

STUDENT ACADEMIC MISCONDUCT PROCEDURE

This procedure applies to all reports of academic misconduct made on or after 11 January 2021. Reports that were made before this date will be determined under the versions of the [Monash University \(Council\) Regulations](#) and the [Student Discipline Guidelines](#) in effect prior to 11 January 2021.

SCOPE

This procedure applies to:

- all students;
- all staff responsible for handling student academic misconduct matters; and
- all locations with the exception of the former Monash South Africa campus.

Students enrolled at the former Monash South Africa campus are subject to Part 7 of the [Monash University \(Council\) Regulations](#) and the [Student Discipline Guidelines](#).

PROCEDURE STATEMENT

This procedure supports the integrity of Monash University's (the University) education delivery by setting out the requirements for handling allegations of student academic misconduct, as defined in Regulation 30 in Part 7 of the [Monash University \(Council\) Regulations](#). This procedure must be read in conjunction with Regulations and the [Student Academic Integrity Procedure](#) and the [Student Academic and General Misconduct: Hearing and Appeals Panels Procedure](#).

1. Academic integrity and misconduct

- 1.1 Students are required to conduct their studies with honesty, integrity, fairness and respect. Where students fail to meet these standards in their academic work, they are at risk of breaching academic integrity or engaging in misconduct.
 - 1.1.1 The [Student Academic Integrity Procedure](#) sets out the requirements and expectations for upholding academic integrity in coursework studies and for providing an educative response to academic integrity breaches that are the result of poor academic practice.
 - 1.1.2 This procedure and the [Student Academic and General Misconduct: Hearing and Appeals Panels Procedure](#) set out the requirements for handling allegations of misconduct relating to coursework studies, including academic misconduct alone or general misconduct combined with academic misconduct. An allegation of misconduct is made when a breach or suspected breach of academic integrity is serious and determined to be intentional or reckless (see section 3.16 of the [Student Academic Integrity Procedure](#)).
- 1.2 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.
- 1.3 General misconduct combined with academic misconduct is conduct that would not result in an unfair academic advantage, for example, if a student responds to an allegation of misconduct with unacceptable behaviour such as harassment.
- 1.4 One action may constitute more than one offence of misconduct.

2. Decision makers

- 2.1 There are four types of decision makers responsible for handling student academic misconduct as follows:

Table 1: Decision makers for student academic misconduct

Decision maker	Type of misconduct	Responsibility
Responsible officer for academic misconduct (RO)	Academic misconduct Academic misconduct coupled with general misconduct	Determination of misconduct and penalty
Student misconduct panel (SMP) (see the Student Academic and General Misconduct: Hearing and Appeals Panels Procedure)	Academic misconduct General misconduct Academic misconduct coupled with general misconduct	Determination of misconduct and penalty
Student appeals panel (SAP) (see the Student Academic and General Misconduct: Hearing and Appeals Panels Procedure)	Academic misconduct General misconduct Misconduct that involves academic and general misconduct	Determination of appeals against the finding of the RO or SMP
Another responsible officer or panel	Misconduct that involves more than one type of misconduct General misconduct Research misconduct Academic misconduct in another faculty	Determination of misconduct and penalty

2.2 The RO for academic misconduct is as [specified by the Vice-Chancellor](#).

Principles for decision making by the responsible officer

2.3 The RO is bound by the rules of natural justice. This means that students have the right to:

- be informed of the process being followed, offered support during the process and notified if unexpected delays arise;
- be informed of the allegations and evidence against them and provided with a reasonable opportunity to respond;
- have the allegations determined by an unbiased decision maker who will base decisions only on the relevant evidence.

2.3.1 The requirements of natural justice may differ in each case depending on the particular facts and circumstances.

2.4 The RO will determine the appropriate weight to give each piece of evidence, considering the relevance and reliability of the evidence, the concurrence of the evidence with the circumstances being investigated, whether the evidence is corroborated, and the circumstances surrounding the alleged misconduct. The RO is not bound by the rules of evidence.

2.5 The RO will consider evidence relating to both the facts of the alleged act and the intention required for misconduct to be proven.

2.5.1 Intention means that the action was deliberate, not that the student intended to engage in misconduct. A student can be found to have engaged in misconduct even if they were unaware that the act was misconduct.

2.5.2 For academic misconduct, previous education about academic misconduct can be considered evidence that the alleged act currently under investigation was intentional. Previous education is advice or instruction personally directed to a student and includes but is not limited to a prior warning about academic misconduct or a prior notice of allegation regardless of the outcome.

2.5.3 A previous finding of academic misconduct against the student must not be considered by the RO in determining whether the misconduct is proven and may only be discovered and considered after making their decision in order to determine the appropriate penalty.

2.6 Where the RO is satisfied that it is more likely than not that the alleged conduct took place and the conduct was intentional or reckless, they will find that the allegation of misconduct is proven. The burden of proof required is the balance of probabilities, not beyond reasonable doubt.

2.7 The RO must document:

2.7.1 both the decision and the reasons for reaching the decision, citing the relevant facts found to be proven;

2.7.2 the evidence on which the findings were based; and

2.7.3 the reasoning for reaching the final decision.

2.8 Each alleged act of misconduct must be the subject of a separate finding that is determined based on the evidence before the RO relevant to that allegation.

- 2.9 Where appropriate, the University may disclose the outcome of a misconduct proceeding to any person aggrieved by the misconduct. The RO may also notify another area of the University about a pending or concluded misconduct proceeding for the purposes of implementing a decision or administering the student's enrolment.
- 2.10 The RO will endeavour to handle and conclude a misconduct matter promptly, having regard to the circumstances of the case.
- 2.11 The RO will be supported by Student Conduct, who may undertake steps in this procedure on behalf of the RO.

3. Reports of academic misconduct

Making a report

- 3.1 A member of staff who suspects that a student may have committed an act of academic misconduct must report the matter to the RO through the [online form](#) to Student Conduct. Persons who are not members of staff can also report a matter through the [online form](#) but are not obliged to do so. If a report of academic misconduct is made to a staff member other than the RO, the staff member receiving the report must promptly refer it to the RO through the [online form](#).
- 3.2 The RO may investigate academic misconduct whether or not a report has been made if they have reasonable grounds to believe a student has committed an act of academic misconduct.
- 3.3 Where multiple allegations or reports are made about the conduct of one student arising from the same or related circumstances, the RO must deal with the allegations at the same time, even if the reports originate from different sources. If the reports involve units in more than one teaching faculty, the RO for the student's managing faculty is the appropriate officer.
- 3.4 Where a report of academic misconduct relates to the conduct of more than one student arising from the same or related circumstances, the RO may deal with the allegations at the same time if appropriate to do so.
- 3.5 If a partner institution makes a finding in relation to academic misconduct of a student enrolled in a joint award, the RO may adopt the finding if they are satisfied that the partner institution observed the rules of natural justice and their process complied with the legal obligations of Monash University. If the RO is not satisfied that these requirements have been met, they must apply the decision-making processes of this procedure.

Receiving and referring a report

- 3.6 When the RO receives a report of academic misconduct, they must consider the report and determine whether to:
- dismiss the report and take no further action;
 - handle the report as an educative response to poor academic practice (see section 4 of the [Student Academic Integrity Procedure](#));
 - handle the report under another process;
 - investigate the report and either make a determination or refer the report to an SMP;
 - refer the report to another RO, in accordance with sections 3.9 and 3.10 of this procedure; or
 - without investigation, having determined that escalation is appropriate, refer the report to an SMP.
- 3.7 The process of an SMP determining a report of academic misconduct is outlined in section 1 of the [Student Academic and General Misconduct: Hearing and Appeals Panels Procedure](#).
- 3.8 In deciding the course of action, the RO may consider any matters deemed relevant.
- 3.8.1 If the RO determines at any time that the allegation is minor, trivial, vexatious or frivolous, they may dismiss the report and take no further action.
- 3.9 Where a report of misconduct includes both academic and research misconduct, the RO will refer the matter to the responsible officer for research misconduct and the matter will not be investigated or determined in accordance with this procedure (see [Responsible Conduct of Research: Procedure for Investigating Code Breaches](#)).
- 3.10 Where a report of misconduct involves academic misconduct coupled with general misconduct and, in the opinion of the RO, the matter is more appropriately handled under the [Student General Misconduct Procedure](#), the report of both academic and general misconduct will be investigated or determined in accordance with the Student General Misconduct Procedure and not in accordance with this procedure.
- 3.11 Where a report of misconduct includes both academic and general misconduct, and the report of general misconduct includes sexual misconduct, the RO must refer the general misconduct allegations to the RO for general misconduct but may continue to manage the allegations of academic misconduct in accordance with this procedure.
- 3.12 Possession of unauthorised material in a scheduled final assessment may constitute an act of academic misconduct where there appears to be an intent by the student to use the material to cheat. If the eAssessment session lead forms the view that a student was in possession of material for the purpose of cheating, they will refer the matter to the RO to investigate as a case of academic misconduct as set out in this procedure.

4. Determination by the responsible officer (RO)

Investigation

- 4.1 If the RO decides to investigate a report of misconduct, they will undertake the following steps:
- identify how the reported allegation could amount to misconduct;
 - consider the evidence available to them;
 - determine their own process, which may include meeting with the student, making follow up enquiries or obtaining additional evidence relevant to the allegation;
 - use appropriate internal University or external resources available to assist in the conduct of the investigation; and
 - request information, orally or in writing, from any person at any time and set a deadline for a response, normally within five working days of the request. When in writing, the request must state that it is made by the RO under the Monash University (Council) Regulations, but it need not disclose the reason for the request. If no response is received by the deadline, the RO will proceed with the investigation on the basis of existing information.
- 4.2 University staff and students are required to respond to an RO's request for information by the date specified. A response may consist of legitimate reasons for not providing the information requested, including that it no longer exists or is subject to privacy obligations.

Notice of allegation and student response

- 4.3 Unless the RO decides on the basis of their investigation to dismiss the case or refer it straight to an SMP, they will notify the student of the alleged misconduct in writing to the student's Monash University email account. The notice of allegation will set out:
- the sections of the [Monash University \(Council\) Regulations](#) relevant to the allegation;
 - the specific allegation made against the student, including the type of misconduct, when and where it is said to have taken place and the role the student is alleged to have played in the misconduct;
 - a copy of the evidence for the misconduct, subject to 4.5 below; and
 - the opportunity for the student to respond to the allegation and evidence.
- 4.4 The evidence for the alleged misconduct may be provided or relayed to the student in writing or during a meeting and the student will be given a reasonable opportunity, normally not less than five working days, to respond to the allegation and evidence before a finding is made.
- 4.5 The RO will give due consideration and care to the health and safety of any person who reported the alleged misconduct or provided evidence. Where necessary, the RO can determine to provide only the substance of the evidence to the student.
- 4.6 If invited to a meeting, a student is entitled to:
- be accompanied and assisted by a support person who is not permitted to represent or advocate for the student;
 - make oral and/or written responses to the allegation and evidence.
- 4.7 If a student does not provide a response in the time specified and/or does not attend a meeting, the RO can make a determination based on the evidence available.

Making a determination and imposing a penalty

- 4.8 At the conclusion of an investigation, the RO must either:
- find that misconduct is not proven and clear the student of the allegation;
 - handle the report under another relevant process, e.g. as an educative response to a breach of academic integrity (see section 4 of the [Student Academic Integrity Procedure](#));
 - find that the misconduct is proven and determine a penalty as set out in section 5 of this procedure; or
 - refer the report to an SMP to hear and determine the matter if satisfied that the allegation of misconduct is sufficiently serious or complex that it would warrant a penalty which can only be imposed by an SMP.
- 4.9 The RO will make a finding in accordance with the principles for decision makers set out in section 1 of this procedure and notify the student of the decision as set out in section 6 of this procedure.
- 4.10 If a student with an allegation of misconduct discontinues their enrolment at the University before the allegation is determined, the RO will:
- suspend the investigation;
 - keep the evidence and documents;
 - arrange for the student's record in the student management system to be flagged for an outstanding allegation;
 - if the student later re-enrols at the University, determine the allegation at that time; and
 - notify the student of these actions.

5. Penalties and outcomes

- 5.1 The penalties available to the RO are prescribed in the Monash University (Council) Regulations and the [penalty powers](#) published under those Regulations, as set out in Table 2 below.
- 5.2 A penalty need not be imposed if the RO is satisfied that:
- this misconduct is minor in nature; and
 - the student is unlikely to engage in further misconduct.
- 5.3 When imposing a penalty or penalties, the RO will take into account:
- punishment of the student who engaged in the misconduct;
 - deterrence of future misconduct by the student or others;
 - rehabilitation of the student to avoid further misconduct;
 - protection of the University community or precinct;
 - protection of any relevant public interest;
 - the nature and severity of the misconduct;
 - the personal circumstances of the student including mitigating and aggravating circumstances;
 - any measures already taken in relation to the student's misconduct;
 - any loss, damage or harm caused by the student's misconduct to the University or a person;
 - any [penalty guidelines](#) issued by the Council, but must not apply the guidance as a rule, instead considering the facts and circumstances of the case; and
 - any previous finding of academic misconduct against the student, which the decision maker will not ascertain until after finding the misconduct proven and before determining the penalty.
- 5.4 The RO has the power to impose the penalties listed in Table 2.

Table 2: Penalty options for academic misconduct and academic misconduct coupled with general misconduct

Penalty	Description and conditions	Operation and effect
No penalty	When misconduct has been proven and the decision maker decides not to impose a penalty because they are satisfied that the misconduct was minor and the student is unlikely to engage in further misconduct.	The finding of misconduct is recorded on the academic integrity register for seven years, but no penalty is recorded. The notice of decision, which records that a finding of misconduct was made but no penalty issued, is added to the student's file.
Record of misconduct	A record of the fact and nature of the misconduct on the student's university file that the student was found to have committed the misconduct. This is appropriate when a student admits to knowingly engaging in misconduct or it is a serious breach of academic integrity.	The record remains on the student's file for as long as the file is retained by the University. The record is added to the academic integrity register for the period set out in section 8.
Reprimand	A formal rebuke and censure for the misconduct, which may be appropriate when a student does not express remorse for the action.	Where a reprimand has previously been issued any subsequent misconduct will have more serious penalty consequences.
Consent penalty	A condition placed on the student, with their agreement, that is intended to educate and rehabilitate the student to avoid further misconduct. A consent penalty for <i>general misconduct</i> may be the requirement to: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> – seek counselling – assist with a University event or activity – apologise to any person aggrieved by the misconduct – write a reflection on the act of misconduct A consent penalty for <i>academic misconduct</i> may be the requirement to: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> – enrol in no more than a specified number of units – enrol in a particular unit 	The decision maker will specify a date by which the condition must be met. The student must inform the relevant responsible officer of their compliance with the consent penalty. If the student fails to comply, and the responsible officer considers the student's reasons for non-compliance to be reasonable, the responsible officer may extend the time for compliance or waive the penalty. In all other cases, if the decision maker determines that the student has failed to comply with the consent penalty, they will annul the penalty and impose a new penalty having regard to the original findings and evidence.

	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> – develop a study plan to be approved as specified – write a reflection on the act of misconduct – seek academic or other counselling – make contact with a course supervisor at specified intervals – meet the conditions imposed by an academic progress committee 	
Disallowance of work or mark	<p>For work not yet assessed the assessment of the work is prohibited; for work that has already been assessed the mark given to the work is disallowed. If the decision maker deems the misconduct to be minor, they may permit resubmission of the work within a specified time and subject to specified conditions.</p> <p>The penalty is applied to the whole work. The disallowance of parts of a work can be the appropriate marking for a breach of academic integrity but when this penalty is imposed the whole work is disallowed.</p>	<p>Where resubmission is allowed, the mark of the resubmitted work will count towards the final unit result. The maximum available mark for a resubmitted task is 50 per cent.</p> <p>Where resubmission is not allowed, the final unit result will be calculated with a mark of zero for the work.</p> <p>If a piece of work has not been assessed pending the outcome of a disciplinary process and no penalty is imposed, the decision maker will instruct the appropriate assessor to assess the work, and the assessor can discount the portions of the work that breach academic integrity.</p>
Mark of zero for unit	The student's mark for the unit of which the work forms a whole or a part is recorded as zero.	Failure of the unit with a mark of zero.
Fine*	<p>A monetary sum that must be paid to the University calculated on the value of one penalty unit multiplied by the number of penalty units imposed as the penalty, not exceeding 5 penalty units (or equivalent at non-Australian locations as determined by the Pro-Vice-Chancellor)</p> <p>See the Vice-Chancellor's notice of the amounts of fines that may be imposed.</p>	A fine is a debt to the University and failure to pay the fine can result in invalidation of enrolment and may be recovered as a debt in court.
Restitution*	A requirement to make restitution to the University or a person who has suffered loss for the sole purpose of making good damage caused by the misconduct, and may be made by payment or action specified by the penalty.	Restitution does not extend to providing financial compensation.
Restriction on contacting certain staff or students*	The student is restricted from contacting specified staff or students for the period determined by the decision maker.	
Prohibition*	The student is prohibited from entering a specified area of the University for a specified period of time and under any conditions attached to the prohibition. This penalty is only imposed if considered necessary to protect any person or University property.	<p>The student remains a student and is not precluded from pursuing any course or unit of study during that period but must not be present in the specified area.</p> <p>The decision maker must ensure the student has reasonable access to all necessary resources to undertake study.</p>

* Penalty typically imposed for general misconduct that arises from the same circumstances as academic misconduct.

5.5 When imposing a penalty, the RO may suspend the operation of that penalty for a period of up to five years on condition that, during the term of the suspension, the respondent does not commit another act of misconduct, and on any additional conditions set by the RO. If, at the end of the period of the suspension of a penalty, all of the conditions on which the suspension of the penalty depends are met, the original penalty will not be imposed. If the student commits another act of misconduct or breaches a condition imposed within the period of the suspension of the penalty, the penalty will take immediate effect.

5.6 The possible outcomes where a breach or suspected breach of academic integrity is determined to be neither intentional nor reckless, whether by the chief examiner or the RO, are outlined in Table 3.

Table 3: Outcomes for suspected breaches determined to be neither intentional nor reckless (determined by chief examiner or RO)

Situation	Outcome for student
Suspected breach was found to be baseless and there was no breach of academic integrity	Suspected breach is dismissed. Student's work is assessed as normal.
Breach of academic integrity was not serious enough to be determined as misconduct	Educative response: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> – Student receives a warning, which is recorded on the academic integrity register. – Portions of the student's work that breach academic integrity may be disallowed in the marking. – Student may be required to resubmit the work, and the mark for the resubmitted work may be capped.

5.7 The possible outcomes where a breach or suspected breach of academic integrity has been referred to the RO as an allegation of academic misconduct are outlined in Table 4.

Table 4: Outcomes for allegations of academic misconduct (determined by RO)

Situation	Finding	Penalty	Outcome for student
There was no breach of academic integrity	Allegation dismissed, i.e. the student is cleared of misconduct	No penalty can be imposed	If the student received notices of allegation and decision, they are recorded on academic integrity register, along with the fact that the case was dismissed. The student has no record of misconduct and the work can be assessed as normal. The receipt of notices of allegation and decision is equivalent to having received a warning for the purpose of previous advice/instruction about academic integrity.
Breach of academic integrity was not serious enough to be determined as misconduct	Allegation dismissed	No penalty can be imposed	Educative response: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> – A warning can be issued, which is recorded on the academic integrity register. A deduction of marks can be made on the assessed work, only by discounting the portions that breach academic integrity, not as a penalty for wrongdoing. – The student may be required to resubmit the work, and the mark for the resubmitted work may be capped. <p>If no warning is issued, the receipt of notices of allegation and decision is equivalent to having received a warning for the purpose of previous advice/instruction about academic integrity.</p>
Misconduct was minor and the RO is satisfied that student is unlikely to engage in further misconduct (see also 5.2 above)	Finding of misconduct	No penalty	Discipline outcome: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> – The notice of decision records that the student engaged in misconduct and that no penalty was imposed due to the nature of the misconduct. – The student has a record of misconduct on the academic integrity register but no penalty is recorded. <p>Educative response:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> – A deduction of marks can be made on the

			<p>assessed work, only by discounting the portions that breach academic integrity, not as a penalty for wrongdoing.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> – The student may be required to resubmit the work, and the mark for the resubmitted work may be capped.
Misconduct was the first offence, not of a serious nature, and student expresses remorse and/or does not appear to have understood the consequences of their actions	Finding of misconduct	Refer to Council's Penalty Guidelines	<p>Discipline outcomes:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> – The finding and penalty are recorded on student's file and the academic integrity register. – Penalties are imposed.
First offence of a serious nature (e.g. deliberate disregard for or a clear attempt to circumvent rules); or Second offence not of a serious nature	Finding of misconduct or referral to SMP	Refer to Council's Penalty Guidelines	<p>Discipline outcomes:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> – The finding and penalty are recorded on student's file and the academic integrity register. – Penalties are imposed.
Second offence of a serious nature	Referral to SMP	Refer to Council's Penalty Guidelines	<p>Discipline outcomes:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> – The finding and penalty are recorded on student's file and the academic integrity register. – Penalties are imposed.

6. Notice of decision

- 6.1 The RO must send a notice of decision to the student's Monash University email account, normally within seven working days of making the decision. It must include a statement that the matter has been determined under the Monash University (Council) Regulations and set out:
- the decision;
 - the reasons for the decision including relevant facts found to be proven;
 - the evidence on which the findings were based;
 - the penalty imposed and any conditions attached;
 - the reasons for the penalty including an assessment of the seriousness of the misconduct and any mitigating or aggravating factors taken into account in imposing the penalty; and
 - the process and timeframe for lodging an appeal.
- 6.2 The notice of decision will be retained on the student's file and notified to staff members responsible for implementing the decision, including:
- for coursework students: the chief examiner and relevant staff in the teaching faculty, and the managing faculty if applicable;
 - for students at Malaysia: the registrar;
 - for graduate research students: the associate dean (graduate research) or equivalent and the Monash Graduate Research Office.
- 6.3 The notice of decision is not itself a record of misconduct. Where the penalty of record of fact has been imposed, this penalty must be listed within the notice of decision, but the notice itself does not constitute the record of fact.

7. Appealing a decision

- 7.1 A student who has been found to have committed an act of academic misconduct by the RO may appeal against the finding and penalty, or the penalty only; however, if the student admitted the misconduct, they cannot appeal against the finding but may appeal against the penalty only.

- 7.2 The procedure for academic misconduct appeals is outlined in section 2 of the [Student Academic and General Misconduct: Hearing and Appeals Panels Procedure](#).
- 7.3 At the Malaysia campus, a student dissatisfied with any disciplinary proceeding may submit an appeal in writing to the Malaysian Registrar General of Private Higher Educational Institutions within 14 days from the date of receipt of the decision, pursuant to the *Private Higher Educational Institutions Act 1996* as amended from time to time.

8. Recording keeping and reporting

Records

- 8.1 For the purpose of this procedure, the student's file is the file stored in the University's secure document storage and retrieval system (i.e. TRIM) and a student's academic record is the record of their enrolment and academic achievement stored in the student management system (i.e. Callista).
- 8.2 The record for a case of misconduct handled under this procedure will be stored on the student's file, but not on the student's academic record, and includes all of the following documents that exist:
- notice of allegation;
 - investigation records of the RO;
 - documents of the student's response to the allegations;
 - minutes of the panel hearing;
 - notice of decision; and
 - notice of appeal and appeal hearing documents.
- 8.3 When a case is concluded (including the appeal) documents held by staff members must be securely destroyed.
- 8.4 The Deputy Vice-Chancellor (Education) (or delegate) will maintain an academic integrity register, which records a summary of the allegations, findings, penalties and appeals relating to each case of student academic misconduct (see section 5 of the [Student Academic Integrity Procedure](#)). Student records in the register will be handled in accordance with the [Privacy of Student Records Policy](#).
- 8.5 The retention period for academic misconduct records in student files and on the academic integrity register is 7 years, unless the student was excluded, in which case the period is 15 years (see the [Retention and Disposal Authority for Records of the Higher and Further Education Functions](#)). After this period the records will be securely destroyed unless there is an external legislative requirement to maintain specific records for a longer period.

Reporting

- 8.6 Academic misconduct matters are reported as set out in section 5 of the [Student Academic Integrity Procedure](#).

DEFINITIONS

Academic misconduct	Intentional 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 of study and includes cheating, collusion and plagiarism as defined in Part 7 of the Monash University (Council) Regulations.
Frivolous	Not serious, relies on trivialities, does not warrant a review of the matter concerned.
General misconduct	Conduct that is contrary to accepted standards of behaviour. It includes a wide range of behaviours which are outlined in Part 7 of the Monash University (Council) Regulations and in the Student General Conduct Policy .
Intentional	Deliberately performing a certain action, whether or not the one acting is aware that the act is misconduct.
Joint award	A partnership arrangement where a course is delivered jointly between Monash and a partner and leads to a single award.
Managing faculty	The faculty specified in the Handbook as being responsible for the administration of a course for the year for which the Handbook is published.
Reckless	Without consideration of or disregarding the risks or consequences of the action.
Student Misconduct Panel (SMP)	The student discipline panel established in accordance with the Student Academic and General Misconduct: Hearing and Appeals Panels Procedure .

Student	A person who: (a) is admitted to a course of study at the University; (b) is enrolled at the University in a non-award study or one or more units of study on an assessed or non-assessed basis and without admission to a course; (c) is pursuing a course of study or unit of study at the University through an exchange or study program or other arrangement between the University and another educational institution; (d) is engaged in a student mobility program involving the University, whether or not the program is credited towards a course of study or unit of study; (e) has completed a course of study but on or to whom the relevant degree or award has not been conferred or awarded; or (f) has deferred, or has intermitted, or has been suspended from, a course of study; (g) is enrolled in a course of study or one or more units of study offered by the University through another educational institution; or (h) has consented in writing to be bound as a student by the University statutes and regulations.
Teaching faculty	The faculty responsible for teaching the unit or, where teaching is shared among faculties, the faculty with the greatest percentage of teaching responsibility.
Vexatious	Done to cause unjustified trouble or for a purpose other than genuine.
Working day	A day other than a Saturday or Sunday, a public holiday under the Public Holidays Act 1993, or university holiday. In Malaysia, working day means a day other than a Saturday, Sunday or a public holiday in the relevant state in Malaysia.

GOVERNANCE

Parent policy	Assessment and Academic Integrity Policy
Supporting schedules	N/A
Associated procedures	Assessment Regime Procedure Scheduled Final Assessments Procedure Grading Schema Procedure Marking and Feedback Procedure Special Consideration Procedure Student Academic Integrity Procedure Student Academic and General Misconduct: Hearing and Appeals Panels Procedure
Legislation mandating compliance	Monash University (Academic Board) Regulations Monash University (Council) Regulations
Category	Academic
Approval	University Education Committee DATE 25 November 2020 MEETING NUMBER 9/2020 / AGENDA ITEM 10.1
Endorsement	Deputy Vice-Chancellor (Education) DATE 18 November 2020
Procedure owner	Deputy Vice-Chancellor (Education)
Date effective	11 January 2021
Review date	11 January 2022
Version	1.1 (<i>Administrative amendments effective on 4 February 2021</i>)
Content enquiries	policy-education@monash.edu