

Category: [Student Management and Support](#)

Version: 15

Document Type: Policy

Document Status: Published

Approved On: 12 September, 2024

Audience: Staff, Students, Academic

Effective Date: 01 January, 2025

Review due by: 01 January, 2028

Policy Approver: Academic Board

Policy Steward: Academic Secretary

Supporting Process:

[Student Management and Support Processes](#)

Student Academic Integrity Policy (MPF1310)

1. Objective

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 (including undergraduate coursework students, graduate coursework students and graduate research candidates) 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 are expected to conduct themselves in a manner that is consistent with academic integrity values and the principles set out in this policy.
- 4.3. The University will promote and foster a culture of academic integrity by implementing effective measures to promote and uphold the academic standards and reputation of the University.
- 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 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 are responsible for:

- a) actively engaging with academic integrity education provided by the University and seeking advice when required
- b) complying with university policies and procedures related to academic activities and following reasonable direction by University staff
- c) demonstrating the scholarly practices and standards appropriate to their discipline and future professional practice
- d) not engaging 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. Academic staff are responsible for:

- a) exemplifying and promoting good scholarly practices and foster an environment that supports academic integrity
- b) ensuring that for their subjects and courses:
 - 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 assessment or examination rules, the learning management system and the subject outline
- c) reporting suspected breaches of student academic integrity standards in accordance with this policy and supporting University processes.

4.9. Deans are responsible for:

- a) ensuring that their faculty has education, detection and prevention strategies to support academic integrity
- b) supporting 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) ensuring the appropriate investigation and management of academic misconduct (Level 1) matters
- d) monitoring and responding to trends in poor academic practice and academic integrity breaches.

4.10. The Academic Registrar is responsible for:

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

4.11. The Deputy-Vice Chancellor (Academic) is responsible for:

- a) ensuring the provision of University-wide education, detection and prevention strategies that foster an environment that supports academic integrity
- b) ensuring that academic integrity breach data is analysed to inform quality assurance, learning and teaching practices and process improvement
- c) ensuring 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) ensuring that processes are in place to identify and respond to potential or actual risks to academic integrity
- e) approving University-wide processes that give effect to the principles and requirements of this policy
- f) reporting to the Academic Board on trends and strategies to mitigate breaches of academic integrity.

4.12. The Academic Board is responsible for overseeing the maintenance of academic integrity at the University and monitoring potential risks.

Breaches of student academic integrity standards

4.13. Breaches of academic integrity standards by a student that have the purpose or effect of gaining an unfair academic advantage for themselves or another person include, but are not limited to:

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)	Unauthorised reuse of one's own work, in whole or in part, for multiple assessments.
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 or information, including but not limited to results and analysis that is required as part of an assessment.

<p>e) Unauthorised or undisclosed use of technology</p>	<p>Unauthorised or undisclosed use of any technology (including generative artificial intelligence, paraphrasing tools and translation tools) in assessable work. For example, using technology to:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> · disguise plagiarism or other forms of academic misconduct · generate or modify text or code · 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 assessment adjustment plan approved in accordance with the Assessment and Results Policy (MPF1326).</p>
<p>f) Collusion</p>	<p>Engaging in unauthorised collaboration with one or more students in the production or submission of assessable work which has been restricted to individual effort.</p>
<p>g) Assessment outsourcing (contract cheating)</p>	<p>Outsourcing or assisting another student to outsource the production of assessable work in whole or in part or engage in academic activities. This includes but is not limited to:</p> <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 or 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 file access or sharing	Accessing, sharing, selling or purchasing the University's or another person's or entity's intellectual property or materials without authorisation.
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.
j) Academic fraud	Engaging in any fraudulent act, 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 breach academic integrity.
l) Cheating	Otherwise engaging in any other form of dishonest conduct, irrespective of whether the advantage or advancement was obtained.

4.14. 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

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

4.16. 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.

4.17. 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.

4.18. 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, such as text-matching software, language analysis software, metadata, investigation software and remote supervision software
- c) manual review and monitoring by professional and academic staff.

Poor academic practice

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

5.3. A determination of poor academic practice is a matter of academic judgement made by the relevant subject coordinator.

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

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

- 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 considers the incident to be 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, direct the student to an educative response.

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.

Reporting potential student academic integrity breaches

5.9. All University staff, honorary appointees and University visitors are obliged to report a suspected breach of the University's academic integrity standards.

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. The dean must appoint one or more faculty case managers to receive and manage reports or allegations of student academic misconduct (Level 1).

5.16. The Academic Registrar (or delegate) must appoint one or more central case managers to receive and manage reports or allegations of:

- a) serious student academic misconduct (Level 2) and,
- b) where requested by the dean (or delegate), student academic misconduct (Level 1) cases.

5.17. Assessment of a potential breach will commence within 10 University business days of lodgement and must 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 in accordance with clause 4.13
- b) whether the breach is likely to constitute student academic misconduct (Level 1) or serious student academic misconduct (Level 2) in accordance with [Schedule 1: Academic misconduct](#)

- c) 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,
- d) 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, such as 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, such as 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 . The student must be informed in advance that any evidence or disclosures they provide may be used in future misconduct allegations.

5.21. Where the 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 assigned faculty case manager must refer the matter to a central case manager appointed by the Academic Registrar.

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 as soon as reasonably practicable and within 10 University business days of the decision to issue an allegation:

- a) refer the matter for 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 an allegation notice to the student(s) in accordance with this policy.

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.

Allegation notice

5.28. An allegation notice must be made in writing and:

- 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
 - ii. be heard, in person or via videoconference, by the decision maker in relation to it, and
 - 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 arising should the allegation(s) be upheld, and that this may include expulsion from the University or suspension
- f) referring the student to support services, and
- g) 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. For the purpose of calculating notice periods, the date the that the allegation is received is considered to be 'day zero,' with 'day one' commencing on the following University business day.

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 10 University business days from the date the allegation notice was issued and 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 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 University business days prior to the hearing.

5.35. The Faculty Academic Integrity Officer or Student Academic Misconduct Committee must hear the matter within 20 University business days of the date the allegation notice was issued.

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, they must notify the University by email or via the case management system within five University business days of the date the allegation notice was issued.

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 hearing.

5.39. Where a student has been invited to provide a written submission and attend the hearing, and fails to do so, the matter may be heard and decided in their absence.

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

Support at a hearing

5.41. A student who wishes to have a specified person present at the hearing (support person) must notify the chair at least 24 hours before the scheduled commencement of the hearing. The support person may not be a person who:

a) was involved in, associated with or alleged to have been involved in or associated with the misconduct alleged in the allegation notice

b) has any other conflict of interest, or

c) is a qualified legal practitioner unless permitted by the Faculty Academic Integrity Officer or chair of the Student Academic Misconduct 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 Level 1 allegations (Faculty Academic Integrity Officer)

5.44. The dean must appoint one or more Faculty Academic Integrity Officers (in accordance with [xx(x)] of the Academic Board Regulation) to hear formal allegations of student academic misconduct (Level 1).

5.45. All Faculty Academic Integrity Officers must have completed appropriate University training.

5.46. Any Faculty Academic Integrity Officer appointed to hear an allegation of student academic misconduct must be free from bias and any conflict of interest. Further, the Faculty Academic Integrity Officer must:

a) not have been involved with the investigation or allegation prior to the hearing

b) where the allegation relates to a subject, not have participated in teaching or assessment of the subject during the teaching period to which the allegation refers.

5.47. Following consideration of an allegation of student academic misconduct, the Faculty Academic Integrity Officer must decide, having regard to evidence and on the balance of probabilities, to either:

- 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 Level 2 allegations (Student Academic Misconduct Committee)

5.48. A Student Academic Misconduct Committee established by the Deputy Vice-Chancellor (Academic) under Section 44(2) of the Academic Board Regulation may hear formal allegations of serious student academic misconduct (Level 2).

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. 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).

5.51. Student members are nominated to the pool by:

- a) the University of Melbourne Student Union (UMSU) President, if they are enrolled as an undergraduate student, or
- b) the University of Melbourne Graduate Student Association (GSA), if they are enrolled as a graduate student.

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:

- a) have completed appropriate University training
- b) be free from bias and any conflict of interest
- c) not have been involved with the investigation or allegation prior to the hearing
- d) where the allegation relates to a subject, not have participated in teaching or assessment of the subject during the teaching period to which the allegation refers, and
- e) in regard to the student member, not be a fixed term or continuing member of University staff or a fixed term or continuing staff member of a student organisation.

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

5.55. 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 either:

- 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.

5.56. 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

5.57. 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.

5.58. 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.

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

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

5.61. 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) may 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.

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

- a) make a decision to uphold or dismiss the allegation(s) 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.

5.63. 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](#)).

Outcomes for breaches of student academic integrity standards

Penalties

5.64. 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.

5.65. Where the 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.

5.66. In imposing and/or recommending a penalty, the decision maker must consider:

- a) the standard penalty range set out in [Schedule 1: Academic misconduct](#) , and
- b) the following mitigating or exacerbating circumstances surrounding the breach to assess the proportionality of any penalty imposed:
 - i. the extent of the breach, including the severity of the misconduct and its impact on academic integrity
 - ii. 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
 - iii. the student's knowledge and understanding of, and exposure to, accepted scholarly practices and cultural norms, including whether discipline practices and requirements have been clearly communicated to the student
 - iv. any previous findings of academic misconduct against the student formally upheld in accordance with the Academic Board Regulation and corresponding University policy. The hearing secretary may only disclose prior findings of academic misconduct to the Faculty Academic Integrity Officer or Student Academic Misconduct Committee if and when the current allegation has been upheld.
 - v. personal hardship, illness, demonstrated remorse and willingness to undertake corrective actions or other mitigating circumstances
 - vi. premeditation, repeat offences and the negative impact on others within the University community or other exacerbating factors.

5.67. The Faculty Academic Integrity Officer may impose any penalty outlined in Section 46(1) of the Academic Board Regulation.

5.68. For the avoidance of doubt, the Faculty Academic Integrity Officer is not authorised to recommend a penalty of suspension or expulsion, or recommend the revocation of an award.

5.69. The Student Academic Misconduct Committee may impose or recommend any penalty outlined in Section 46(2) of the Academic Board Regulation.

Outcome notification

5.70. Within five 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 to uphold or dismiss the allegation(s)
- b) any penalty imposed
- c) the reason(s) for both the decision and any penalty imposed
- d) the right to appeal, and
- e) the availability of independent advice from the Student Union Advocacy Service.

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

Suspension and expulsion

5.72. Where the Student Academic Misconduct Committee recommends to the Vice-Chancellor that the student's enrolment is suspended or that the student is expelled, the Vice-Chancellor, in accordance with relevant regulations:

- a) must have regard to the terms of the decision and recommendation
- a) is not required to accord a hearing to the student before imposing a penalty, and
- b) may:
 - i. accept the committee's recommendation and expel the student or suspend the student's enrolment (as the case requires)
 - ii. refer the matter back to the committee for reconsideration, or
 - iii. substitute a different penalty.

5.73. Within five University business days of a decision to suspend a student's enrolment or expel a student, the Vice-Chancellor must provide written notice to the student of:

- a) the decision, any terms and conditions of the decision, and a summary of the reasons for the decision,
- b) a copy of the Academic Board Regulation, and
- c) the student's right of appeal against the suspension, or expulsion.

Revocation of award

5.74. 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.

5.75. Where the Student Academic Misconduct Committee recommends the revocation of an award, it must:

- a) allow 20 working days for the student to lodge an appeal in accordance with the Student Appeals Policy ([MPF1323](#))
- b) after this timeframe has elapsed, submit its recommendation, including reasons for its decision, to the University Secretary for referral to Council in accordance with the Revocation of Awards Policy ([MPF1316](#)).

Appeals

5.76. Appeals against a decision of a Faculty Academic Integrity Officer or Student Academic Misconduct Committee made under this policy may be lodged in accordance with the Student Appeals Policy ([MPF1323](#)).

Reinstatement and readmission

Reinstatement following suspension

5.77. 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.

Readmission after expulsion

5.78. After a period of not less than five years since the date of a student's expulsion, a student may make a written request to the Vice-Chancellor to lift or vary the terms of the expulsion to permit their readmission.

5.79. The Vice-Chancellor may consider the student's written request and then may:

- a) lift the expulsion unconditionally
- b) lift the expulsion with conditions, or
- c) make no change to the terms of the expulsion.

5.80. Any decision by the Vice-Chancellor's to lift an expulsion sanction on admission and enrolment does not reinstate the student's place in a course or subject.

5.81. Where the expulsion is lifted by the Vice-Chancellor, the student will:

- a) be required to apply for admission to a course or subject,
- b) be subject to the usual competitive selection processes as other applicants, and
- c) be subject to applicable University regulation, policy and procedures governing selection and admission.

5.82. The Vice-Chancellor's decision to lift or vary the terms of the expulsion is final and is not subject to appeal within the University.

Forfeiture of fees

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

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

Record keeping

5.85. 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.

5.86. 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](#)).

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

Reporting

5.88. 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.

5.89. 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.

6. Roles and responsibilities

Role	Responsibility	Conditions or limitations
Academic Registrar	In addition to the responsibilities outlined in clause 4.10: - 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 clause 4.8	n/a

<p>Case manager</p>	<p>Take any actions authorised under this policy, including to:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - undertake a preliminary review of a reported potential breach referred to them in the case management system - undertake activities to aid in the identification, or exclusion, of potential breaches as part of the preliminary review - prepare the case for a decision whether to proceed with a formal allegation and to refer the matter to a hearing 	<p>n/a</p>
<p>Dean</p>	<p>In addition to the responsibilities outlined in clause 4.9:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - provide students with educative materials on academic integrity - appoint faculty case managers - appoint Faculty Academic Integrity Officer(s) in accordance with the Academic Board Regulation 	<p>May delegate to relevant academic staff members with responsibility for student academic integrity</p>

<p>Deputy Vice-Chancellor (Academic)</p>	<p>In addition to the responsibilities outlined in clause 4.11:</p> <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 Committee members may be empanelled 	<p>May delegate to a Pro-Vice Chancellor with responsibility for student academic integrity</p>	
<p>Faculty Academic Integrity Officers</p>	<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>	
<p>President of the Academic Board</p>	<p>Vary the composition of the Student Academic Misconduct Committee</p>	<p>May delegate to the Vice-President of the Academic Board or the Deputy Vice-President of the Academic Board</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 	n/a
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 clause 4.7	n/a
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. Schedules

7.1. The following schedule is established in accordance with this policy:

- a) Schedule 1: Academic misconduct

8. Definitions

academic integrity means acting with the core values of honesty, fairness, trust, respect, responsibility and courage 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.

balance of probabilities means that based on the available evidence, a proposition is more likely to be true than not.

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

case manager means:

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

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

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:

c) the dean of the custodial faculty for a subject or a course

d) 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.

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

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

faculty academic integrity officer means a senior member of academic staff appointed by the dean under 43(1) of the Academic Board Regulation to determine student academic misconduct matters within the faculty.

honorary appointees and University visitors are defined in the Honorary Appointments and University Visitors Procedure ([MPF1156](#)).

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

poor academic practice means an incident:

a) that is reasonably judged to be a minor and unintentional departure from accepted scholarly conventions or failure to comply with assessment guidelines

b) that is characterised by inexperience, lack of student knowledge or poor academic skills

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

d) where the impact does not compromise the purpose or integrity of the assessment.

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 Academic Board Regulation.

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

POLICY APPROVER

Academic Board

POLICY STEWARD

Academic Secretary

REVIEW

This policy is to be reviewed by 1 January 2028.

VERSION HISTORY

Version	Approved By	Approval Date	Effective Date	Sections Modified
----------------	--------------------	----------------------	-----------------------	--------------------------

1	Academic Board	7 April 2016	21 July 2016	New policy arising from the revision of the University's regulatory framework and the Policy Consolidation Project.
2	President, Academic Board	6 June 2016	21 July 2016	Revoke section 2.3, new sections 5.62, 5.64 and amendments to 5.63 to allow inclusion of matters to do with revocation. New section 5.74 student conduct reports.
3	Academic Secretary	2 November 2016	3 November 2016	Correction to section reference in section 5.54.
4	Academic Secretary	9 January 2017	9 January 2017	Correction to section reference in section 5.30.
5	Academic Secretary	11 September 2019	13 September 2019	Editorial changes removing gendered pronouns – 5.22, 5.30, 5.35, 5.41, 5.44, 5.45, 5.61, 5.67
6	President, Academic Board	8 October 2020	13 October 2020	Added 'assessment materials' to definitions.

7	President, Academic Board	16 November 2020	17 December 2020	Updates to address diversity and inclusion requirements at section 4.3.
8	President, Academic Board	8 April 2021	9 April 2021	Updated to reflect changes to the Academic Board regulation and the Vice-Chancellor 's Regulation. Updates throughout to indicate that all allegations of academic misconduct, educative and formal, are to be managed and recorded via the Resolve Case Management System. Removal of requirement to provide allegation/academic misconduct committee outcome to the Academic Registrar as all records will be retained in the Resolve Case Management System/ HPE Content Manager (University's official record keeping system). Clarification of language and process throughout.
9	President, Academic Board	17 June 2021	18 June 2021	Changes consequent upon changes to the Academic Board Regulation.

10	Academic Secretary	21 June 2021	23 June 2021	Addition of 'business' to clarify meaning of days in 5.38.
11	Academic Secretary	31 August 2021	1 September 2021	Corrected reference to notice given to students in 5.41 and minor editorial change to 5.53(b).
12	President, Academic Board	20 September 2021	8 October 2021	New section 5.75A - academic misconduct reports to the Board.
13	Academic Secretary	24 November 2022	30 November 2022	Amendment to Section 6 – Responsibility for providing academic misconduct reports to the board or its committees reassigned to the Office of Student Academic Integrity.
14	Academic Board	15 December 2022	22 December 2022	Amendment to section 8 to align the definition of "termination of enrolment" with the Vice Chancellor Regulation and Academic Board Regulation.

15	Academic Board	12 September 2024	1 January 2025	<p>Major review streamlines the policy for improved readability, seeks to improve the overall effectiveness of the University's policy framework related to student academic integrity, expands the overarching principles, clearly articulates responsibilities and includes a new schedule to incorporate the former Academic Board Schedule of penalties and categorise academic misconduct allegation types.</p>
----	----------------	-------------------	----------------	--