Detection and Investigation (Unit level)

**STUDENT**
- Submits work for marking.

**ACADEMIC STAFF**
- Suspects breach of academic integrity.
- Collects and documents evidence.
- Discussed submitted work with student. UC and Student sign a written record of discussion.
- Determines if there is evidence to support allegation of academic misconduct.
- Dismisses allegation.
- Provides comprehensive feedback to the student & AS on current deficiencies and strategies.

**UNIT COORDINATOR**
- Lodges the allegation and requests a report of previous entries recorded on the Online Complaints Management System (the Register).
- Determines if there is evidence to support allegation of academic misconduct.
- Provides comprehensive feedback to the student & AS on current deficiencies and strategies.

**COMPLAINTS MANAGEMENT UNIT**
- Checks if there are previous breaches registered and advises UC.

**UNIT COORDINATOR**
- Determines if the alleged breach is:
  - Related to examinations.
  - Denied by the student.
  - Serious.

**HEAD OF SCHOOL**
- Escalates the allegation to the Head of School or relevant Pro-Vice Chancellor if the HoS is the Unit Coordinator.
  - Provides HoS with all relevant documentation, including previous entries on the Register.

**NOTE:** CMU can provide support, guidance and advice on this process.

**UNIT COORDINATOR**
- Where the breach resulted from misunderstanding, inexperience or carelessness, UC chooses:
  - **OPTION 1:** Work is to be resubmitted with a maximum grade of pass OR
  - **OPTION 2:** The work is to be marked taking full account of the deficiencies in achieving the intended learning outcomes.

  UC provides comprehensive feedback to the student on current deficiencies and strategies to address these.

**UNIT COORDINATOR**
- Submits work for marking.
- Accepts the decision of the UC and implements feedback on addressing deficiencies.

**STUDENT**
- Completes marking, grading and resulting process.
In cases of serial or substantial breaches, HoS refers matter to relevant PVC for hearing by Board of Inquiry.

Undertakes University level review.

**School Consideration**

**HEAD OF SCHOOL**
1. Thoroughly reviews the allegation.
2. Provides an opportunity to the student to be heard and give information.
3. Collects relevant information from other sources.

**HEAD OF SCHOOL**
Determine if there is sufficient evidence to support the allegation.

**HEAD OF SCHOOL**
Determines whether the breach has resulted from misunderstanding, inexperience or carelessness, or if there are sufficient mitigating circumstances.

**HEAD OF SCHOOL**
Lodges outcome into the Register. Lodgement includes rationale for decision, copy of notice to Student and supporting documentation.

**HEAD OF SCHOOL**
Determines if there is sufficient evidence to support the allegation.

**HEAD OF SCHOOL**
Dismisses allegation.

**HEAD OF SCHOOL**
Determine disciplinary intervention if no mitigating factors:

- **OPTION 1:** Award zero marks OR
- **OPTION 2:** Award fail grade for the whole unit.

HoS may recommend disallowing supplementary assessment to examination board.

HoS notifies UC and student in writing of decision and its basis.

HoS lodges outcome into the Register.

**HEAD OF SCHOOL**
Determines if there is sufficient evidence to support the allegation.

**HEAD OF SCHOOL**
Dismisses allegation.

**HEAD OF SCHOOL**
With UC determine educative intervention:

- **OPTION 1:** Work is resubmitted with maximum grade of pass OR
- **OPTION 2:** The work is to be marked taking full account of the deficiencies in achieving the intended learning outcomes.

Provides comprehensive feedback to the Student and AS on deficiencies and strategies to address these.

**STUDENT**
Student accepts the determination, receives feedback and implements strategies to address identified deficiencies. Resubmits assessment for marking if permitted OR Lodges an appeal to the Academic Appeals Committee.

**ACADEMIC STAFF**
Completes marking, grading and resulting process.

**PRO-VICE CHANCELLOR**
Advices student in writing of escalation to a Board of Inquiry. Establishes a BoI comprised of: PVC, Associate Dean L&T, HoS from a School uninvolved with allegation and a student nominated by CDU Students’ Association.

**BOARD of INQUIRY**
Undertakes University level review.

**Student**
1. The determination OR 2. The steps being taken and an estimate of time till a decision will be made.

**HoS**
Has 10 working days from the date of referral of allegation to notify UC and Student of:

- The determination OR
- The steps being taken and an estimate of time till a decision will be made.

Refer to University Governance Document Library: Students Breach of Academic Integrity Procedures (PRO-092).
CDU ACADEMIC INTEGRITY: STAFF GUIDE FOR INVESTIGATING ALLEGATIONS OF STUDENT BREACHES
Part 3 of 3

University Deliberation

BOARD of INQUIRY

Undertakes thorough review to determine if there is sufficient evidence to support allegation.

NO

BOARD of INQUIRY

Determines whether breach resulted from misunderstanding, inexperience or carelessness, or if there were mitigating circumstances.

YES

NO

BOARD of INQUIRY

Determines if the breach is serial or substantial.

YES

BOARD of INQUIRY

If no mitigating circumstances, BoI determines disciplinary intervention.

OPTION 1:
Award zero for work where breach occurred OR
OPTION 2:
Award fail grade for whole unit.

Provides comprehensive feedback to Student on deficiencies and strategies to address these and informs Student of right of appeal.

STUDENT

Student accepts the determination, receives feedback and implements strategies to address identified deficiencies. Resubmits assessment for marking if permitted. OR Lodges an appeal to the Academic Appeals Committee.

ACADEMIC STAFF

Completes marking, grading and resulting process.

STUDENT

Accepts the decision of the BoI OR lodges an appeal to the Academic Appeals Committee.

ACADEMIC STAFF

Undertakes thorough review to determine if there is sufficient evidence to support allegation.

NO

PRO-VICE CHANCELLOR

Advises student and HoS with a written decision (includes basis for decision and right to appeal). Submits review outcome and documentation to complaints officer.

PVC

HEAD OF SCHOOL

Provides Comprehensive feedback to Student and AS on deficiencies and strategies to address these and informs Student of their right to appeal.

HoS

CMU

COMPLAINTS MANAGEMENT UNIT

Lodges review outcome and documents in Register.

S

STUDENT

PVC has 10 working days from receipt of documentation to notify student and HoS of the BoI determination.

Student has 20 working days from receipt of notification to appeal the determination.

Refer to University Governance Document Library: Students Breach of Academic Integrity Procedures (PRO-092).
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