



Policy and Governance Unit, Academic Registrar's Division

# PROCEDURE FOR MANAGING ALLEGED ACADEMIC MISCONDUCT BY A STUDENT UNDERTAKING COURSEWORK

Student Conduct Rules

<b>Date approved</b>	17 August 2007	<b>Date Procedure will take effect:</b>	1 January 2008	<b>Date of Next Review:</b>	January 2014
<b>Approved by:</b>	University Council				
<b>Custodian title &amp; e-mail address:</b>	Senior Manager, Policy and Governance Unit <a href="mailto:governance@uow.edu.au">governance@uow.edu.au</a>				
<b>Responsible Division</b>	Policy and Governance Unit, Academic Registrar's Division				
<b>Supporting documents, procedures &amp; forms of this procedure:</b>	<a href="#">Procedure Flowchart</a> <a href="#">Investigation and Outcome Notice Templates</a> <a href="#">Student Misconduct Investigation Form</a>				
<b>References &amp; Legislation:</b>	<a href="#">State Records Act 1998</a> <a href="#">General Retention and Disposal Authority GDA23</a> <a href="#">Student Conduct Rules</a> <a href="#">Records Management Policy</a> <a href="#">Research Misconduct Policy</a> <a href="#">Academic Integrity and Plagiarism Policy</a>				
<b>Audience:</b>	Public – accessible to anyone				
<b>Expiry date:</b>	Not Applicable				

Contents

[1 Introduction and Purpose.....3](#)

[2 Scope of Procedure.....3](#)

[3 Definitions.....3](#)

[4 Roles & Responsibilities.....3](#)

[5 Academic Misconduct by a Student Undertaking Coursework.....4](#)

[6 Urgency Provisions.....9](#)

[7 Procedure for Managing Alleged Academic Misconduct by a Student Undertaking Coursework.....10](#)

[8 Investigation Committee Procedures .....20](#)

[9 Extension of Time Limits .....24](#)

[10 Record Keeping.....24](#)

[11 Flowchart and Templates.....25](#)

[12 Version Control and Change History.....25](#)

[13 Schedule 1 - Application of Procedure for the Managing Alleged Academic Misconduct by a UOW student undertaking study through UOW College.....27](#)

## 1 Introduction and Purpose

1. This procedure supports and should be read in conjunction with the [Student Conduct Rules](#). In accordance with the Rules, this procedure must be followed when managing alleged academic misconduct by a student undertaking coursework.
2. The purpose of this procedure is to direct UOW staff and students on the process to be followed when managing alleged academic misconduct by a student undertaking coursework.

## 2 Scope of Procedure

1. This procedure applies to the management of alleged academic misconduct by a student of UOW undertaking coursework (as defined in section 3 of the [Student Conduct Rules](#)), under the circumstances defined in section 4 of the [Student Conduct Rules](#).
2. This procedure includes management of alleged misconduct relating to research-based assessment tasks by Honours or Masters-by-Coursework students. When managing such misconduct, consideration may be given to the process and outcomes related to managing research misconduct by a Higher Degree Research student, as outlined in the [Research Misconduct Policy](#).
3. This procedure includes management of alleged academic misconduct by a Higher Degree Research student undertaking coursework.

## 3 Definitions

Word/Term	Definition
Assessor	An academic staff member responsible for evaluating and allocating a mark for an assessment item.
Central Register	A register and file of student misconduct investigations, controlled and maintained by the Academic Registrar's Division.
Conflict of interest	A conflict between a person's private interests and University obligations
Due process	Procedural rights under this procedure, including the application of the principles of natural justice
Investigation Committee	Faculty Investigation Committee; Student Conduct Committee or Council Committee of Appeal
Local Register	A register and file of student misconduct investigations, controlled and maintained by the Faculty.
SOLSMail	Student Online Services email system

All other definitions relating to Student Conduct are detailed in section 3 of the [Student Conduct Rules](#).

## 4 Roles & Responsibilities

1. Subject Coordinators have a responsibility to initiate investigations of alleged academic misconduct by a student undertaking coursework in accordance with the procedures set out in [section 7](#).

2. Primary Investigation Officers have a responsibility to:
  - a. Work with Subject Coordinators in determining an appropriate finding and outcome for academic misconduct by a student undertaking coursework, in accordance with the procedures set out in [section 7](#);
  - b. Impose low-level outcomes in response to upheld allegations of academic misconduct by a student undertaking coursework;
  - c. Communicate the progress and outcome of an investigation to the student, Subject Coordinator and complainant, using the appropriate notice letter template for advice to the student where necessary;
  - d. File and maintain a record of the investigation on the Local Register throughout the investigation, and advise ARD to create and maintain a record of the investigation on the Central Register where necessary; and
  - e. Refer cases to the Faculty Investigation Committee or Student Conduct Committee where necessary
3. Investigation Committee Chairs and members have a responsibility to undertake investigations of alleged academic misconduct by a student undertaking coursework in accordance with the procedures set out in [section 7](#) and [section 8](#).
4. The Associate Dean, Sub-Dean, or equivalent appointed by the Dean has a responsibility to receive, and make a decision upon, appeals by students against a decision of the Subject Coordinator and Primary Investigation Officer.
5. The Academic Registrar has a responsibility to receive, and make a decision upon, appeals by students against a decision of the Faculty Investigation Committee.
6. The Vice-Principal (Administration) has a responsibility to receive, and make a decision upon, appeals by students against a decision of the Student Conduct Committee.
7. The Vice-Chancellor has a responsibility to undertake action in accordance with the Urgency Provisions set out in [section 6](#).
8. The Academic Registrar's Division has a responsibility to:
  - a. Maintain the Central Register;
  - b. Maintain a record of Primary Investigation Officers;
  - c. Provide support to the Student Conduct Committee; and
  - d. Make training available to PIOs and other staff involved in investigating student misconduct.
9. Other roles and responsibilities are detailed in section 5 of the [Student Conduct Rules](#).

## **5 Academic Misconduct by a Student Undertaking Coursework**

### **Poor Academic Practice**

1. In some cases the Subject Coordinator, Primary Investigation Officer or Investigation Committee may determine not to make a finding of academic misconduct on the grounds that that the conduct of the student represents poor academic practice or scholarship rather than academic misconduct. For example, where:
  - a. the student is at an early stage of an undergraduate program of study;
  - b. the student is undertaking study at an Australian university for the first time;
  - c. the conduct represents a minor contravention of acknowledgement practice or other academic standards or requirements; or

- d. there is other compelling evidence that the conduct arose from a genuine lack of understanding of acknowledgement practice or other academic standards or requirements.
2. In such cases, the Subject Coordinator, Primary Investigation Officer or Investigation Committee must impose an informal outcome in response to the student's conduct to educate the student on correct academic practice. An informal outcome includes one or more of the following:
    - a. warning to the student;
    - b. referring the student to Learning Development;
    - c. requiring the student resubmit the assessment item without penalty;
    - d. requiring the student to provide additional material to support the assessment item; or
    - e. imposing a minor mark penalty on the assessment item (noting that where a student disputes the mark penalty, this will be dealt with as an appeal under this procedure in accordance with clauses 7.35 - 41).
  3. The Subject Coordinator, Primary Investigation Officer or Investigation Committee may take action under an informal response as outlined in 5.2 at their discretion.
  4. Where a Subject Coordinator has taken action under an informal response during Stage 1 of the investigative process (as per clause 7.23), the Subject Coordinator will inform the student and complainant of the outcome and will retain a record of the interaction.
  5. Where a Primary Investigation Officer or Investigation Committee has imposed an informal outcome at a later stage of the investigative process, the communication and record-keeping requirements of that stage of the process will be followed.

### Academic Misconduct

6. Academic misconduct by a student undertaking coursework is defined in the [Student Conduct Rules](#). Types of misconduct and illustrative and non-exhaustive examples of academic misconduct, and the level of outcome that should be imposed for each type, are shown in Table 5.1. An attempt to engage in academic misconduct shall be assessed against the level of outcome as if the academic misconduct had occurred.

Table 5.1 - Academic Misconduct by a Student Undertaking Coursework		
Types and Examples of Academic Misconduct		Level of Outcome
<u>Cheating</u> Behaving deceitfully or dishonestly (in examinations and in-class tests)	Example: Bringing unauthorised equipment or material into an examination	Low-Level, Medium-Level or High-Level
	Example: Using unauthorised equipment or material in an examination (calculators etc)	Medium-Level or High-Level
	Example: Copying another student's work	Medium-Level or High-Level
	Example: Accessing confidential examination information prior to examination	Medium-Level or High-Level

**Table 5.1 - Academic Misconduct by a Student Undertaking Coursework**

Types and Examples of Academic Misconduct	Level of Outcome
<p><u>Fabrication</u>                      Intentional and unauthorised falsification or invention of any information or citation in an academic exercise                      Examples:                      Making up sources for a bibliography                      Making up footnotes                      Claiming results of research where none have been obtained                      Changing results of research</p>	<p>Medium-Level or High-Level</p>
<p><u>Facilitating academic dishonesty</u>                      Intentionally or knowingly helping or attempting to help another student engage in some form of academic dishonesty</p>	<p>Low-Level, Medium-Level or High-Level</p>
<p><u>Fraud</u>                      Deceitful behaviour by which it is sought to gain some unfair or dishonest advantage                      Examples:                      Giving a false excuse for missing a test or deadline                      Falsely claiming inventorship</p>	<p>Medium-Level or High-Level</p>
<p><u>Misleading ascription of authorship</u>                      Example:                      Claiming credit for a proportion of work contributed to a group assessment item that is greater than that actually contributed</p>	<p>Low-Level, Medium-Level or High-Level</p>
<p><u>Misrepresentation</u>                      Representing data or information incorrectly, improperly, or falsely                      Examples:                      Stating or presenting a material or significant falsehood                      Omitting a fact so that what is stated or presented as a whole states or presents a material or falsehood</p>	<p>Medium-Level or High-Level</p>

**Table 5.1 - Academic Misconduct by a Student Undertaking Coursework**

Types and Examples of Academic Misconduct	Level of Outcome
<p><u>Obstruction / Interference</u></p> <p>Behaving in any way that limits the academic opportunities of other students by improperly impeding their work or their access to educational resources</p> <p>Examples:</p> <p>Borrowing all copies of a particular text from the Library so others do not have access to it</p> <p>Inventing a bomb scare or other security risk</p> <p>Taking or materially damaging any study-related property of another</p>	<p>Medium-Level or High-Level</p>
<p><u>Plagiarism</u></p> <p>Using another person's ideas, designs, words or works without appropriate acknowledgement.</p> <p>Examples:</p> <p>Failure to acknowledge sources of quotations, ideas or data (including when paraphrasing)</p> <p>Copying another students' work (with or without consent)</p> <p>Collusion (presenting an assessment item as independent work when it has been produced in part or in whole in collusion with other people)</p>	<p>Low-Level, Medium-Level or High-Level</p>
<p><u>Re-using one's own work</u></p> <p>Example:</p> <p>Re-using, without acknowledgement, part or all of one's own work that has been previously submitted and counted towards another assessment item.</p>	<p>Low-Level, Medium-Level or High-Level</p>
<p><u>Using unauthorised equipment or material in an assessment item</u></p>	<p>Medium-Level or High-Level</p>
<p><u>Using another person to undertake an examination or assessment item</u></p>	<p>High-Level</p>

7. The process for managing alleged academic misconduct by a student undertaking coursework is outlined in full in [section 7](#).

**Outcomes to Academic Misconduct by a Student Undertaking Coursework**

8. Academic misconduct by a student undertaking coursework may be managed with a Low-Level Outcome, Medium-Level Outcome or High-Level Outcome. The only possible outcomes of each level and the persons authorised to implement these outcomes are shown in Table 5.2.

<b>Table 5.2 – Outcomes to Academic Misconduct</b>		
<b>Level of Outcome</b>	<b>Outcome</b>	<b>Authorised Persons</b>
Low-Level Outcomes	Any informal outcome (as listed at clause 5.2); Submission of an alternative assessment task; Resubmission of assessment task with a mark penalty; Deduction of marks for assessment task; or Zero mark in assessment task, providing that this will not automatically result in failure of the subject (for example, where an assessment task has a specified level of attainment in order to pass the subject).	Primary Investigation Officer
Medium-Level Outcome	Any informal outcome (as listed at clause 5.2); Any Low-Level outcome; or Zero mark or reduced mark in subject	Faculty Investigation Committee
High-Level Outcome	Any informal outcome (as listed at clause 5.2); Any Low-Level outcome; Any Medium-Level outcome; and/or any of the following: Reprimand from the Vice-Chancellor; Immediate Suspension by the Vice-Chancellor (with or without also suspending any scholarship the student may hold); Deferred Suspension by the Vice-Chancellor subject to one or more conditions (e.g. good behaviour, demonstrated consultation with a registered professional, academic performance); Exclusion from the University by the Vice-Chancellor; Expulsion from the University by the Vice-Chancellor; Withhold official certification (eg academic transcript, degree testamur) for up to three months; or Rescission of degree by the University Council	Student Conduct Committee (in some cases in consultation with the Vice-Chancellor)

### **Determining Whether Academic Misconduct by a Student Undertaking Coursework has Occurred**

9. A determination (finding) of whether academic misconduct by a student undertaking coursework has occurred will be made on the strength of the evidence available.

## Considerations when Determining an Appropriate Outcome

10. Where a finding of academic misconduct by a student undertaking coursework has been made, the following considerations may be taken into account when determining an appropriate outcome:
  - a. Whether the misconduct is considered important or of consequence to the assessment item in which it has occurred, also taking into account the nature of the misconduct and the context in which it is found;
  - b. The extent of the misconduct in an assessment item;
  - c. The proportion of the overall course mark represented by the assessment item;
  - d. The nature of the subject and the assessment item;
  - e. The degree to which the misconduct affects any underlying thesis on which the assessment item is based;
  - f. The conventions associated with the particular academic discipline;
  - g. The year or study level of the student;
  - h. The language proficiency of the student;
  - i. Any relevant individual circumstances of the student;
  - j. Whether a finding of academic misconduct has previously been made against the student and is the subject of an entry on any applicable Local Registers or the Central Register; and/or
  - k. Any apparent intention to deceive by the student, and if any, the level and effect of that intention.

## 6 Urgency Provisions

1. Where alleged academic misconduct by a student undertaking coursework:
  - a. is the subject of investigation by the Police or other civil authorities;
  - b. may bring the University and its staff and students into disrepute;
  - c. involves extreme harassment or vilification which breaches the University's Principles, Statement of Values, Rules, codes and/or policies;
  - d. threatens the welfare or study of other students or staff; or
  - e. is otherwise considered to be serious enough to warrant immediate action,a recommendation may be made to the Vice-Chancellor that the following action be taken, pending the outcome of the investigation:
  - f. temporary block of the student's IT access;
  - g. limitation of the student's right of access to the University;
  - h. termination of the student's right of access to the University; or
  - i. immediate suspension of the student from the University.
2. The following officers may, after preliminary review, make a recommendation as detailed in clause 6.1:
  - a. Subject Coordinator
  - b. Primary Investigation Officer
  - c. Chair of a Faculty Investigation Committee

- d. Chair of the Student Conduct Committee
3. Upon receiving a recommendation under clause 6.1 the Vice-Chancellor or standing nominee of the Vice-Chancellor may either:
  - a. accept the recommendation, impose a temporary block of IT access, limitation or termination of right of access, or immediate suspension, and, where appropriate, direct the officer that made the recommendation to refer the matter to the Student Conduct Committee as soon as possible and within a maximum of ten working days; or
  - b. not accept the recommendation for immediate suspension, limitation or termination of access, or temporary block of IT access, and refer the matter back to the officer that made the recommendation for further investigation in accordance with the normal procedure.
4. Where action is imposed under clause 6.3, the officer that recommended the action to the Vice-Chancellor or standing nominee of the Vice-Chancellor will:
  - a. ensure that the student is served with a written notice of the temporary block of IT access, limitation or termination of right of access, or suspension, as a matter of urgency;
  - b. refer the matter to the Student Conduct Committee for the service of an Investigation Notice; and
  - c. notify the Academic Registrar in writing, for advice to relevant officers.
5. Rule 4.5 of the [Campus Access and Order Rules](#) stipulate action to be taken where teaching activities have been disrupted by disorderly conduct of a student.

## **7 Procedure for Managing Alleged Academic Misconduct by a Student Undertaking Coursework**

1. Staff members responsible for managing alleged academic misconduct by a student undertaking coursework will follow the process set out in this procedure and the [Management of Alleged Academic Misconduct by a Student Undertaking Coursework Flowchart](#).
2. This procedure provides a staged investigation and appeal process for dealing with all allegations of academic misconduct by a student undertaking coursework:
  - Stage 1: Initial determination by Subject Coordinator
  - Stage 2: Conclusion of investigation by Subject Coordinator and Primary Investigation Officer (PIO)
  - Stage 3: Investigation by Faculty Investigation Committee
  - Stage 4: Investigation by Student Conduct Committee
  - Stage 5: Consideration of an Appeal by Council Committee of Appeal

### **Primary Investigation Officers**

3. Within each faculty, the Head of Academic Unit and a standing nominee, or a maximum of two standing nominees appointed by the Head of Academic Unit, hold the position of Primary Investigation Officer (PIO) for the purpose of managing alleged academic misconduct by a student undertaking coursework. Where a faculty is not comprised of separate Academic Units, the Faculty will appoint two Primary Investigation Officers and may appoint more with the written approval of the Deputy Vice-Chancellor (Operations).
4. PIOs are permitted to seek advice from other University officers during the investigation of alleged academic misconduct by a student undertaking coursework. Where possible, such

advice should be sought from officers who are unlikely to be involved in the conduct of the investigation at a later date. PIOs may obtain administrative assistance from other staff members during the investigation.

5. The Academic Registrar's Division (ARD) will maintain a record of all Primary Investigation Officers.

## **Stage 1 - Initial Investigation by Subject Coordinator**

### **Preliminary Determination**

6. A staff member must bring an allegation of academic misconduct by a student undertaking coursework to the attention of the Subject Coordinator as soon as possible once it has been identified. A student may bring an allegation of academic misconduct by a student undertaking coursework to the attention of the Subject Coordinator. The staff member or student will provide the Subject Coordinator with relevant information and evidence relating to the allegation. In the case of alleged academic misconduct during a University Examination, the officer in charge of the conduct of the examination may discuss the matter with the student in order to assist in providing relevant supporting information to the Subject Coordinator in relation to the allegation. If necessary, the Subject Coordinator may collect further evidence relating to the allegation.
7. The Subject Coordinator has the option to consult with a PIO at any stage outlined in 7.8 to 7.15.
8. The Subject Coordinator may obtain administrative assistance from other staff members during the investigation.
9. The Subject Coordinator will determine whether there is sufficient evidence that academic misconduct may have occurred.
10. If there is not sufficient evidence that academic misconduct may have occurred, the allegation will be dismissed. The Subject Coordinator will inform the complainant that the allegation has been dismissed. No further action will be taken.
11. If there is sufficient evidence that academic misconduct may have occurred, the allegation will be investigated by the Subject Coordinator.

### **Discussion with Student**

12. The Subject Coordinator will seek to discuss the allegation with the student and obtain a student response to the allegation.
13. The Subject Coordinator will provide the following information to the student in writing prior to the discussion with the student, using the appropriate notice letter template:
  - a. Substance of the allegation;
  - b. Date, time, location of the discussion;
  - c. Advice that a support person may be present for both the student and the Subject Coordinator;
  - d. Reference to related policies;
14. During the discussion with the student, the Subject Coordinator will explain the allegation to the student and give the student the opportunity to respond to the allegation. The student has the right to refuse to respond to the allegation.
15. Both the student and the Subject Coordinator are permitted to be assisted by a support person during the discussion.

16. The Subject Coordinator will keep an adequate record of the discussion. With the permission of the student, the Subject Coordinator may make an audio recording of the discussion and attach this to the investigation file.
17. If, after all reasonable efforts have been made to contact and discuss the allegation with the student, the Subject Coordinator has not been able to do so; they may proceed with the investigation without discussion with the student.
18. In accordance with the General Course Rules, a student may not vary their enrolment in a subject that is currently part of an academic misconduct investigation until the investigation has been finalised. Where a student attempts to vary their enrolment in a subject that is currently part of an academic misconduct investigation, the Academic Registrar's Division will reinstate the student's enrolment.

#### **Determination by Subject Coordinator**

19. Based on the evidence collected, including information gathered during the discussion with the student where this has taken place, the Subject Coordinator will make a finding of whether academic misconduct has occurred. The Subject Coordinator must make this finding as soon as possible and within a maximum of ten working days of having received the allegation.
20. The student should continue their normal academic work within that subject while the investigation is taking place, as failure to do so would disadvantage the student.

#### **Allegation Dismissed**

21. If the Subject Coordinator finds that academic misconduct has not occurred, the allegation will be dismissed.
22. The Subject Coordinator will advise the student and the complainant that the allegation has been dismissed.
23. As per clause 5.1, in some cases the Subject Coordinator may determine not to make a finding of academic misconduct on the grounds that the conduct of the student represents poor academic practice or scholarship rather than academic misconduct, and may impose an informal outcome.

#### **Allegation Upheld**

24. If the Subject Coordinator finds that academic misconduct has occurred, the allegation will be upheld.
25. The Subject Coordinator will notify a PIO of the case. Where the Subject Coordinator has sought preliminary advice that is specific in nature from a PIO (as stipulated in clause 7.7), the Subject Coordinator will notify a different PIO within the Faculty at this stage.
26. The PIO will create a record of the case on the Local Register. The Local Register records all cases within the Faculty where academic misconduct has been found to have occurred, for the purpose of risk management and auditing.

#### **Appropriate Outcome Determined**

27. The PIO will check the Local Register to determine whether an entry exists for the student for any previous finding of academic misconduct. Where the student is or has been enrolled in a subject(s) from another faculty(ies), the PIO will request that faculty(ies) to check its Local Register to determine whether an entry exists for the student for any previous finding of academic misconduct.
28. The PIO will request ARD to check the Central Register to determine whether an entry exists for the student for any previous finding of academic misconduct.

29. The Subject Coordinator and PIO will determine the appropriate level of outcome. In doing so, the Subject Coordinator and PIO may give consideration to the factors listed at clause 5.8.
30. If the Subject Coordinator and PIO determine that a low-level outcome is appropriate, they will continue with management of the case in accordance with [Stage 2 - Conclusion of Investigation by Subject Coordinator & Primary Investigation Officer](#).
31. If the Subject Coordinator and PIO determine that a medium-level outcome is appropriate, the PIO will refer the case to the Faculty Investigation Committee in accordance with [Stage 3 – Investigation by Faculty Investigation Committee](#).
32. If the Subject Coordinator and PIO determine that a high-level outcome is appropriate, the PIO will refer the case to the Student Conduct Committee, in accordance with [Stage 4 – Investigation by Student Conduct Committee](#).
33. When referring a matter to the Faculty Investigation Committee or the Student Conduct Committee, the PIO must:
  - a. use the Student Misconduct Investigation Form to record full details of the case, including:
    - i. a detailed explanation of the allegation;
    - ii. summary of key evidence supporting the allegation;
    - iii. summary of results of evidence gathering (including discussion or interview with the student); and
    - iv. supporting materials.
  - b. update the record of the case and referral on the Local Register;
  - c. advise ARD to create a record of the case on the Central Register;
  - d. advise the student of the referral using the appropriate notice letter template; and
  - e. advise the complainant and other relevant staff of the referral, as necessary.
34. An outcome will be determined by the Subject Coordinator and PIO as soon as possible and within a maximum of ten working days of having determined that academic misconduct has occurred.
35. If the Subject Coordinator is not available at any time during the investigation of alleged academic misconduct by a student undertaking coursework, another member of academic staff in a similar position and nominated by the Head of School or Academic Unit may act in place of the Subject Coordinator for the purpose of investigating the allegation.

## **Stage 2 - Conclusion of Investigation by Subject Coordinator & Primary Investigation Officer**

### **Low Level Response**

36. The Subject Coordinator and PIO will determine the appropriate low-level outcome to be applied in accordance with clause 5.8.
37. The PIO will:
  - a. impose the outcome;
  - b. update the record of the case and outcome on the Local Register;
  - c. advise the student of the outcome using the appropriate notice letter template; and
  - d. advise the complainant and other relevant staff of the outcome, as necessary.

### **Appeal against Finding of Subject Coordinator & Primary Investigation Officer**

38. Once an outcome has been imposed, a student may appeal against the finding of the Subject Coordinator and PIO, only if the appeal is based on a breach of natural justice requirements, a lack of due process, or if there is new and substantial evidence that has not previously been considered.
39. An appeal by a student against a decision of the Subject Coordinator and PIO must:
  - a. be lodged in writing with the Associate Dean, Sub-Dean, or equivalent appointed by the Dean, of the Faculty within a maximum of ten working days of notification of the outcome of the Subject Coordinator and PIO's investigation;
  - b. state fully the reasons for the appeal; and
  - c. include any relevant documentary evidence to support the appeal.
40. The Associate Dean, Sub-Dean, or equivalent appointed by the Dean, will consider the case put forward and evidence provided by the student to support the appeal.
41. The Associate Dean, Sub-Dean, or equivalent appointed by the Dean, will determine whether there are sufficient grounds for the appeal as soon as possible and within a maximum of ten working days of having received the appeal.

### **Appeal Dismissed**

42. If the Associate Dean, Sub-Dean, or equivalent appointed by the Dean, determines that there are not sufficient grounds for the appeal, then the decision of the Subject Coordinator and PIO stands. The Associate Dean, Sub-Dean, or equivalent appointed by the Dean will:
  - a. update the record of the case, appeal and outcome on the Local Register; and
  - b. advise the student and PIO of the outcome of the appeal using the appropriate notice letter template for the student.
43. The student has no further opportunity to appeal the decision within the University.

### **Appeal Upheld**

44. If the Associate Dean, Sub-Dean, or equivalent appointed by the Dean, determines that there are sufficient grounds for the appeal, then the case is either referred back to the PIO for re-consideration (in the case of new and substantial evidence), or to a different PIO within the Faculty or the Faculty Investigation Committee for consideration (in the case of a breach of natural justice requirements or lack of due process). The Associate Dean, Sub-Dean, or equivalent appointed by the Dean will:
  - a. refer the matter back to the PIO, to a different PIO within the Faculty or to the Faculty Investigation Committee using the Student Misconduct Investigation Form;
  - b. update the record of the case, appeal and referral on the Local Register;
  - c. advise ARD to create a record of the case on the Central Register (for cases referred to the Faculty Investigation Committee); and
  - d. advise the student, and the original PIO as necessary, of the referral using the appropriate notice letter template for advice to the student.
45. Where the matter has been referred back to the same PIO or to a different PIO, the PIO will investigate the matter in accordance with the procedures set out in [Stage 1 - Initial Investigation by Subject Coordinator](#).

### **Stage 3 - Investigation by Faculty Investigation Committee**

46. The Faculty Investigation Committee will consider cases referred to it by:

- a. the PIO;
  - b. the Sub-Dean as a result of appeal by the student against a decision of the PIO; or
  - c. the Academic Registrar for reconsideration as a result of appeal by the student as per clauses 7.54 – 7.60.
47. The Faculty Investigation Committee will comprise:
- a. the Dean (or the Dean's nominee) as Chair; and
  - b. two members of academic staff (appointed by the Chair) who are not involved with the teaching or assessment of the subject concerned. For a particular case the Dean may choose to nominate a student in the place of one of the academic staff members.
48. A general staff member appointed by the Dean will act as Secretary to the Committee. The Secretary, who is not a member of the committee, will assist the Committee in whatever way the Chair of the Committee directs. Clause 8.8 details the role of the Secretary to the Committee.
49. The Faculty Investigation Committee will meet to consider the evidence of the case and interview the student and any other persons relevant to the case. The Committee will conduct the meeting in accordance with [section 8. Investigation Committee Procedures](#).
50. Based on the evidence considered and the interview with the student, the Faculty Investigation Committee will make a finding of whether academic misconduct has occurred.

#### **Allegation Dismissed**

51. If the Faculty Investigation Committee finds that academic misconduct has not occurred, the allegation will be dismissed.
52. The Faculty Investigation Committee will:
- a. quash any outcome that has been imposed (where the committee has met as a result of an appeal by the student)
  - b. advise ARD to update the record of the case on the Central Register; and
  - c. advise the student and the PIO of the outcome using the appropriate notice letter template for advice to the student.
53. The Faculty Investigation Committee may determine not to make a finding of academic misconduct on the grounds that the conduct of the student represents poor academic practice or scholarship rather than academic misconduct, and may impose an informal outcome, following the procedures set out in clauses 5.2 – 5.3.

#### **Allegation Upheld**

54. If the Faculty Investigation Committee finds that academic misconduct has occurred, the allegation will be upheld.
55. The Faculty Investigation Committee will then determine the appropriate level of outcome. When doing so, consideration may be given to the factors listed in clause 5.8.
56. If the Faculty Investigation Committee determines that a Low-Level or Medium-Level outcome is appropriate, it will:
- a. impose an outcome;
  - b. advise ARD to update the case and outcome on the Central Register accordingly; and
  - c. advise the student and the PIO of the outcome using the appropriate notice letter template for advice to the student.

57. If the Faculty Investigation Committee determines that a High-Level outcome is appropriate, it will refer the matter to the Student Conduct Committee.
58. When referring a matter to the Student Conduct Committee, the Faculty Investigation Committee will:
  - a. use the Student Misconduct Investigation Form;
  - b. advise ARD to update the case and referral on the Central Register accordingly; and
  - c. advise the student and the PIO of the referral using the appropriate notice letter template for advice to the student.

### **Appeal against Decision of Faculty Investigation Committee**

59. Once an outcome has been imposed, a student may appeal against the finding of the Faculty Investigation Committee, only if the appeal is based on a breach of natural justice requirements or a lack of due process, or if there is new and substantial evidence that has not previously been considered.
60. An appeal by a student against a decision of the Faculty Investigation Committee must:
  - a. be lodged, in writing, with the Academic Registrar within a maximum of ten working days of notification of the outcome of the Faculty Investigation Committee's investigation;
  - b. state fully the reasons for the appeal; and
  - c. include any relevant documentary evidence to support the appeal.
61. The Academic Registrar will consider the case put forward and evidence provided by the student to support the appeal.
62. The Academic Registrar will determine whether there are sufficient grounds for the appeal as soon as possible and within a maximum of ten working days of having received the appeal.

### **Appeal Dismissed**

63. If the Academic Registrar determines that there are not sufficient grounds for the appeal, then the decision of the Faculty Investigation Committee stands. The Academic Registrar will:
  - a. advise ARD to update the case, appeal and outcome on the Central Register accordingly; and
  - b. advise the student and the PIO of the outcome using the appropriate notice letter template for advice to the student.
64. The student has no further opportunity to appeal the decision within the University.

### **Appeal Upheld**

65. If the Academic Registrar determines that there are sufficient grounds for the appeal, then the case is referred either back to the Faculty Investigation Committee for re-consideration (in the case of new and substantial evidence); or to the Student Conduct Committee for consideration (in the case of breach of natural justice requirements or lack of due process). The Academic Registrar will:
  - a. refer the matter back to the Faculty Investigation Committee or to the Student Conduct Committee using the Student Misconduct Investigation Form;
  - b. advise ARD to update the case, appeal and referral on the Central Register accordingly; and
  - c. advise the student and the PIO of the referral using the appropriate notice letter template for advice to the student.

## Stage 4 - Investigation by Student Conduct Committee

66. The Student Conduct Committee will consider cases referred to it by:
  - a. the PIO;
  - b. the Faculty Investigation Committee;
  - c. the Academic Registrar based on appeal by the student against the decision of the Faculty Investigation Committee; or
  - d. the Vice-Principal (Administration) for reconsideration as a result of appeal by the student as per clauses 7.70 – 7.76;
67. Where the Chair of the Student Conduct Committee considers that the case has been referred to the Student Conduct Committee unnecessarily, the Chair may determine to refer the matter back to the Faculty Investigation Committee for consideration.
68. The Student Conduct Committee will comprise:
  - a. a Deputy Vice-Chancellor or the Chair of Academic Senate (or in either case, a nominee, appointed by the Deputy Vice-Chancellor (Academic)), as Chair;
  - b. a senior UOW staff member appointed by the Chair; and
  - c. a student appointed by either:
    - i. the President of the Wollongong Undergraduate Student Association (for undergraduate cases);
    - ii. the President of the Wollongong University Postgraduate Association (for postgraduate cases); or
    - iii. the Vice-Chancellor, if it is not possible or appropriate for an appointment to be made under i, or ii.
69. A Secretary to the Committee will be appointed by the Academic Registrar, to assist the Committee in whatever way the Chair of the Committee directs. Clause 8.8 details the role of the Secretary to the Committee.
70. The Student Conduct Committee will meet to consider the evidence of the case and interview the student and any other persons relevant to the case. The committee will conduct the interview in accordance with [section 8. Investigation Committee Procedures](#).
71. Based on the evidence considered and the interview with the student, the Student Conduct Committee will make a finding of whether academic misconduct has occurred.

### Allegation Dismissed

72. If the Student Conduct Committee finds that academic misconduct has not occurred, the allegation will be dismissed.
73. The Student Conduct Committee will:
  - a. quash any outcome that has been imposed (where the committee has met as a result of an appeal by the student)
  - b. advise ARD to update the record of the case on the Central Register; and
  - c. advise the student and PIO of the outcome using the appropriate notice letter template for advice to the student.
74. The Student Conduct Committee may determine not to make a finding of academic misconduct on the grounds that the conduct of the student represents poor academic practice or scholarship rather than academic misconduct, and may impose an informal outcome, following the procedures set out in clauses 5.2 – 5.3.

### **Allegation Upheld**

75. If the Student Conduct Committee finds that academic misconduct has occurred, the allegation will be upheld.
76. The Student Conduct Committee will then determine the appropriate level of outcome. When doing so, consideration may be given to the factors listed in clause 5.8. The Student Conduct Committee will:
  - a. impose an outcome;
  - b. advise ARD to record the case and outcome on the Central Register; and
  - c. advise the student and PIO of the outcome using the appropriate notice letter template for advice to the student.

### **Appeal against Decision of the Student Conduct Committee**

77. Once an outcome has been imposed, a student may appeal against the finding of the Student Conduct Committee, only if the appeal is based on breach of natural justice requirements, lack of due process, or if there is new and substantial evidence that has not previously been considered.
78. An appeal by a student against a decision of the Student Conduct Committee must:
  - a. be lodged, in writing, with the Vice-Principal (Administration) within a maximum of twenty working days of notification of the outcome of the Student Conduct Committee's investigation;
  - b. state fully the reasons for the appeal; and
  - c. include any relevant documentary evidence to support the appeal.
79. The Vice-Principal (Administration) will consider the case put forward and evidence provided by the student to support the appeal.
80. The Vice-Principal (Administration) will determine whether there are sufficient grounds for the appeal, as soon as possible and within a maximum of ten working days of having received the appeal.

### **Appeal Dismissed**

81. If the Vice-Principal (Administration) determines that there are not sufficient grounds for the appeal, then the decision of the Student Conduct Committee stands. The Vice-Principal (Administration) will:
  - a. advise ARD to update the case, appeal and outcome on the Central Register; and
  - b. advise the student and the PIO of the outcome using the appropriate notice letter template for advice to the student.
82. The student has no further opportunity to appeal the decision within the University.

### **Appeal Upheld**

83. If the Vice-Principal (Administration) determines that there are sufficient grounds for the appeal, then the case is referred to either the Student Conduct Committee for re-consideration (in the case of new and substantial evidence) or the Council Committee of Appeal for consideration (in the case of breach of natural justice requirements or lack of due process). The Vice-Principal (Administration) will:
  - a. refer the matter back to the Student Conduct Committee or to the Council Committee of Appeal using the Student Misconduct Investigation Form;
  - b. advise ARD to update the case, appeal and referral on the Central Register; and

- c. advise the student and PIO of the referral using the appropriate notice letter template for advice to the student.

### **Stage 5 - Consideration of an Appeal by Council Committee of Appeal**

84. The Council Committee of Appeal will consider cases referred to the committee by the Vice-Principal (Administration) as a result of appeal by the student against a decision of the Student Conduct Committee.
85. The Council Committee of Appeal will comprise:
  - a. Deputy Chancellor (as Chair, *ex officio*);
  - b. one external member of Council;
  - c. one academic staff member of Council; and
  - d. one student member of Council.
86. Staff and student members of the Committee will not be from the same faculty as the student.
87. Members of the Committee will be appointed when required by the Council in accordance with the membership provisions above. If a Council meeting is not imminent when an appeal matter arises, the Committee will be constituted by the Chancellor in accordance with the membership provisions.
88. A Secretary to the Council Committee of Appeal will be appointed by the Vice-Principal (Administration). The Secretary, who is not a member of the committee, will assist the Committee in whatever way the Chair of the Committee directs. Clause 8.8 details the role of the Secretary to the Committee.
89. The Council Committee of Appeal will meet to consider the evidence of the case and interview the student and any other persons relevant to the case. The Committee will conduct the interview in accordance with [section 8. Investigation Committee Procedures](#).
90. The Council Committee of Appeal will determine whether the appeal is warranted and will be upheld. Where the appeal is upheld, action will be taken to close the matter.

### **Appeal Dismissed**

91. If the Council Committee of Appeal determines that the appeal is not warranted, the decision of the Student Conduct Committee will be upheld.
92. The Council Committee of Appeal will:
  - a. advise ARD to update the record of the case on the Central Register accordingly; and
  - b. advise the student and PIO of the outcome using the appropriate notice letter template for advice to the student.
93. The student will have no further opportunity to appeal the decision within the University.

### **Appeal Upheld**

94. If the Council Committee of Appeal determines that the appeal is warranted, action will be taken to close the matter in accordance with clauses 7.88 – 7.89 or 7.90 – 7.91.

### **Allegation Dismissed**

95. If the Council Committee of Appeal finds that academic misconduct has not occurred, the allegation will be dismissed.
96. The Council Committee of Appeal will:

- a. quash the outcome imposed by the Student Conduct Committee;
  - b. advise ARD to update the record of the case, appeal and outcome on the Central Register accordingly; and
  - c. advise the student and PIO of the outcome using the appropriate notice letter template for advice to the student.
97. The Council Committee of Appeal may determine not to make a finding of academic misconduct on the grounds that the conduct of the student represents poor academic practice or scholarship rather than academic misconduct, and may impose an informal outcome, following the procedures set out in clauses 5.2 – 5.3.

### **Allegation Upheld**

98. If the Council Committee of Appeal finds that academic misconduct has occurred but that a different outcome should be imposed, the allegation will be upheld and the Council Committee of Appeal will impose a new outcome.
99. The Council Committee of Appeal will:
- a. quash the original outcome imposed by the Student Conduct Committee and impose a new outcome;
  - b. advise ARD to update the record of the case, appeal and outcome on the Central Register accordingly; and
  - c. advise the student and PIO of the outcome using the appropriate notice letter template for advice to the student.
100. The student will have no further opportunity to appeal the decision within the University.

### **Termination of Investigation Proceedings**

101. Any student misconduct investigation proceedings, including appeal proceedings, may be suspended by the Vice-Principal (Administration) if the student ceases to be enrolled at the University.
102. If student misconduct investigation proceedings are suspended under rule 7.92, the Vice-Principal (Administration) will advise the student that:
- a. they have no automatic right to return to the University; and
  - b. if they apply for re-enrolment, they will not be re-enrolled until the student conduct investigation proceedings are completed.
103. The Vice-Principal (Administration) will ensure that the record of the investigation on the Central Register is updated accordingly.

## **8 Investigation Committee Procedures**

1. The procedures set out below must be followed by any Investigation Committee when conducting an investigation of alleged academic misconduct by a student undertaking coursework.
2. Investigation Committees authorised to investigate cases of alleged academic misconduct by a student undertaking coursework are:
  - a. Faculty Investigation Committee;
  - b. Student Conduct Committee; and
  - c. Council Committee of Appeal.

## **Membership of Investigation Committees**

3. Both genders must be represented on a committee.
4. A person may not sit on a committee investigating an allegation of misconduct where that person has previously been involved with the investigation of the allegation or there is, otherwise, a potential or actual conflict of interest on the part of that person.
5. A member of a committee who, during an investigation or appeal, ceases to hold the office by virtue of which they are a member of that committee, may remain a member of the committee until the investigation has been completed.
6. If during the currency of an investigation or appeal a member of a committee becomes unable (through illness or any other cause) to act for a period that would unduly delay the completion of the investigation, the committee may complete its investigation or appeal in their absence as long as at least two other members are still able to act.

## **Secretary to Investigation Committees**

7. All Investigation Committees will have a Secretary to assist the Committee in whatever way the Chair of the Committee directs.
8. The Secretary:
  - a. plays a key role in the operation and conduct of the committee, and in ensuring that investigations are carried out in accordance with relevant policies and procedures.
  - b. in carrying out his/her role has a direct reporting link to the chair of the committee regarding the conduct of the committee's business;
  - c. keeps the chair informed on all issues relating to the affairs of the committee and works closely with the chair to establish and implement good governance practices for the committee;
  - d. provides guidance to the chair and members of the committee as to their responsibilities under the committee's terms of reference;
  - e. is the point of contact for committee members who wish to obtain information from officers of the University;
  - f. is responsible for advising the committee on policy and procedural matters;
  - g. is responsible for all aspects of committee meeting arrangements in consultation with the chair;
  - h. is responsible for preparation of committee agendas and minutes, the chair's notes, conducting research and preparing reports where required; and
  - i. is to ensure that all documentation provided to the committee is accurate, timely, concise and appropriate.

## **Referrals to Investigation Committees**

9. Matters will be referred to an Investigation Committee using the Student Misconduct Investigation Form. Referrals must include full details of the case, including:
  - i. a detailed explanation of the allegation;
  - ii. summary of key evidence supporting the allegation;
  - iii. summary of results of evidence gathering (including discussion or interview with the student); and
  - iv. supporting materials.

## Service of an Investigation Notice

10. Where a matter has been referred to a Faculty Investigation Committee or the Student Conduct Committee, the Secretary of that committee must serve the student with a written Investigation Notice as soon as possible and within a maximum of ten working days of the referral.
11. An Investigation Notice served under clause 8.8 must include:
  - a. details of the allegation;
  - b. reference to any rule, policy or code allegedly breached;
  - c. advice on withholding assessment results (where relevant);
  - d. an invitation to attend an interview at a given date, time and location;
  - e. the option for the student to be assisted by a support person of their choice at the interview;
  - f. attached copies of any documentation being considered (subject to any requirement to maintain the privacy or safety of another person) and any relevant rule, policy or code;
  - g. an invitation to the student to provide a written statement of how they wish to answer the allegation and any supporting evidence, including counselling reports in advance of the investigation interview; and
  - h. advice that, if the student chooses not to attend, the matter will be determined in their absence.
12. A notice may be served on a student under this procedure either:
  - a. personally within the University or elsewhere (e.g. at their residence); or
  - b. by SOLSMail and post addressed to the student's last known place of residence.
13. If a notice is served by way of SOLSMail and post, it will be deemed to have been served on the student on the date on which it would have been delivered in the ordinary course of the post.
14. A copy of the notice served on a student under clause 8.8 must be provided to the Academic Registrar, for advice to other relevant officers of the University.

## Investigation Committee Meetings

15. The committee meeting should be held as soon as possible and within a maximum of twenty working days of the date of service of the Investigation Notice, unless the Chair of the committee grants an extension to the student or more time is required to collect necessary evidence.
16.
  - a. If a student wishes to submit documentation listed below in i, ii or iii. to the Committee, it must be provided at least two working days before the committee meeting:
    - i. a written statement of how they intend to respond to the allegation;
    - ii. other written material pertinent to their case; or
    - iii. the names of any witness(es) and/or any person supporting the student during the meeting in accordance with clause 8.18(f).
  - b. Any other supporting documentation including professional report(s), statement(s) of extenuating circumstances, or character reference(s), may be provided at the committee meeting.

## Conduct of investigation

17. Where a student who has been given due notice chooses not to attend a committee meeting, the committee may investigate the matter or hear an appeal in the student's absence.
18. In conducting an investigation or appeal meeting, a committee will:
  - a. give the student an opportunity to be heard;
  - b. where an allegation of misconduct is being investigated by a Faculty Investigation Committee or the Student Conduct Committee, explain the allegation to the student and give the student the opportunity to respond to the allegation;
  - c. with the permission of the student, make an audio recording of the interview between the Committee and the student and attach to the Committee file;
  - d. give the Primary Investigation Officer bringing the complaint and/or any other staff member or student involved in the event(s) leading up to the complaint an opportunity to be heard;
  - e. permit the student to be assisted by a support person;
  - f. at the discretion of the Chair, permit any person appearing before the committee to be assisted by a support person;
  - g. permit any support person attending the meeting to provide advice to the student and to address the committee in a summary statement only; the support person is not permitted to interview witnesses or to address the committee directly during interviews;
  - h. permit the student to nominate witnesses to appear to support their defence against the complaint;
  - i. permit any person appearing before the Committee in accordance with (d) above to nominate witnesses to appear to support their evidence;
  - j. disallow questions which it considers to be unseemly or irrelevant for the nature of its investigation;
  - k. caution all persons appearing before the committee that they are expected to conduct themselves in a reasonable and responsible manner during the proceedings and that any form of behaviour which is an impediment to the proceedings will of itself be regarded as a breach of the Rules;
  - l. where there is reasonable concern by the committee or any witness or participant in the proceedings that an individual's safety may be compromised by contact with the student who is the subject of the allegation (e.g. where the student is subject to an Apprehended Violence Order), be entitled to allow the evidence to be presented without the student being present;
  - m. where the conduct of any person interferes with any other person's right to be heard, be entitled to remove that person from the meeting and to hear their evidence separately;
  - n. in cases where the committee makes a finding of academic misconduct, give the student the opportunity to be heard on the issue of outcome;
  - o. hold all its proceedings in private; and
  - p. keep an adequate record of the committee meeting proceedings.
19. Decisions of a committee are made by majority.
20. Where multiple investigations of alleged academic misconduct by a particular student undertaking coursework are taking place concurrently, the determination of an appropriate

outcome for the latter investigation/s may be deferred until the determination of an outcome for the former investigation has been made.

21. A comprehensive file of all relevant documentation, including records of the committee proceedings, evidence presented and the committee's decision will be created, maintained and retained by ARD in accordance with [section 10](#) of this procedure.

## **Outcome of Investigation**

22. As soon as practicable after a meeting of a Faculty Investigation Committee or Student Conduct Committee, and within a maximum of ten working days, the Chair of the Faculty Investigation Committee (or nominee), or the Student Conduct Committee (or nominee), must serve the student with written notice of the outcome of the investigation using the appropriate notice letter template.
23. Where the outcome includes a reprimand from the Vice-Chancellor, the notice will be signed by the Vice-Chancellor (or nominee).
24. Where the Council Committee of Appeal has met in response to a student appeal, as soon as practicable after the meeting and within a maximum of ten working days, the Secretary of the Committee must serve the student with written notice of the outcome of the appeal using the appropriate notice letter template.
25. A copy of the outcome notice served on a student under clause 8.22 or 8.24 must be provided to the Academic Registrar, for advice to other relevant officers of the University.
26. At the conclusion of all investigations, ARD will update and close the record of the case on the Central Register accordingly.

## **9 Extension of Time Limits**

1. Any time limit set in this procedure may be extended at the discretion of the PIO or Chair of the committee, for example, to provide adequate time to gather evidence and convene a meeting or because of special circumstances demonstrated by the student.

## **10 Record Keeping**

1. Cases of academic misconduct by a student undertaking coursework resulting in a low-level outcome will be recorded on the Local Register by the Primary Investigation Officer. Each faculty is responsible for creating and maintaining a Local Register.
2. Cases of academic misconduct by a student undertaking coursework resulting in a medium-level or high-level outcomes will be recorded and filed centrally by the Academic Registrar's Division. The Academic Registrar's Division is responsible for developing and maintaining the Central Register.
3. All files relating to investigations of student misconduct will be retained and disposed of in accordance with the University's [Records Management Policy](#), the [State Records Act 1998](#), and the [General Retention and Disposal Authority GDA23](#). Records of the investigation may include:
  - a. Investigation plan;
  - b. Evidence and other information gathered;
  - c. Record of investigation meetings;
  - d. Summary of investigation; and
  - e. Outcome of investigation.
4. Files relating to cases of academic misconduct by a student undertaking coursework that have been investigated by the Subject Coordinator, PIO and/or Faculty Investigation Committee will be retained and disposed of by the Faculty.

5. Files relating to cases of academic misconduct by a student undertaking coursework that have been investigated by the Student Conduct Committee and/or Council Committee of Appeal will be retained and disposed of by the Academic Registrar's Division.
6. The student has the right of access to copies of all records relating to the investigation.

## **11 Flowchart and Templates**

1. [Procedure Flowchart](#)
2. Investigation and Outcome Notice Templates:
  - a. [Notice of Initial Investigation Discussion Meeting](#)
  - b. [Notice of Outcome of Investigation](#)
  - c. [Notice of Investigation Committee Meeting](#)
  - d. [Notice of Action following Appeal](#)
  - e. [Student Misconduct Investigation Form](#)

## **12 Version Control and Change History**

Version Control	Date Effective	Approved By	Change Details
1	1 January 2008	University Council	Procedure for Managing Alleged Academic Misconduct by a Student Undertaking Coursework accompanies Student Conduct Rules and replaces Rules for Student Conduct and Discipline.
2	20 May 2008	Vice-Principal (Administration)	Minor amendment to clause 7.6 to accommodate alleged academic misconduct during a University Examination.
3	5 February 2009	Deputy Vice-Chancellor (Academic)	Migrated to UOW Procedure Template as per Policy Directory Refresh
4	5 February 2010	University Council	References to <i>Council Committee of Appeal (Student Discipline)</i> amended to <i>Council Committee of Appeal</i> , and committee membership amended, as per University Council resolution 2010/03.
5	Autumn Session 2011	University Council – 15 October 2010	Major review
6	21 June 2011	Vice-Principal (Administration)	Updated to reflect change of name from Wollongong College Australia to UOW College.
7	5 August 2011	University Council	Clause 7.18 added to cross-reference General Course Rule regarding students not withdrawing from a subject that is part of a student misconduct investigation.

### 13 Schedule 1 - Application of Procedure for the Managing Alleged Academic Misconduct by a UOW student undertaking study through UOW College

#### Application

1. The conduct of UOW students who are undertaking study through UOW College is governed by the [Student Conduct Rules](#) and associated procedures, as defined in section 4 of the [Student Conduct Rules](#).

#### Procedure for management of alleged misconduct by a UOW student undertaking study through UOW College

2. The following modified features apply to management of alleged academic misconduct by a UOW student who is undertaking study through UOW College. Where otherwise not stipulated, the Procedure for Managing Alleged Academic Misconduct by a Student Undertaking Coursework applies without modification.

#### Authorised Officers for management of alleged misconduct by a UOW student undertaking study through UOW College

3. For the purposes of management of alleged academic misconduct by a UOW student who is undertaking study through UOW College, the following officers or committees are considered to have equivalent authority and responsibility to the UOW officers or committees referred to in sections 5 – 8 of the Procedure for Managing Alleged Academic Misconduct by a Student Undertaking Coursework:

UOW Officer	UOW College Officer
Subject Coordinator	Program Coordinator
Sub-Dean	Student Advisor
Primary Investigation Officer	Campus Director
Faculty Investigation Committee	Academic Misconduct Panel: <ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>• Director of UOW College (Chair)</li><li>• Two teaching staff appointed by the Chair</li></ul>