University has the meaning given to it in Academic Board Regulation, Part 9 – Academic Integrity.

University activities has the meaning given to it in the Vice-Chancellor Regulation.

POLICY APPROVER

Academic Board

POLICY STEWARD

Academic Secretary

REVIEW

This policy is to be reviewed by >>TBC<<.

VERSION HISTORY

DRAFT

Schedule 1: Academic misconduct

This schedule details the categories of academic misconduct and typical penalty range. If a student is found to have engaged in any academic misconduct conduct, including those not specifically listed here, with a view to gaining unfair advantage, whether or not the advantage has been gained, the decision maker:

- may apply any penalty available to them under the Academic Board Regulation, and
- should exercise their judgment in deciding the level of penalty which should apply having regard to the principle of proportionality and taking into account the considerations set out at clause 5.70.

Misconduct category	Standard penalty range where the allegation is upheld								
	Reprimand and caution	Course of corrective action	Resubmission, or revision and resubmission, the whole or part of the assessment, examination or research	Disallow or amend a mark or grade for the whole or part of the assessment, examination or research	Failure in a subject	Impose conditions or restrictions on a student's access to University premises, facilities, services, and/or participation in University activities	Suspension of enrolment for a period not exceeding 12 months	Expulsion from course (termination of enrolment and exclusion from the University without any right to enrol or re-enrol in any course or subject at the University)	Revocation of the award (if already conferred)
Academic misconduct (Level 1)									
Plagiarism	X	X	X	X	X	Repeated, systematic and/or high impact breaches of academic misconduct (Level 1) by a student: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • may be considered serious student academic misconduct (Level 2) • be heard by the Student Academic Conduct Committee, and • may attract a more serious penalty. 			
Unauthorised re-use of previous work	X	X	X	X	X				
Breach of examination or assessment rules or directions	X	X	X	X	X				
Falsifying or misrepresenting data or results	X	X	X	X	X				
Unauthorised use of technology	X	X	X	X	X				
Collusion	X	X	X	X	X				
Cheating (minor, not otherwise classified)	X	X	X	X	X				
Serious academic misconduct (Level 2)									
Contract cheating	Where it is demonstrated that there are mitigating circumstances surrounding the breach, following the decision to uphold the finding of academic misconduct, the Student Academic Misconduct Committee may exercise discretion and apply a lesser penalty to the standard penalty.				X	X	X	X	X
Unauthorised access or sharing of intellectual property					X	X	X	X	X
Coercion					X	X	X	X	X
Academic fraud					X	X	X	X	X
Misuse of University resources					X	X	X	X	X
Cheating (serious, not otherwise classified)					X	X	X	X	X