SCOPE

This procedure applies to:

- all staff;
- all students;
- all coursework courses and units; and
- all teaching locations, with the exception of the former Monash South Africa campus.

Coursework students at the former Monash South Africa campus should refer to the Student Academic Integrity Policy and Procedures and the Monash University (Council) and (Academic Board) Regulations.

In relation to the assessment of a thesis or alternative research component of a graduate research degree, students are to refer to the Graduate Research Thesis Examination Procedures.

PROCEDURE STATEMENT

In this procedure, references to the associate dean (education) may include roles with equivalent responsibility within the faculty, such as deputy dean (education) or associate dean (learning and teaching).

1. Academic integrity

1.1 The Monash University Ethics Statement and Monash University Student Charter set out Monash University’s (the University) expectations of staff and students to act with honesty, fairness and respect in their academic endeavours.

1.2 The University treats academic misconduct seriously and will investigate and address suspected misconduct according to the Student Discipline regulations as set out in the Monash University (Council) Regulations, Part 7.

University and staff responsibilities

1.3 As part of orientation to Monash and through the mandatory Student Academic Integrity online module (see 1.11), the University will advise all commencing students about the Assessment and Academic Integrity Policy, this Student Academic Integrity Procedure and the Student Discipline regulations.

1.4 During orientation and at the start of each unit, faculties must advise students about the faculty and University services and resources available for developing sound academic integrity practices, including academic integrity tutorials and resources to educate students in good academic practice, such as:

- correct referencing methods;
- techniques for expressing ideas informed by other sources in an appropriate and original manner;
- appropriate paraphrasing and summarising of an author’s ideas; and
- actions that breach academic integrity and the range of penalties.

1.5 Chief examiners must ensure that:

- students are educated in good academic practice specific to the discipline;
- the difference between collusion and acceptable collaboration with respect to specific assessment tasks in a unit is clearly explained to students;
- all assessment formats that can be submitted online are submitted through the learning management system, except as approved by the dean (or delegate) based on legitimate pedagogical reasons where online submission is not appropriate; and
• all text-based assignments that can be submitted through a similarity-detection system are submitted through the system provided (e.g. Turnitin). For non-text-based assignments, if alternative systems have been put in place by the faculty, these must be used (e.g. MOSS).

1.6 Staff must adhere to the principles of sections 2 (Implementing the assessment regime) and 7 (Communicating assessment requirements) of the Assessment Regime Procedure when designing assessment tasks and communicating assessment requirements to students.

1.7 Staff are responsible for understanding and applying Monash’s commitment to academic integrity, procedures for dealing with breaches and the use of tools such as similarity-detection systems. Relevant staff are expected to undertake professional development in academic integrity procedures provided by the University.

1.8 The Vice-Chancellor nominates a responsible officer in each faculty to receive reports, investigate, determine or refer allegations of academic misconduct (Monash University (Council) Regulations, Part 7). The responsible officer is the associate dean (education) (or delegate) of the teaching faculty or, if there are multiple related acts of academic misconduct by one student across more than one faculty, the associate dean (education) of the student’s managing faculty. The associate dean (education) can delegate their responsible officer responsibilities to other staff members. For faculties that teach at Monash Malaysia, the associate dean (education) can delegate the responsible officer duties for Malaysia to a staff member at that location.

1.8.1 Where an allegation of academic misconduct occurs with an allegation of research misconduct, the matter is referred to the responsible officer for research misconduct.

1.9 Each faculty will assign the responsibilities of a student academic integrity officer to appropriate staff members to support the responsible officer with the administration of this procedure and to ensure compliance with the relevant policies and regulations. Faculties that teach at Monash Malaysia must include a Malaysia school-based staff member as one of the student academic integrity officers.

Student responsibilities

1.10 Students are responsible for their own good academic practice and must:
• undertake their studies and research responsibly and with honesty and integrity;
• ensure that their work is not falsified;
• not resubmit any assessment they have previously submitted, without the permission of the chief examiner; appropriately acknowledge the work of others; and
• take reasonable steps to ensure that other students are unable to copy or misuse their work.

1.11 Students (except graduate research students) must complete the mandatory Student Academic Integrity online module at the start of their studies. Students who do not complete the module in the required timeframe will have an encumbrance placed on their student record.

1.12 Unless stated otherwise in the learning management system, students can have another person or entity proofread their work. Acceptable proofreading is the process of identifying errors and suggesting corrections to spelling and grammar. Proofreading by another person or entity does not include:
• rewriting passages of text in order to clarify meaning;
• changing the words used by the student;
• rearranging or reformattting text, code or other material;
• adding material or references to the original work; or
• checking calculations or formulas.

1.13 For assessment tasks that are submitted through the similarity-detection system, and where possible, students may use the system prior to final submission of their task to check and improve their work. The system may take significant time for processing and it is the students’ responsibility to plan ahead and ensure they submit the task by the deadline.

1.14 Students must complete an assessment declaration when submitting assessment tasks, except for invigilated examinations or assessments completed and submitted in class.

1.14.1 The declaration may cover a single assessment task, a group of assessment tasks, or an entire unit, as determined by the chief examiner. It must be submitted online, unless required by the chief examiner to be submitted in hard copy.

1.14.2 For group tasks, each member of the group must complete an assessment declaration.

1.14.3 Assessment tasks that are not accompanied by a declaration will not be marked.

2. Breaches of academic integrity

2.1 A breach of academic integrity includes, but is not limited to, conduct described in this section.
2.2 Students suspected of breaching academic integrity knowingly or recklessly can be investigated for the following types of misconduct:

2.2.1 Academic misconduct is conduct that could result in an unfair or unjustified academic advantage in a course or unit. An unfair or unjustified academic advantage means, for example, that the student has submitted work for assessment that misrepresents the student’s work or academic ability. Misconduct relating to research activities in a coursework unit are handled as academic misconduct.

2.2.2 General misconduct in relation to academic integrity breaches is conduct that would not result in an unfair academic advantage, e.g. if a student has unauthorised material in an examination, but an investigation found that the student was not attempting to cheat with the material.

2.2.3 One action may constitute more than one offence of misconduct.

2.3 Students found to have unintentionally breached academic integrity through poor academic practice will receive a warning and academic counselling and may receive marking consequences (see section 4).

Types of breaches

2.4 Plagiarism is the act of using another person’s ideas or manner of expressing them and passing them off as one’s own, e.g. by failing to give appropriate acknowledgement. Specifically, it occurs when a student:

- paraphrases other people’s work and/or ideas without a reference to the source;
- copies other people’s work in whole or in part;
- presents other people’s designs, codes or images as their own work;
- appropriates cultural artefacts without permission and/or appropriate acknowledgement;
- uses exactly the same phrases, passages or structure without quotation marks or without a reference to the source; or
- reproduces provided lecture notes without acknowledgement.

2.4.1 Any type of information can be plagiarised, including but not limited to:

- published or unpublished works;
- physical artefacts;
- code;
- media;
- lecture notes and recordings;
- web pages; and
- spoken words.

2.5 Collusion is unauthorised collaboration with another person or entity on assessable work that is presented as the student’s own work, or as the work of the other student. In contrast, students can collaborate on group tasks when authorised or instructed to do so. Collusion occurs when a student, without the authorisation of teaching staff:

- allows others to copy their work, or shares questions or answers to an assessment task;
- allows another person or entity to produce or edit their work, except where Disability Support Services has approved the use of a scribe;
- produces or edits work for another student; or
- offers to produce academic work for other students.

2.5.1 Collusion occurs whether or not the persons or assessment concerned are connected with Monash University.

2.6 Resubmission of previous work: Students must not, without the permission of the chief examiner or nominee, submit for assessment any part of any work they have previously submitted, whether in the same unit or in another unit or course, at any higher education institution.

2.7 Contract cheating is an act of engaging another student, person or entity to complete some or all of an assessment task on the student’s behalf and typically involves financial or another kind of payment in return for the work. A breach of academic integrity also occurs when a student directly or indirectly engages in such activity by completing some or all of an assessment task for another student, e.g. through a third party. Contract cheating includes instances when a student:

- engages a person or company to produce some or all of the work;
- has another person sit an examination or take their place in assessable work (e.g. placement, in-class assessment, examination);
- produces work for another student; or
- takes the place of another student in assessable work.
2.8 **Fraud** is a form of cheating where a student submits false information in or relating to an assessment task. Fraud is a criminal offence and may be subject to legal action. Types of fraudulent information include:

- sources or references in an assessment, e.g. sources that the student has not read;
- data for an assessment;
- signatures of teaching or professional staff or placement supervisors, or similar forms of authorisation;
- a fraudulent medical certificate submitted with an application for special consideration.

2.9 **Unauthorised distribution of course-related materials**: Students are not permitted to share, sell or pass on to another person or entity external to Monash:

- any course material produced by Monash University (such as lecture slides, lecture recordings, class handouts, assessment requirements, examination questions; excluding Handbook entries) as this is a breach of the Copyright Compliance Policy and such conduct may be a copyright law infringement subject to legal action; or
- any course-related material produced by students themselves or other students (such as class notes, past assignments), nor to receive such material, without the permission of the chief examiner.

2.10 **Examination misconduct** is cheating, or attempting to cheat, in examinations and includes the possession of unauthorised materials as published on the Monash website.

2.11 When investigating academic integrity breaches, staff should refer to the appropriate Student Discipline regulations as shown in Table 1 for guidance, although the particulars of each case may justify a different application of the regulations.

### TABLE 1: Types of academic misconduct

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Monash University (Council) Regulations</th>
<th>Types of academic integrity breaches</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| 30(4) **Academic misconduct** is conduct by which a student seeks to gain for himself, herself or another person an unfair or unjustified academic advantage in a course of study or unit of study. This includes, but is not limited to, conduct by which a student: | Contract cheating  
Examination misconduct  
Fraud  
Resubmission of previous work |
| (a) knowingly cheats in an examination or in any work required to be submitted for assessment; or | |
| (b) knowingly or recklessly: | |
| (i) breaches the conditions or requirements set for an examination, assessment or other work; or | Examination misconduct  
Breaching the conditions or requirements for an assessment |
| (ii) engages in an act of plagiarism or collusion or otherwise breaches the academic integrity requirements of the University; or | Plagiarism  
Collusion  
Unauthorised distribution of course-related materials |
| (iii) breaches a published university policy on a matter of an academic nature. | Breaching any academic policy or procedure |

**General misconduct described in Regulation 30(3)**

- Examination misconduct  
- Fraud  
- Unauthorised distribution of course-related materials

### Detecting breaches

2.12 Faculties must have processes in place to prevent and detect breaches of academic integrity. Detection methods include but are not limited to:

- referring to the similarity report from a similarity-detection system;
• random sampling of submitted assessment tasks to check for similarities;
• comparing the performance of students across a number of tasks;
• searching the Internet or electronic databases using likely search phrases to identify sources of suspected plagiarism; and
• verifying medical certificates with the issuing clinics.

2.13 Staff must review similarity reports, where provided, and apply academic judgement to identify suspected breaches of academic integrity.

3. Dealing with suspected breaches of academic integrity

Procedural fairness and natural justice

3.1 Staff must apply the principles of procedural fairness and natural justice in all interactions with students about academic integrity. These requirements are:

3.1.1 Students must have the opportunity to have their views heard about any allegations and evidence before a decision is made.

3.1.2 Staff who make decisions must not have any bias.

3.1.3 Decisions must be based only on the relevant evidence.

3.1.4 Matters must be addressed promptly and students must be notified if unexpected delays arise.

Reporting breaches of academic integrity

3.2 The responsible officer receives reports of and acts on allegations of academic misconduct (see 1.8).

3.3 University staff members are required to report suspected cases of student academic integrity breaches as outlined in this procedure. People who are not Monash staff members can report suspected cases of student academic integrity breaches to the responsible officer.

3.4 Monash students and staff members can report contract cheating services or other services that are reasonably likely to encourage or facilitate academic misconduct to the portfolio of the Deputy Vice-Chancellor (Education) through the online form provided. The University may report this information to authorities.

Breaches related to an assessment task

3.5 When a staff member suspects that a student has breached academic integrity in relation to an assessment task, they must stop marking the assessment and refer the matter immediately to the chief examiner or nominee for action, together with any evidence relating to the suspected breach. The nominee will usually be the unit coordinator at the teaching location.

3.6 If the chief examiner or nominee determines that there has been no breach of academic integrity, they will dismiss the matter and notify the staff member who referred the matter to them and, if the student had been informed about the suspected breach, the student.

3.7 If the chief examiner or nominee determines that there has been a breach of academic integrity they must check with the academic integrity officer if the student has received a prior warning or finding of misconduct.

3.7.1 If the student has received a prior warning or finding of misconduct, the chief examiner or nominee must refer the case to the responsible officer as an allegation of academic misconduct (see section 5).

3.7.2 If the student has not received a prior warning or finding of misconduct, the chief examiner or nominee must determine the nature of the breach to either:
  − provide an educative response for poor academic practice (see section 4); or
  − refer the student's conduct to the responsible officer as an allegation of academic misconduct (see section 5).

3.8 If the chief examiner or nominee does not have enough evidence to determine the matter in 3.5, they can send the student a notice of suspected breach and invite the student to respond within five working days. The notice must:

• clearly describe the suspected breach and provide the evidence;
• invite the student to provide a response;
• refer the student to the relevant student association for advice and support;
• describe the obligation of the chief examiner to determine if the breach was intentional or reckless and to refer any allegation of misconduct to the responsible officer.

3.8.1 If the student does not respond, the chief examiner or nominee will determine whether there has been a breach of academic integrity based on the evidence before them.
3.9 If the breach relates to a group assessment task:

3.9.1 Each member of the group must be considered independently to determine if that student breached academic integrity.
3.9.2 A case will be dismissed for any group member who is found not to have breached academic integrity.
3.9.3 The assessment task may be awarded a mark that reflects poor academic practice (see 4.2).

Poor academic practice versus academic misconduct

3.10 The chief examiner or nominee may determine that a breach of academic integrity is the result of poor academic practice where they judge the breach to be minor and have formed the reasonable belief that the student’s conduct was neither intentional nor reckless.
3.11 The chief examiner or nominee must refer a breach of academic integrity as an allegation of misconduct where they judge the breach to be serious and/or have formed the reasonable belief that the student’s conduct was either intentional or reckless.

Breaches unrelated to an assessment task

3.12 If a staff member suspects a current student of having breached academic integrity but not in relation to a particular assessment task or unit, e.g. by sharing an assignment from a previous year with another student or entity, they must immediately report the matter to the responsible officer as an allegation of academic misconduct.

4. Educative response for poor academic practice

4.1 If the chief examiner or nominee determines that the student’s breach was due to poor academic practice (see section 3.10), they must ensure that the faculty:
- helps the student identify gaps in their skills or knowledge that led to the academic integrity breach;
- counsels the student in good academic practice;
- recommends that the student undertake relevant academic skills development (e.g. Library resources); and
- warns the student of the consequences of academic misconduct.

4.2 The chief examiner or nominee will award a mark that reflects the poor academic practice indicated by the breach. This may result in:
- disregarding the sections of the work that contain the breach when marking the work;
- marking the work with or without a deduction of marks, e.g. a percentage may be deducted for inadequate referencing as detailed in the marking criteria or a maximum mark of 50 per cent may be given; or
- requiring the student to resubmit the work in whole or in part and mark it with or without a deduction of marks.

4.3 The chief examiner or nominee must advise the student in writing of the outcome within five working days of their decision.
4.4 The warning in section 4.1 is a record that the student has been counselled in good academic practice and warned of the consequences of academic misconduct. The warning is recorded on the academic misconduct register but not on the student’s record. If the student is suspected on a later occasion of breaching academic integrity, the warning will be taken into account and the later occasion will be referred directly to the responsible officer as an allegation of academic misconduct.

5. Dealing with allegations of academic misconduct

5.1 When the responsible officer receives an allegation of academic misconduct they must consider the matter in accordance with the Student Discipline regulations (Monash University (Council) Regulations, Part 7) and with reference to the Student Discipline Guidelines.

5.2 The responsible officer can, in accordance with Part 7 of the Monash University (Council) Regulations, either:
- investigate the matter;
- refer the matter to the faculty discipline panel or another appropriate officer; or
- dismiss the matter.

5.3 If the responsible officer or panel determines that the breach does not constitute academic misconduct, they can take the actions outlined in section 4.
5.4 If the responsible officer or panel determines that the student did engage in academic misconduct, they can impose a penalty in accordance with the penalty guidelines issued by the Council.
5.5 The responsible officer or panel must record their findings in writing and notify the student of the outcome.
5.6 All findings of academic misconduct will result in a record of fact on the student’s record. Additional penalties for a finding of academic misconduct include:
- reprimand;
- disallowance of work;
- mark of zero in the task or the unit;
- consent penalty, i.e. with the agreement of the student, focused on the cause of the conduct;
- suspension; or
- exclusion.

**Appeals**

5.7 Students can appeal a finding of misconduct (except as set out in 5.7.1), or the penalty alone, on the following grounds and in accordance with regulation 45 of the [Monash University (Council) Regulations](#):

- actual or perceived bias on the part of the responsible officer or a panel member;
- a penalty that is excessive;
- new evidence that was not previously available to the student;
- a breach of the rules of natural justice; or
- the decision is manifestly wrong.

5.7.1 If a student admitted the misconduct to the responsible officer or panel they can not appeal against the finding but can appeal the penalty.

5.8 Appeals must be submitted on a notice of appeal to the chair of the appeal panel (as indicated on the notice) within 20 working days of the notice of decision.

5.9 The chair of the appeal panel must be appointed within 10 working days of receiving the notice of appeal. The student must be notified of an appeal outcome within 7 working days of the outcome being decided.

5.10 Appeals are conducted in accordance with Student Discipline regulations ([Monash University (Council) Regulations](#), Part 7).

**6. Record keeping and reporting**

**Student’s record**

6.1 For the purpose of this procedure, the student’s record is the file stored in the University’s secure document storage and retrieval system (e.g. TRIM).

6.2 All of the following documents that exist must be filed on the student’s record for the original investigation and any appeals, for the duration required by the [Retention and Disposal Authority for Records of the Higher and Further Education Functions](#), after which they will be destroyed (see also 6.6):

- notice of allegation;
- investigation records of the responsible officer and/or discipline panel;
- notice of referral to the panel;
- documents submitted to the panel;
- minutes of the panel hearing;
- notice of decision;
- documents of the student’s response to the responsible officer or panel; and
- notice of appeal.

6.3 Warnings are not recorded on the student’s record but are recorded on the academic misconduct register (see 6.4).

**Academic misconduct register**

6.4 The Deputy Vice-Chancellor (Education) (or delegate) will maintain an academic misconduct register on which student academic integrity officers must record:

- warnings given to students about breaches of academic integrity;
- findings of student academic misconduct by the responsible officer or faculty discipline panel;
- penalties imposed on students; and
- the outcomes of appeals.

6.5 The register will be accessible only to:

- responsible officers (or delegates);
- student academic integrity officers; and
- other staff authorised by the deans or the Deputy Vice-Chancellor (Education) (or delegate).
6.6 The register will retain records for the following periods of time in accordance with the Retention and Disposal Authority for Records of the Higher and Further Education Functions, after which they will be destroyed unless there is an external legislative requirement to maintain records for a longer period:

6.6.1 Warnings will be retained for seven years.

6.6.2 Findings of misconduct will be retained for seven years unless the student was excluded, in which case the record will be retained for 15 years.

Reporting

6.7 The faculty student academic integrity officers will maintain accurate records of academic integrity investigations and outcomes in the format directed by the Deputy Vice-Chancellor (Education) or nominee.

6.8 If student academic integrity officers find indications of any trends or systemic issues, they must notify the responsible officer who is responsible for taking appropriate action.

6.9 At the start of each year, the associate dean (education) will collate, from all applicable delegated responsible officers, and submit the faculty's academic misconduct data for the previous year to the portfolio of the Deputy Vice-Chancellor (Education).

6.10 The Deputy Vice-Chancellor (Education) or nominee will collate and analyse all faculty data and present an academic misconduct annual report to Academic Board and the University Education Committee, highlighting trends and addressing risk and quality issues related to academic integrity.

6.11 Faculties must undertake any directions given by the Academic Board in relation to academic integrity and report back to the Board within 12 months of the direction.

DEFINITIONS

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Term</th>
<th>Definition</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Academic integrity</td>
<td>The use, generation and communication of knowledge, information and data in an ethical, honest and responsible manner.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Academic misconduct</td>
<td>Knowing or reckless conduct by which a student seeks to gain for themselves or another person an unfair or unjustified academic advantage in a course or unit. It includes cheating, collusion and plagiarism.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Academic skills development</td>
<td>Services and resources to help students improve their academic skills, which are offered by the Library and in faculties.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cheat, cheating</td>
<td>To seek to obtain an unfair advantage in a course or unit.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chief examiner</td>
<td>The academic staff member responsible for the implementation of a unit’s assessment regime and for recommending the final result for each student. A dean must appoint a chief examiner for each unit taught by the faculty.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Collaboration</td>
<td>Working with others on authorised group work under the instruction of the chief examiner or nominee.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Collusion</td>
<td>Unauthorised collaboration with another person or entity on assessable work that is presented as the student’s own work, or as the work of the other student. In contrast, students can collaborate on group tasks when authorised or instructed to do so.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Consent penalty</td>
<td>A discipline penalty imposed on a student with their agreement as defined in Monash University (Council) Regulation 43.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Contract cheating</td>
<td>Submitting work for assessment that was partly or wholly produced by a third party, or producing such work, or contracting a third party to take the student’s place in assessment.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Encumbrance</td>
<td>A block placed on a student’s access to university services as a result of unpaid fees, fines, loan repayments, missing information (e.g. tax file number), unreturned resources (e.g. library item) or disciplinary proceedings.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Examination misconduct</td>
<td>Conduct that breaches the examination rules, instructions and conditions.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fraud</td>
<td>Making up or altering information or documents to mislead or deceive.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Intentional</td>
<td>For the purpose of this procedure, intentional does not mean with the intention to breach academic integrity, but means to deliberately perform a certain action, such as working on a task with another person.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Knowingly</td>
<td>Acting consciously or deliberately, in full awareness of the action.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Learning management system</strong></td>
<td>Moodle, the University's system for the administration, documentation, tracking, reporting and delivery of units and other forms of study.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-------------------------------</td>
<td>----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Managing faculty</strong></td>
<td>The faculty assigned responsibility for coordinating administrative matters for a course (including but not restricted to admission, enrolment, course advice, academic progress and academic referral). For double degree courses the managing faculty is as specified in the University Handbook.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Plagiarism</strong></td>
<td>The act of taking and using another person's ideas and or manner of expressing them and passing them off as one's own.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Proofreading</strong></td>
<td>The process of identifying errors and suggesting corrections to a text.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Recklessly</strong></td>
<td>Acting without consideration of or disregarding the risks or consequences of the action.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Similarity-detection system</strong></td>
<td>A system (e.g. Turnitin or MOSS) that compares text, data, code or other elements in a student assessment against various sources including the internet, published works, commercial databases and assessments previously submitted through the system.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Teaching location</strong></td>
<td>The physical place where a course is delivered, including Australian and international locations as well as online delivery. The location may or may not be a Monash campus or owned by Monash.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Unauthorised distribution of course-related materials</strong></td>
<td>Sharing materials in breach of copyright or without appropriate permissions.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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