The Rules for Student Conduct and Discipline were approved by the University Council on 24 November 2006 under Section 29(2)(d) of the University of Wollongong Act 1989
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Schedule 1: Application of Rules to Students Offshore

1. Preamble

1.1 Aim

1.1.1 The University of Wollongong is committed to providing a safe and orderly environment for the University community, and expects each member of that community to behave responsibly and ethically. These Rules seek to support the achievement of this goal by providing a clear and transparent process for dealing with alleged student misconduct.

1.1.2 The Rules affirm the Guiding Principles of the University of Wollongong which include commitment to:

- high ethical standards including honesty, cooperation, tolerance, and acceptance of obligations as well as rights;
- active support for the intellectual and cultural needs of staff and students;
- accountability to students, the University community, the public and governments;
- the principles of equal opportunity and social justice.

1.2 Application onshore

1.2.1 These Rules apply to alleged misconduct by a person who is a student (as defined in rule 2) at the time of the misconduct, where the misconduct took place either:
  a. on an on-shore Australian campus (as defined in the Campus Access and Order Rules); or
  b. elsewhere, where:
    (i) the student is representing the University of Wollongong (UOW) or Wollongong University College (WUC) (including during work or clinical placements, education practicum and related activities, field trips or sporting competitions); or
    (ii) the misconduct affects another member of the University community in their capacity as a student or member of staff (as defined in the Campus Access and Order Rules).

1.2.2 These Rules also apply to alleged misconduct:
a. by a person who is a student at the University when the allegation is received by the Primary Investigation Officer; and
b. which has affected, or might have affected, the enrolment of that person.

1.3 Application offshore

These Rules apply to alleged misconduct by students enrolled in a UOW program delivered offshore or students undertaking research at an offshore location, as set out in Schedule 1.

1.4 Review

To ensure their efficacy, these Rules will be reviewed by the Academic Registrar’s Division by June 2007. Any amendment to these Rules must receive the approval of Council.

2. Definitions

Key terms used in these Rules are defined as follows:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Term</th>
<th>Definition</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>balance of probabilities</td>
<td>More likely than not to have occurred</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>due process</td>
<td>Procedural rights under these Rules, including the application of the principles of natural justice</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Higher Degree Research (HDR)</td>
<td>Refers to courses leading to a Doctorate by research (including professional doctorate) or a Masters by Research, on a full-time or part-time basis.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>misconduct</td>
<td>Conduct by a student which:</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(i) breaches any University by-law, rule, policy or code, or any resolution of Council;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(ii) is deemed or stated to be misconduct under such a by-law, rule, policy, code or resolution; or</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(iii) is otherwise detrimental to the proper conduct or reputation of the University.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>natural justice</td>
<td>The right:</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(i) to be given a fair hearing and the opportunity to present one’s case; and</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(ii) to have a decision made by an unbiased decision-maker</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Primary Investigation Officer</td>
<td>An officer with delegated responsibilities under 6.1.1 of these Rules</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>student</td>
<td>A person:</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(i) who has been accepted for admission to or enrolled in any course or program offered at, or in conjunction with, the University of Wollongong or the Wollongong University College; or</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(ii) whose body of work, completed while so enrolled (e.g. a research thesis), is still under examination.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>working days</td>
<td>Monday to Friday (not including Public Holidays)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

3. General principles guiding investigations of misconduct
3.1 Persons or committees conducting investigations under these Rules must act in accordance with the principles of natural justice and are not bound by the rules of evidence required in court proceedings.

3.2 Decisions regarding alleged misconduct are made under these rules on the balance of probabilities (defined in rule 2).

3.3 The University may report apparent or suspected criminal conduct by a student to the police.

3.4 All parties involved in an investigation should be treated with respect and impartiality, and any issues put forward by the student such as a disability or medical condition should be taken into consideration.

3.5 The confidentiality of parties involved in an investigation should be respected at all times, subject to the need to fully investigate the matter and any legal requirements for disclosure.

4. Categories of Misconduct

For the purposes of administering these rules, “misconduct” has been grouped into the following categories:

4.1 Academic misconduct – including plagiarism and other forms of cheating by students enrolled in coursework subjects in breach of the General Course Rules [link] or any relevant policy or code, for example, Codes of Practice – Teaching and Assessment, Students, Honours, and Supervision. (Plagiarism in research projects, research reports, publications and theses is covered in 4.2 below).

Examples:
- bringing unauthorised material into an examination room
- plagiarism: using the ideas of another person without giving them credit

4.2 Research Misconduct

Is an action that disrupts, inhibits or prevents sound research practice.

Misconduct in research includes:

- The fabrication of data: claiming results where none have been obtained;
- The falsification of data including changing records;
- Plagiarism (in the context of a research project, report or thesis), including the direct copying of textual material, the use of other people's data and/or ideas without acknowledgment;
- Misleading ascription of authorship including the listing of authors without their permission, attributing work to anyone who has not contributed to the research, and the lack of appropriate acknowledgment of work primarily produced by a research student/trainee or associate;
- Falsely claiming inventorship;
- Other practices that seriously deviate from those commonly accepted within the research community for proposing, conducting or reporting research. For example, failure to comply with legal requirements or official University processes.

Misconduct does not include genuine errors or differences in interpretation or judgments of data.

Examples of research misconduct include but are not limited to the following:

A. Misappropriation: A student researcher shall not:
(i) plagiarise, which shall be understood to mean the presentation of the documented words or ideas of another in a research project, report or thesis, as his or her own, without attribution appropriate for the medium of presentation;
(ii) make use of any information in breach of any duty of confidentiality associated with the review of any manuscript or grant application; and
(iii) omit reference to the relevant published work of others for the purpose of inferring personal discovery of new information.

B. Interference: A student researcher shall not without authorisation take or sequester or materially damage any research-related property of another, including without limitation the apparatus, reagents, biological materials, writings, data, hardware, software, or any other substance or device used or produced in the conduct of research.

C. Misrepresentation: A student researcher shall not:

(i) state or present a material or significant falsehood; or
(ii) omit a fact so that what is stated or presented as a whole states or presents a material or falsehood.

4.3 General Misconduct
4.3.1 Library misconduct – refer Library Code of Conduct [link]

Examples:
- disruptive behaviour in library
- overdue items
- damaging materials

4.3.2 Misconduct in Halls of Residence – refer University Residences Handbooks [link]

Examples:
- breaches of the Campus Access & Order Rules [link]
  - harassing other residents
  - damaging property
- other conduct by a student, including alleged criminal conduct, which is detrimental to the proper conduct or reputation of the University.

4.3.3 IT misconduct - refer IT Acceptable Use Policy [link]

Examples:
- disclosing a user ID and password giving access to the IT network or using another person's password
- disrupting or damaging IT facilities
- misusing email
- accessing offensive material without authority
- illegal or unauthorised downloading of music, video or text
- creating or installing malicious software
- gaining unauthorised access to University IT facilities

4.3.4 Other misconduct – including:

a. breaches of Campus Access & Order Rules [link];
b. breaches of other University by-laws, rules, policies, codes or resolutions not covered under the above categories;
c. other conduct by a student, including alleged criminal conduct, which is detrimental to the proper conduct or reputation of the University.

Examples:
Breaches of Campus Access & Order Rules
- harassing, threatening or abusing students or staff
- disrupting a class or examination
■ damaging University property or external property while representing the University as a student
■ multiple or blatant breaches of parking rules

Other conduct detrimental to the proper conduct or reputation of the University
■ attempting to bribe or otherwise improperly influence staff
■ falsifying documents (e.g. medical certificates or enrolment documents)

5.1 Investigation & Appeal Framework for all misconduct OTHER THAN Research Misconduct (The process for dealing with Research Misconduct is covered in Section 10 of these rules)

Sections 5 to 9 provide a staged investigation and appeal process for dealing with all allegations of student misconduct, other than those of Research Misconduct:

Stage 1: initial investigation by Primary Investigation Officer – rule 6 [link]
Stage 2: appeal or referral to Faculty Investigation Committee (for academic misconduct only) – rule 7 [link], Stage 3: appeal or referral to Student Conduct Committee – rule 8 [link]
Stage 4: appeal to University Council Committee of Appeal (Student Discipline) - rule 9 [link]  See the flowchart depicting the investigation and appeal processes in Appendix A [link].

6. Stage 1: Primary Investigation of an Allegation

6.1 Allegation and preliminary action

6.1.1 A member of the University staff may refer an allegation of misconduct by a student to an appropriate Primary Investigation Officer listed below, as soon as practicable after the alleged misconduct has occurred. The Academic Registrar’s Division (ARD) must be notified in writing of the names and contact details of all PIO’s and standing nominees.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Primary Investigation Officer</th>
<th>Category of misconduct (as defined in rule 4) over which officer has authority</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Head of Academic Unit and a standing nominee or a maximum of two standing nominees appointed by the Head of Academic Unit</td>
<td>Academic misconduct</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Head of Wollongong University College or standing nominee</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Academic Registrar or standing nominee</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The University Librarian or standing nominee</td>
<td>Library misconduct</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Head of a University Residence or standing nominee</td>
<td>Misconduct in Halls of Residence</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IT Director or standing nominee</td>
<td>IT misconduct</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Academic Registrar, or nominee (eg Head of Shoalhaven Campus, Education Centre Heads)</td>
<td>Other misconduct</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>■ Breaches of Campus Access &amp; Order Rules</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>■ Breaches of other University by-laws, rules, policies, codes or resolutions not covered under Library misconduct, misconduct in the halls of residence or IT</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Other conduct by a student, including alleged criminal conduct, which is detrimental to the proper conduct or reputation of the University.

Other officers may be appointed by a Deputy Vice-Chancellor to act as a Primary Investigation Officer from time to time. This must also be notified to ARD.

6.1.2 A PIO or nominee who has a real or potential conflict of interest in a discipline matter (e.g., if a PIO dealing with an allegation of plagiarism assessed the work of a student, tutored or was subject coordinator for the subject in which plagiarism was detected) should not act as a PIO in relation to that matter and an alternate standing nominee should act as PIO.

6.1.3 Where the alleged misconduct poses a risk of:
   a. injury to another person;
   b. damage to property; or
   c. disruption of University activities,
   a Primary Investigation Officer may remove the student immediately from access to the activity, facility or property.

6.1.4 After a preliminary review of the allegation and any supporting documents, the Primary Investigation Officer may:
   a. refuse to take the matter further if there are insufficient grounds for the allegation (notifying the person/s who raised the allegation of this decision); or
   b. investigate the allegation in accordance with rule 6.2; or
   c. refer the matter, in accordance with rule 6.2.6b.ii, to the relevant Faculty Investigation Committee or the Student Conduct Committee, as appropriate, if the Primary Investigation Officer believes that the alleged offence would warrant a higher penalty than they can impose under Appendix D; 
   AND
   d. where appropriate, take urgent action to deal with serious misconduct in accordance with rule 11.1.

6.1.5 A Primary Investigation Officer, who proceeds with an investigation or refers a matter to a committee under rule 6.1.4, must notify ARD to report that an investigation is to commence (and the Research Student Centre in the case of higher degree research students). The Academic Registrar may withhold the student’s assessment results until the proceedings (including any appeals) are finalised.

6.2 Primary Investigation Process

6.2.1 Where the Primary Investigation Officer decides to proceed with the investigation under rule 6.1.4, the Primary Investigation Officer must serve the student with a written Investigation Notice within ten working days of the date of the allegation. Notices should be served in accordance with section 12.2 of these Rules.

6.2.2 The Investigation Notice must comply with the requirements in Appendix C, clause 2.1.2 and include an invitation to attend an interview at a given date, time and location.

   See Sample Letter 1 - Primary Investigation Notice 1, Appendix E [link].

6.2.3 The student must respond to the Investigation Notice and provide any supporting information in advance of the investigation interview.
6.2.4 The investigation interview must be held within ten working days of the date of service of the Investigation Notice, unless the Primary Investigation Officer grants an extension to the student or more time is required to collect necessary evidence.

6.2.5 In conducting the investigation, the Primary Investigation Officer will:

a. review any available documentation (including the student’s academic record), discuss the circumstances of the matter with the initiating staff member and seek any clarification or further information required to assess the validity or seriousness of the allegation;

b. give the student an opportunity to present a case verbally at an investigation interview and/or by way of written submission;

c. create and maintain a comprehensive file of all relevant documentation (including records of interviews/conversations with relevant parties) and retain in accordance with rule 12.3.

6.2.6 At the conclusion of the investigation, the Primary Investigation Officer:

a. may dismiss the allegation; or

b. where misconduct is found to have occurred, must contact ARD to determine whether the student is a repeat offender (where this is the case, the matter can be considered in determining a penalty). The PIO can either:
   (i) impose a penalty (in accordance with their authority under Appendix D); or
   (ii) where a higher penalty is warranted, refer the matter to the relevant Faculty Investigation Committee or the Student Conduct Committee.

6.2.7 When referring a matter to an investigation committee under rule 6.1.4 or 6.2.6, the Primary Investigation Officer must provide the committee with a written report which includes the following details:

a. the name and student number of each student involved;

b. the details of the allegation;

c. any rule, policy or code breached;

d. copies of supporting documents; and

e. the Primary Investigation Officer’s assessment of the matter after investigation and interview.

6.2.8 As soon as practicable after the interview and within ten working days of the interview date, the Primary Investigation Officer must serve the student with written notice of:

a. the outcome of the investigation (including any referral to a committee under rule 6.2.6);

b. any penalty imposed;

c. where misconduct has been found to have occurred, relevant appeal processes and requirements.

Notices should be served in accordance with section 12.2 of these Rules.

A copy of the notice must also be given to:

a. the Academic Registrar (where the Academic Registrar is not the Primary Investigation Officer) for advice to other relevant officers;

b. the Research Student Centre in the case of higher degree research students

See Sample Letter 2 - Primary Investigation Outcome Notice, Appendix E [link].

6.3 Appeals
6.3.1 A student may appeal against a decision of the Primary Investigation Officer or the penalty imposed.

6.3.2 An appeal by a student under rule 6.3.1 must:
   a. be lodged, in writing, with the Academic Registrar (or, where the Academic Registrar is the Primary Investigation Officer, another nominated officer not involved in the investigation) within ten working days of notification of the outcome of the primary investigation;
   b. state fully the reasons for the appeal; and
   c. include any relevant documentary evidence to support the appeal.

6.3.3 The Academic Registrar (or other officer) will refer the appeal to:
   a. a Faculty Investigation Committee – for academic misconduct warranting a penalty which can be imposed by such a committee under Appendix D; or
   b. the Student Conduct Committee – for other misconduct.

7. Stage 2: Investigation by Faculty Investigation Committee

7.1 Faculty Investigation Committee

7.1.1 A Faculty Investigation Committee investigates:
   a. allegations of academic misconduct referred to it by a Primary Investigation Officer; or
   b. appeals by students against decisions of Primary Investigation Officers regarding academic misconduct, referred to it by the Academic Registrar.

7.1.2 A Faculty Investigation Committee** comprises:
   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.

See also Appendix C, clause 1 [link] for general provisions governing committee membership.

7.1.3 A general staff member appointed by the Dean acts as Secretary to the Committee, assisting the Committee in whatever way the Chair of the Committee may from time to time direct.

7.2 Procedural matters

7.2.1 For each matter before the Faculty Investigation Committee either by way of appeal or referral, the Chair of the committee may, after a preliminary review:
   a. decide that the committee should proceed with the investigation; or
   b. where the offence would warrant a higher penalty than that which can be imposed by the committee under Appendix D, refer the matter to the Student Conduct Committee (providing the student with a written notice within ten working days informing them that the matter has been referred to the Student Conduct Committee).

** In the case of WUC, the Investigation Committee comprises: (i) the Director (or the Director’s nominee) as Chair; and (ii) either two members of permanent staff (usually the Program Director or Program Manager and one other) who are not involved with the teaching or assessment of the subject concerned or one member of the permanent staff and one academic staff member of UOW who is also a member of the WUC education committee. A general staff member appointed by the Director acts as Secretary to the Committee, assisting the Committee in whatever way the Chair of the Committee may from time to time direct.
Committee and sending a copy of the notice to the Academic Registrar for advice to other relevant officers);

AND

c. where appropriate, take urgent action to deal with serious misconduct in accordance with rule 11.1.

7.2.2 The Faculty Investigation Committee will conduct investigations in accordance with the procedures set out in Appendix C.

7.2.3 At the conclusion of an investigation, the Faculty Investigation Committee may:
   a. dismiss the allegation; or
   b. where misconduct is found to have occurred, either (i) impose a penalty in accordance with its authority under Appendix D; or (ii) where a higher penalty is warranted, refer the matter to the Student Conduct Committee.

7.2.4 A written notice of the outcome of the investigation (including a referral to the Student Conduct Committee under rule 7.2.3(b)(ii)) must be served on the student in accordance with section 12.2 and Appendix C, clause 4.1 of these Rules.

7.2.5 A copy of the notice must also be given to:
   a. the Academic Registrar for advice to other relevant officers;
   b. the Research Student Centre in the case of higher degree research students.

7.3 Appeals

7.3.1 A student may appeal to the Student Conduct Committee against a decision of the Faculty Investigation Committee on the grounds that:
   a. due process has not been adhered to by the Faculty Investigation Committee; or
   b. relevant new or additional information is now available.

7.3.2 An appeal by a student under rule 7.3.1 must:
   a. be lodged, in writing, with the Academic Registrar within ten working days of notification of the decision of the Faculty Investigation Committee;
   b. state fully the reasons for the appeal; and
   c. include any relevant documentary evidence to support the appeal.

7.3.3 The Academic Registrar may determine that:
   a. additional information has been made available that was not placed before the Faculty Investigation Committee and refer the matter back to that Committee for reconsideration in accordance with the procedures set out in Appendix C; or
   b. the appeal is based on the ground of lack of due process and refer the appeal to the Student Conduct Committee; or
   c. there are insufficient grounds to warrant an appeal and no further action will be taken.

7.3.4 Where the Academic Registrar makes a determination under rule 7.3.3 that there are insufficient grounds to warrant an appeal, a written notice of that decision must be served on the student as soon as practicable in accordance with section 12.2 of these Rules.

8. Stage 3: Student Conduct Committee

8.1 Student Conduct Committee

8.1.1 The Student Conduct Committee investigates:
   a. allegations of misconduct referred to it by a Primary Investigation Officer or Faculty Investigation Committee; or
   b. appeals by students against decisions of a Primary Investigation Officer or Faculty Investigation Committee, referred to it by the Academic Registrar.
8.1.2 The Student Conduct Committee comprises:
• a Deputy Vice-Chancellor (usually for non-academic misconduct or student misconduct) OR Chair of Academic Senate or nominee (usually for academic misconduct), as Chair
• a senior University staff member appointed by the Chair
• 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).

See also Appendix C, clause 1 [link] for general provisions governing committee membership.

8.1.3 A Secretary to the Committee is appointed by the Academic Registrar to assist the Committee in whatever way the Chair of the Committee may from time to time direct.

8.2 Procedural matters

8.2.1 The Chair of the Student Conduct Committee may, after a preliminary review, take urgent action to deal with alleged serious misconduct under rule 11.1.

8.2.2 The Student Conduct Committee will conduct investigations in accordance with the procedures set out in Appendix C.

8.2.3 At the conclusion of an investigation, the Student Conduct Committee may:
   a. dismiss the allegation; or
   b. where misconduct is found to have occurred, either i) for penalties not including a suspension, deferred suspension or exclusion, impose a penalty, in accordance with the Committee’s authority under Appendix D; or (ii) for penalties including suspension, deferred suspension or exclusion, recommend to the Vice-Chancellor that such a penalty be imposed.

8.2.4 On receipt of a recommendation under rule 8.2.3b(ii), the Vice-Chancellor may:
   a. approve the penalty recommended by the Student Conduct Committee; or
   b. refer the issue of penalty back to the Student Conduct Committee for further consideration.

8.2.5 A written notice of the Vice-Chancellor’s decision under rule 8.2.4 must be served on the student in accordance with section 12.2 and Appendix C, clause 4.1 of these Rules.

8.2.6 A copy of the notice must also be given to:
   a. the Academic Registrar for advice to other relevant officers;
   b. the relevant Faculty sub-dean
   c. the Research Student Centre in the case of higher degree research students.”

8.2.7 If agreement cannot be reached between the Vice-Chancellor and the Student Conduct Committee over an appropriate penalty then the matter shall be referred to the Council Committee of Appeal (Student Discipline).

8.3 Appeals

8.3.1 A student may apply to appeal against a decision of the Student Conduct Committee on the grounds that:
   a. due process has not been adhered to by the Student Conduct Committee; or
   b. relevant new or additional information is now available.
8.3.2 An application for appeal by a student under rule 8.3.1 must:
a. be lodged, in writing, with the Vice-Principal (Administration) within ten working days of notification of the decision of the Student Conduct Committee;
b. state fully the reasons for the appeal; and
c. include any relevant documentary evidence to support the appeal.

8.3.3 The Vice-Principal (Administration) may determine that:
a. additional information has been made available that was not placed before the Student Conduct Committee and refer the matter back to that Committee for reconsideration in accordance with the procedures set out in Appendix C; or
b. the appeal is based on the ground of lack of due process and refer the appeal to the Council Committee of Appeal (Student Discipline); or
c. there are insufficient grounds to warrant an appeal and no further action will be taken.

8.3.4 Where the Vice-Principal (Administration) makes a determination under rule 8.3.3 that there are insufficient grounds to warrant an appeal, a written notice of that decision must be served on the student as soon as practicable in accordance with section 12.2 of these Rules.

9. Stage 4: University Council Committee of Appeal (Student Discipline)

9.1 Committee of Appeal

9.1.1 The Council Committee of Appeal (Student Discipline) (referred to in this rule as the “Committee of Appeal”) is a committee of the University Council which has delegated authority to investigate appeals against decisions of the Student Conduct Committee, DVC(R), DVC(A) and RMIC, and to decide whether due process has been followed by that authority.

9.1.2 The Committee of Appeal comprises:

- the Deputy Chancellor or, if unavailable, another member of Council appointed by the Chancellor (as Chair)
- the student member of Council or, if unavailable, another student appointed by Council
- one other member of Council appointed by Council

See also Appendix C, clause 1 for general provisions governing committee membership.

9.1.3 A Secretary to the Committee of Appeal is appointed by the Vice-Principal (Administration) to assist the Committee in whatever way the Chair of the Committee may from time to time direct.

9.2 Procedural matters

9.2.1 The Committee of Appeal must conduct investigations in accordance with the procedures set out in Appendix C.

9.2.2 At the conclusion of an investigation, the Committee of Appeal may:
a. affirm that due process was followed by the Student Conduct Committee and confirm the decision taken by the Committee or by the Vice-Chancellor on the advice of that Committee; or
b. set aside the original decision on the ground of lack of due process and refer the matter back to the Student Conduct Committee, DVC(R), DVC(A) or RMIC as appropriate for a new hearing, with a reference to the shortcomings in due process; or
c. refer the matter back to the Student Conduct Committee, DVC(R), DVC(A) or RMIC as appropriate for reconsideration of relevant new evidence that was made available during the appeal.

9.2.3 A written notice of the decision of the Committee of Appeal under rule 9.2.2 must be served on the student in accordance with section 12.2 and Appendix C, clause 4.2 of these Rules.

9.2.4 A copy of the notice must also be given to:
   a. the Academic Registrar for advice to other relevant officers
   b. the relevant Faculty sub-dean
   c. the Research Student Centre in the case of Higher degree research students"

10 Investigation & Appeal Framework for Research Misconduct

Due to the unique nature of research and the vast differences in its pursuit and practice, allegations of research misconduct can have serious consequences, particularly for students presenting their research in a public forum. Research misconduct therefore must be investigated and disciplined under a separate process.

Stage 1: initial assessment by Advisor on Integrity in Research (AIR) – rule 10.1 [link]
Stage 2: referral to PVC(R) – rule 10.2 [link],
Stage 3: referral to DVC(R) – rule 10.3 [link]
Stage 4: referral to Research Misconduct Investigation Committee (RMIC) – rule 10.4
Stage 5: appeal to University Council Committee of Appeal (Student Discipline) - rule 9 [link]

10.1 Procedures Where Research Misconduct is Suspected or Alleged

10.1.1 Advisors on Integrity in Research

a. Faculty Research Committee Chairs, Directors of University Research Strengths, Deans and Heads of Academic Units or Schools are the University’s nominated Advisors on Integrity in Research. They are required to be familiar with this document, and with issues surrounding research misconduct, including procedural fairness.

b. Advisors on Integrity in Research should recognise that students or staff may sometimes make improper allegations of research misconduct as a result of frustration based on poor communication, misunderstanding or, at worst, harassment, rather than research misconduct.

10.1.2 Stage 1: Initial Assessment

a. A member of staff or a student should in the first instance contact their Faculty Research Chair (FRC), the Director of their Research Strength, Dean or Heads of Academic Unit or School if he/she requires confidential advice about what might constitute misconduct in research, the rights and responsibilities of a potential complaint, and the procedures for dealing with allegations of research misconduct within the University. The role of Advisors on Integrity in Research, at this stage, is limited to giving confidential general advice regarding research misconduct and, if the matter merits further investigation, to facilitate the referral of the matter to the Dean who will make an initial assessment of the allegation and determine:

   i. That there is no substance to the allegation/ suspicion, and so no further action will be taken. In this case a file note will be retained and the complainant will be notified of the Dean's decision.

   Or

   ii. That the matter should be referred to the PVC(R) for an assessment to establish whether there is a case to answer in accordance with 10.2 below.
b. Complainants who have additional evidence to suggest that a Dean's finding—that there was no further substance to the allegation/suspicion—was flawed, may request that the matter be considered by the PVC(R) who will determine:

i. That there is no substance to the allegation/suspicion, and so no further action will be taken. In this case a file note will be retained and the complainant will be notified of the Dean's decision.

Or

ii. That the matter should be referred to the PVC(R) for an assessment to establish whether there is a case to answer in accordance with 10.2 below.

c. There may be instances where the Chair of the University's Animal Ethics Committee, the Animal Facilities Management Committee, the Biosafety Committee, the University of Wollongong/Area Health Service Health and Medical Human Research Ethics Committee, or the University of Wollongong/Area Health Service Humanities, Social Science and Behavioural Human Research Ethics Committee suspects research misconduct involving a student associated with the University has occurred. The Chair will forward those suspicions to the PVC(R) for an assessment to establish whether there is a case to answer in accordance with 10.2 below.

10.2 Stage 2: Establishment of a Case to Answer

10.2.1 Where research misconduct is suspected or alleged, the PVC(R) will undertake a further assessment to establish whether there is a case to answer and whether or not the matter should be referred to a Research Misconduct Investigations Committee (10.3). This assessment will include provision of a written statement of any allegations to the person(s) against whom the allegation has been made and for a written response from that person to be received within 10 working days. The PVC(R) may contact the person(s) against whom the allegation has been made and conduct an interview with the person(s).

10.2.2 At the conclusion of the assessment establishing whether there is a case to answer, the PVC(R) will either:

a. Determine that there is a case to answer and refer the matter to an RMIC for investigation as to matters of fact;

Or

b. Refer the matter to the DVC(R) with a recommendation:

   i. That there is no case to answer and the matter should be closed with no further action required.

   Or

   ii. That the persons against whom the allegation has been made should be censured for their actions, but there is no need to establish an RMIC.

10.2.3 It is important to recognise that an allegation of research misconduct can damage irreparably the reputation of the person(s) within their discipline, even when proved to be baseless. For this reason, it is vital that action be taken expeditiously and confidentially to identify whether or not a case of research misconduct should be pursued.

10.2.4 Where, following the initial assessment, the PVC(R) determines that there is no substance to the matter and that no further action is required, or that the matter
requires censure by the DVC(R), the PVC(R) will retain a file note concerning the allegation and assessment of whether there was a case to answer.

10.3 Stage 3: Matters referred to DVC(R) from PVC(R)

10.3.1 Where following 10.2b.ii the PVC(R) refers a matter to the DVC(R) for action, the DVC(R) will determine whether:

a. To conclude the matter, with no further action required.

b. To impose a penalty on students. The penalties available are:
   i. Imposing a period of probation (with or without also suspending any scholarship the student may hold)
   ii. Suspension of candidature for a period
   iii. Termination of Candidature

c. To censure the person(s) involved.

d. To refer the matter to an RMIC for investigation.

10.3.2 In the case that the DVC(R) determines to refer the matter to an RMIC, the DVC(R) will establish an RMIC as articulated in 10.4, with the DVC(R) establishing the RMIC rather than the PVC(R) or Standing Nominee, and the report of the RMIC will be delivered to the DVC(A). The penalty options available to the DVC(A) would be the same as those available to the DVC(R) in 10.5.2.

10.3.3 Following the process in 10.4, the Deputy Vice-Chancellor (Research) will ensure that all necessary steps are taken to rectify distortions that may exist in the research record.

10.4 Stage 4: Investigation Process where Research Misconduct by a student is Suspected or Alleged

10.4.1 Where the DVC(R) accepts that the matter should be referred to a RMIC, the DVC(R) will establish the Committee (refer (e) below) that will conduct a detailed investigation to determine whether a case of research misconduct has occurred. The DVC(R) will provide written notification of the establishment of the RMIC to the notifier of the allegation and the person(s) against whom the allegation has been made.

10.4.2 Where the DVC(R) accepts that the matter should be referred to a RMIC, then the DVC(R) will provide advice of this, in confidence, to the secretary of any funding agency currently supporting the person(s) against whom the allegations are made, on the understanding that the agency will not terminate its support.

10.4.3 The investigation must make provision for a written statement of any allegations to be provided to the person(s) against whom such allegations are directed, and for a written response from that person(s) to be received and considered within 10 working days. The RMIC will report on the findings, whether misconduct has occurred and any mitigating circumstances. Under normal circumstances, the investigation should be completed within a period of 20 working days.

10.4.4 If the person(s) accused of such misconduct is a former student, the investigation must continue in order to establish the facts. Distortions of the research record must be rectified, whether or not the person(s) involved remains in the institution.

10.4.5 The RMIC will normally consist of a maximum of three (3) members who are senior academics (level D or above), and may include one senior academic who is external
to the University, appointed by the DVC(R) or Standing Nominee of the Vice-Chancellor. Where possible the Committee shall have representation of both genders. All members will have relevant research backgrounds. The Chair will be from a Faculty other than that of the Faculty where the matter has arisen. The Committee will keep all matters confidential. All records of meetings of the Committee will be kept confidential within the Research Student Centre (for allegations primarily against a HDR candidate(s)) or the Academic Registrar’s Division (for all other students). The Committee may seek any documentary evidence or expertise it considers may assist the investigation.

10.4.6 The rights of all stakeholders must be protected during the investigation by maintaining confidentiality and ensuring procedural fairness.

Stakeholders can include:

• the University of Wollongong
• those alleging research misconduct
• the person(s) against whom an allegation is made
• staff, student and trainees working or involved with those making an allegation, or with those against whom an allegation is made
• journals and other media reporting research subject to suspected, alleged, or found research misconduct
• funding bodies supporting persons or research involved
• the public.

10.4.7 The RMIC will adhere to the principles of procedural fairness and will seek whatever evidence that is deemed relevant to a proper investigation of the matter. The RMIC is charged with responsibility for finding whether, as a matter of fact, research misconduct has occurred. The RMIC does not have authority to impose penalties.

10.4.8 The RMIC shall report its findings and any mitigating circumstances to the DVC(R) for consideration and any subsequent action on the matter (if the RMIC was established by the DVC(R) then the report will be made to the DVC appointed by the VC in accordance with 10.3.2.

10.5 Penalties that may be applied where the RMIC finds that a case of Research Misconduct exists

10.5.1 Where, following investigation of the matter, a view is formed by the RMIC that a case of research misconduct exists, the RMIC shall report its findings and any mitigating circumstances to the DVC(R) for consideration and any subsequent action. The DVC(R) should, as early as practicable, inform the person against whom the allegation has been made as to whether or not it is considered a case of research misconduct exists and any subsequent action proposed. The notifier of the allegation will also be advised as to the result of the investigation.

10.5.2 Where the DVC(R) concludes, based on the RMIC report, that research misconduct exists the DVC(R) shall determine whether to:

a. To conclude the matter, with no further action required

b. To impose a penalty on students.

i. The penalties available are:

   a. Imposing a period of probation (with or without also suspending any HDR scholarship the student may hold)
   b. Suspension of candidature for a period
   c. Termination of Candidature
c. To censure the person(s) involved

d. To refer the matter for further action:
   i. A case against a former student may need to be referred to the Legal and Commercial Unit of the Financial Services Division for consideration of legal ramifications and to the DVC(R) to implement procedures noted in 10.5.4 below.

10.5.3 When, following the process in 10.5.2, research misconduct is found not to have occurred the DVC(R) shall insure that the secretary of any funding body notified under 10.4.2. is advised of the finding.

10.5.4 When, following the process in 10.5.2, research misconduct is found to have occurred, the DVC(R) shall ensure that the findings of research misconduct are reported to all funding agencies that have funded work in respect of which such misconduct occurred, or which are currently supporting the person found to have engaged in research misconduct, and to journals and other media and relevant agencies, through which the research in question was reported, and take any other steps required to rectify distortions that may exist in the research record.

10.5.5 In those cases, where the RMIC is established by the DVC(R), following 10.4.1 then the report of the RMIC will be made to the DVC appointed by the VC in accordance with 10.4.2. That DVC will follow the process articulated in 10.5.1-10.5.4.

10.6 Appeals

10.6.1 A student may apply to appeal against a decision of the DVC(R), PVC(R) or RMIC on the grounds that:
   a. due process has not been adhered to by the DVC(R), PVC(R) or RMIC; or
   b. relevant new or additional information is now available.

10.6.2 An application for appeal by a student under rule 10.6.1 must:
   a. be lodged, in writing, with the Vice-Principal (Administration) within ten working days of notification of the decision of the DVC(R), PVC(R) or RMIC;
   b. state fully the reasons for the appeal; and
   c. include any relevant documentary evidence to support the appeal.

10.6.3 The Vice-Principal (Administration) may determine that:
   a. additional information has been made available that was not placed before the DVC(R), PVC(R) or RMIC and refer the matter back to that person/Committee for reconsideration in accordance with the procedures set out in Appendix C; or
   b. the appeal is based on the ground of lack of due process and refer the appeal to the Council Committee of Appeal (Student Discipline); or
   c. there are insufficient grounds to warrant an appeal and no further action will be taken.

10.6.4 Where the Vice-Principal (Administration) makes a determination under rule 8.3.3 that there are insufficient grounds to warrant an appeal, a written notice of that decision must be served on the student as soon as practicable in accordance with section 12.2 of these Rules.

For cases of Student Appeals against decisions of Research Misconduct refer to 9. Stage 4: University Council Committee of Appeal (Student Discipline)

11 Urgency provisions where serious misconduct may have occurred
11.1 Where alleged misconduct:
   a. is the subject of investigation by the police or other civil authorities;
   b. may bring the University and its students into public disrepute;
   c. involves extreme harassment or vilification which breaches the University’s Guiding Principles and policies;
   d. threatens the welfare or study of other students; or
   e. is otherwise considered to be serious enough to warrant immediate suspension.

   A Primary Investigation Officer, the Chair of a Faculty Investigation Committee or the Chair of the Student Conduct Committee may, after preliminary review, recommend to the Vice-Chancellor that the student be suspended immediately from the University, pending the outcome of the investigation.

11.2 Upon receiving a recommendation under rule 11.1, the Vice-Chancellor may either:
   a. accept the recommendation, impose an immediate suspension and, where appropriate, direct the Primary Investigation Officer or Faculty Investigation Committee to refer the matter to the Student Conduct Committee within ten working days; or
   b. not accept the recommendation for immediate suspension and refer the matter to the Primary Investigation Officer, the Chair of the Faculty Investigation Committee or the Chair of the Student Conduct Committee, as appropriate, for further investigation via the normal processes.

11.3 Where an immediate suspension is imposed under rule 11.2, the officer or committee chair which recommended the suspension to the Vice-Chancellor (or nominee) must:
   a. ensure that the student is served with a written notice of the suspension as a matter of urgency in accordance with section 12.2 of these Rules;
   b. where the recommendation was made by a Primary Investigation Officer or Chair of the Faculty Investigation Committee, refer the matter to the Student Conduct Committee for the service of an Investigation Notice in accordance with section 12.2 and Appendix C, clause 2.1 of these Rules; and
   c. notify the Academic Registrar, in writing, for advice to relevant officers.


12.1 Termination of disciplinary proceedings

12.1.1 Any disciplinary proceedings, including appeal proceedings, may be suspended by the Vice-Principal (Administration) if the student ceases to be enrolled at the University.

12.1.2 If disciplinary proceedings are suspended under rule 12.1.1, 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 disciplinary proceedings are completed.

12.2 Serving notices

12.2.1 A notice may be served on a student under these Rules 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.

12.2.2 If a notice is served by way of post, it shall 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.

12.3 Retention of records
All records relating to the investigation of an allegation of misconduct or an appeal from a decision made under these Rules must be retained in accordance with the requirements of the University's Records Management Policy [web link] and Privacy Policy [web link].

12.4 Students seeking information on discipline procedures

Information for students about discipline procedures can be sought from the Academic Registrar's Division.

NOTE: The Dean of Students does not have a role in the discipline process. The role of the Dean of Students is to act as an ombudsman (and not a student advocate) in relation to student complaints.

12.5 Limitation on effect of Rules

12.5.1 Nothing in these Rules affects:
   a. the authority of any person or body in the University duly authorised to administer any University rule not inconsistent with these Rules; and, in particular,
   b. any power of a committee or person or other authority within the University to withdraw a student from a course, or to cancel the enrolment of a student, or to refuse a person further enrolment for any course or subject, or to deal otherwise with their case, by reason of their failure to satisfy academic requirements or to pay any fee, fine, charge or other money payable to the University.

12.5.2 Nothing in these Rules affects the power of Council to make rules given by any provision of the By-laws.

12.5.3 Nothing in these Rules shall be interpreted as limiting in any way any power vested in Council by the Act or any other rule of the University or as limiting the right of the University to enforce by any other means any right vested in it or to take any other action which it may be entitled or empowered to take in the circumstances.
APPENDIX A: STUDENT CONDUCT INVESTIGATION AND APPEAL PROCESSES

**Stage 1**
- Allegation of misconduct referred to appropriate Primary Investigation Officer (PIO) by a University Staff member
  - Preliminary review and investigation by Primary Investigation Officer (PIO) r.6.1, 6.2
  - Referral by officer r.6.1.3(c) or 6.2.6(b)(ii)
- Investigation by Faculty Investigation Committee (FIC) r.7.2
  - Penalty imposed by PIO r.6.2.6(b)(i)
  - Student appeal r.6.3
  - Committee referral r.7.2.1(b) or 7.2.3(b)(ii)
  - Student appeal r.6.3
  - Referral by officer r.6.1.3(c) or 6.2.6(b)(ii)
- Investigation by Student Conduct Committee (SCC) r.8.2
  - Decision by VC r.8.2.4
  - Recommendation by SCC r.8.2.4(b)
  - Investigation by Council Committee of Appeal regarding due process by SSC r.9.2
  - Referral back to SCC where new evidence or lack of due process r.9.2.2(a),(b)
  - Action taken by SCC confirmed r.9.2.2(a)

**Stage 2**
- Recommendation to VC that student be suspended immediately r.6.1.3(d),10(l)
  - No further action r.6.1.2(a); or
  - Allegation dismissed after investigation r.6.2.6(a)
- Referral by officer r.6.1.3(c) or 6.2.6(b)(ii)
- Investigation by Faculty Investigation Committee (FIC) r.7.2
  - Penalty imposed by FIC r.7.2.3(b)(ii)
  - Student appeal r.7.3
  - Referral back to SCC where new evidence or lack of due process r.9.2.2(a),(b)

**Stage 3**
- Recommendation to VC that student be suspended immediately r.8.2.1, 10(l)
- Allegation dismissed r.8.2.3(a)
- Referral by officer (r.6.1.3(c)) or 6.2.6(b)(ii)
- Student appeal r.6.3
- Investigation by Faculty Investigation Committee (FIC) r.7.2
  - Penalty imposed by FIC r.7.2.3(b)(ii)
- Decision by VC r.8.2.4
  - Recommendation by SCC r.8.2.4(b)
  - Investigation by Council Committee of Appeal regarding due process by SSC r.9.2
  - Referral back to SCC where new evidence or lack of due process r.9.2.2(a),(b)
  - Action taken by SCC confirmed r.9.2.2(a)

**Stage 4**
- Allegation dismissed r.8.2.3(a)
- Referral by officer (r.6.1.3(c)) or 6.2.6(b)(ii)
- Student appeal r.6.3
- Investigation by Faculty Investigation Committee (FIC) r.7.2
  - Penalty imposed by FIC r.7.2.3(b)(ii)
- Decision by VC r.8.2.4
  - Recommendation by SCC r.8.2.4(b)
  - Investigation by Council Committee of Appeal regarding due process by SSC r.9.2
  - Referral back to SCC where new evidence or lack of due process r.9.2.2(a),(b)
  - Action taken by SCC confirmed r.9.2.2(a)

Investigation by relevant officer or committee
Possible actions by relevant officer or committee
Appendix B – Investigation Process for Allegations of Plagiarism in HDR Theses

**Stage One**

- Allegation of Plagiarism referred to Primary Investigation Officer (PIO) by University Staff Member or Examiner
  - Preliminary Review and investigation by PIO (11.1), notification to TIC
    - PIO serves student with written Investigation Notice (within 20 working days of allegation) as per Appendix C (2.1.2)
    - Written response from Student to Investigation Notice, with supporting information

**Stage Two**

- Investigation by Thesis Investigation Committee (TIC) (11.3)
  - Investigation Interview conducted by TIC (11.3.3), incl. existing documentation, interview(s) with relevant staff and opportunity for student to present case (verbal or written submission)
  - Review documentation and interview relevant staff to assess validity and seriousness of allegation
  - Resolution by TIC / VC
    - Uphold allegation and determine course of action (refer matter to VC if termination of candidature is recommended) (11.3.5.b)
    - Written notification to TIC/VC decision
    - Referred to Thesis Examination Committee

**Stage Three**

- Further Appeals to Student Conduct Committee as per Discipline Rules
APPENDIX C: INVESTIGATION & APPEAL COMMITTEE PROCEDURES

The procedures set out below must be followed by a Faculty Investigation Committee, the Student Conduct Committee, Research Misconduct Investigation Committee (RMIC) or the University Council Committee of Appeal (Student Discipline) in conducting an investigation into alleged misconduct or an appeal under these Rules.

1. Membership of committees

1.1 Both genders must be represented on a committee.

1.2 A person may not sit on a committee investigating an allegation of misconduct where that person has previously been involved with the allegation or there is, otherwise, a potential conflict of interest.

1.3 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, shall remain a member of the committee until the investigation has been completed.

1.4 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.

2. Procedures before committee meeting

2.1 Referrals to committee

2.1.1 Where a matter has been referred to a Faculty Investigation Committee, RMIC or the Student Conduct Committee, the Secretary of the committee must serve the student with a written Investigation Notice within ten working days of the referral.

See rule 12.2 [link] for general provisions regarding service of notices.

2.1.2 An Investigation Notice served under clause 2.1.1 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 (in the case of allegations of research misconduct by students, the Primary Investigation Process is purely procedural, involving the collecting of information, and the opportunity for an interview does not arise until the matter is referred to the PVC(R), DVC(R) or the RMIC);

e. the option for the student to be assisted by a support person of their choice at the interview (in the case of allegations of research misconduct by students, the opportunity for an interview does not arise until the matter is referred to the PVC(R), DVC(R) or the RMIC);

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 (or referral of the matter to the PVC(R), DVC(R) or the RMIC in the case of Primary Investigation of allegations of research misconduct by students); and
h. advice that, if the student chooses not to attend, the matter will be determined in their absence.

See Sample Letter 3 - Investigation Committee Notice, Appendix E. [link]

2.1.3 The committee meeting should be held within 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.

2.1.4 If a student wishes to submit documentation listed in a.i, ii or iii to the committee, it must be provided at least two working days before the committee meeting:
   a. i) a written statement of how they intend to respond to the allegations;
      ii) other written material pertinent to their case;
      iii) the names of any witness(es) and/or any person supporting the student during the meeting in accordance with clause 3.3(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

2.2 Appeals

2.2.1 Where a student appeals against a decision of a Primary Investigation Officer or a committee, the Secretary of the appeal committee must serve the student with written notice:
   a. of the time, date and general location of the appeal meeting; and
   b. stating that, where the student chooses not to attend the committee meeting, the appeal will be heard in their absence.

See rule 12.2 [link] for general provisions regarding service of notices.

2.2.2 An appeal should be heard within ten working days of the date of service under clause 2.2.1 unless the Chair of the appeal committee grants an extension to the student or more time is required to collect necessary evidence.

2.2.3 At least five working days before the date of the appeal, the student must provide the appeal committee with:
   a. any documentation upon which they wish to rely that was not made available at an earlier investigation or attached to the notice of appeal; and
   b. the names of any witness(es) and/or any person supporting the student during the meeting.

2.2.4 At the request of the Secretary to the appeal committee, the officer or committee against whom the appeal is lodged must provide the appeal committee with:
   a. the name and student number of each student involved;
   b. details of the allegation (e.g. date, subject(s), assessment task, or description of incident);
   c. reference to any rule, policy or code allegedly breached;
   d. copies of any supporting documents (including, for alleged plagiarism, copies of the original source material); and
   e. the officer’s or committee’s reason for the decision and penalty.

2.2.5 The Secretary of the appeal committee must advise the Primary Investigation Officer bringing the complaint, and/or any other staff member or student involved in the events leading up to the complaint, of relevant committee procedures and time requirements.

3. Conduct of investigation or appeal
3.1 When acting as a committee of appeal against a decision of a Primary Investigation Officer, Faculty Investigation Committee PVC(R), DVC(R) or the RMIC, a committee will review material or evidence provided by the officer, committee or student and may call for additional evidence.

3.2 Where a student who has been given due notice under clause 2.1.1. or 2.2.1 chooses not to attend a committee meeting, the committee may investigate the matter or hear an appeal in the student's absence.

3.3 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, the Student Conduct Committee or PVC(R), DVC(R) or the RMIC, 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, if they wish, 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 shall 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 finds that the complaint is proven, give the student the opportunity to be heard on the issue of penalty;
   o. hold all its proceedings in private; and
   p. keep an adequate record of the committee meeting proceedings.

3.4 Decisions of a committee are made by majority.

3.5 A comprehensive file of all relevant documentation, including records of the committee proceedings, evidence presented and the committee's decision should be created, maintained and retained in accordance with rule 12.3.
4. **Outcome of investigation or appeal**

4.1 As soon as practicable after a meeting of a Faculty Investigation Committee, Thesis Investigation Committee, Student Conduct Committee, or PVC(R), DVC(R), or the RMIC decision under rule 11.3.6 or the Vice- Chancellor’s decision under rule 8.2.4, and within ten working days, the Chair of the Faculty Investigation Committee (or nominee), the Student Conduct Committee (or nominee), or the PVC(R), DVC(R) or the RMIC (or nominee) as appropriate, must serve the student with written notice of:

a. the outcome of the investigation (including any referral to an investigation committee under rule 7.2.3);
b. any penalty imposed;
c. where misconduct has been found to have occurred, appeal processes and requirements.

Where the penalty includes a reprimand from the Vice-Chancellor, the notice will be signed by the Vice-Chancellor.

*See Appendix E:*
- *Sample Letter 4 - Investigation Committee Outcome Notice [link]*
- *Sample Letter 5 – Committee Appeal Outcome Notice [link]*

*See rule 12.2 for general provisions regarding service of notices.*

4.2 As soon as practicable after a meeting of the University Council Committee of Appeal and within ten working days, the Secretary of the Committee must serve the student with written notice of the outcome of the appeal.

*See Sample Letter 6 – Council Committee of Appeal Outcome Notice, Appendix E. [link]*

*See rule 12.2 [link] for general provisions regarding service of notices.*

4.3 A notice served on a student under clause 4.1 or 4.2 must be provided to the Academic Registrar, for advice to other relevant officers of the University.

5. **Extension of time limits**

Any time limit set in the procedures in Appendix C, or deadlines for student appeals set out in the body of these Rules, may be extended at the discretion of the 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.
APPENDIX D: PENALTY PROVISIONS

1. Penalty options for officers and committees

The penalty options within the authority of Primary Investigation Officers and relevant committees are set out below:

**Primary Investigation Officers**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Officer</th>
<th>Category of misconduct (as defined in rule 4)</th>
<th>Penalty options</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| Head of Academic Unit Head of Wollongong University College | Academic misconduct | a. Reprimand  
b. Deduction of marks for assessment task  
c. Imposition of zero mark for assessment task (including an examination) as long as the task constitutes less than 40% of the total marks for that subject.  
d. In the case of study abroad students, inform their home University of the misconduct |
| The University Librarian | Library misconduct | a. Reprimand  
b. Removal from Library for a period of up to one week  
c. Charge for costs of up to $500 for replacing or repairing any damaged property*  
d. Fine (as prescribed in the University Library Borrowing Conditions) for overdue items  
e. In the case of study abroad students, inform their home University of the misconduct |
| Head of University Residence Misconduct in Halls of Residence | Misconduct in Halls of Residence | a. Reprimand  
b. Charge for costs of up to $500 for replacing or repairing any damaged property*  
c. Exclusion from the Residence for up to one session  
d. Permanent exclusion from the Residence  
e. In the case of study abroad students, inform their home University of the misconduct |
| IT Director | IT misconduct | a. Reprimand  
b. Email/Internet access withdrawn, or restricted  
c. Fine of up to $250  
d. Charge of up to $500 for replacing or repairing damaged IT facilities*  
e. In the case of study abroad students, inform their home University of the misconduct |
| Academic Registrar, Other misconduct | Other misconduct | a. Reprimand  
b. Fine of up to $250  
c. Withhold official certification (e.g., academic transcript, degree testamur) for up to three months  
d. Charge for costs of up to $500 for replacing or repairing any damaged property*  
e. Withdraw or restrict access to IT Account |
for up to one month
f. In the case of study abroad students, inform their home University of the misconduct

* Costs in excess of $500 can be imposed by the Student Conduct Committee

**Faculty Investigation Committee**

a. Reprimand
b. Deduct marks for the assessment task
c. Impose a Fail grade for the assessment task
d. Impose a Fail grade for the subject

d. **Student Conduct Committee**

a. Any penalty option available to a Primary Investigation Officer or Faculty Investigation Committee (set out above)
b. Vary marks for a subject
c. Reprimand from the Vice-Chancellor
d. Fine of up to $1,000
e. Charge costs in excess of $500 for replacing or repairing damaged property or facilities
f. Recommend to the Vice-Chancellor suspension for up to two sessions
g. Recommend to the Vice-Chancellor deferred suspension for up to two sessions, subject to one or more conditions (e.g., good behaviour, demonstrated consultation with a registered professional, academic performance)
h. Recommend exclusion to the Vice-Chancellor
i. Recommend degree rescission to the University Council

**DVC(R) and DVC(A) for Research Misconduct:**

a. To censure/reprimand the person(s) involved
b. Imposing a period of probation (with or without also suspending any HDR scholarship the student may hold)
c. Suspension of candidature for a period
d. Termination of Candidature

Note: A case against a former student may need to be referred to the Legal and Commercial Unit of the Financial Services Division for consideration of legal ramifications and to the DVC(R) to implement necessary procedures

---

**2. Suspension, exclusion and degree rescission**

2.1 Any suspension, deferred suspension or exclusion must be approved by the Vice-Chancellor.

2.2 Where a student is suspended their enrolment is cancelled for a specified period and some or all of their rights or privileges are withdrawn (e.g., to re-enrol, to attend class and to use University facilities and services) for that period. A decision under these Rules to suspend a student must specify the period of the suspension and the rights and privileges that are being withdrawn.

2.3 Where a student is excluded, their enrolment is cancelled indefinitely and all their rights and privileges as a student are terminated. A student who has been excluded will not be able to re-enrol except by permission of Council.
2.4 Degrees can only be rescinded by resolution of the University Council.

3. **Fines**

3.1 A fine imposed on a student pursuant to these Rules must be:
   a. paid into the general funds of the University;
   b. payable within ten working days of the date of notification of the fine, unless the Vice-Principal (Administration), on application from the student, grants an extension of time for payment; and
   c. suspended while an appeal from the decision imposing it is pending.

3.2 Where the fine imposed is not paid within the time limited for its payment, the student shall be suspended and shall remain suspended so long as the fine remains unpaid.
APPENDIX E: INVESTIGATION & OUTCOME NOTICES

Sample Letter 1 – Primary Investigation Notice

[DATE]
[STUDENT’S NAME]
[ADDRESS]

Dear Mr/Ms

I am writing to inform you that, in accordance with the Rules for Student Conduct and Discipline, a formal complaint has been referred to me as an authorised Primary Investigation Officer alleging that you breached [section … of RULE, POLICY or CODE]: [QUOTE]

The complaint alleges that you [DETAIL].

I invite you to attend an interview with me at [TIME], [DATE] in [LOCATION] to examine the allegation against you. A copy of the documentation which will be considered by me is attached, together with a copy of the Rules for Student Conduct and Discipline and the [cite and attach RELEVANT RULES, POLICIES or CODES]. [In the case of the primary investigation of allegations of plagiarism or other academic misconduct by HDR students, this paragraph should be replaced with: A copy of the documentation relating to this allegation is attached. This allegation, together with all available relevant documentation will be forwarded to the Thesis Investigation Committee 20 working days after the date of this notice and the Thesis Investigation Committee will write to invite you to attend an interview to examine the allegation against you or to provide a written statement in relation to the allegation. You are invited to provide a written response to the allegation prior to the matter being investigated by the DVC(R), PVC(R) or the Research Misconduct Investigation Committee.]

You have the opportunity to:

1. provide a written statement of how you wish to answer the allegation(s);
2. present your case in person;
3. submit any supporting information, such as psychologist’s/counsellor’s report, statement of extenuating circumstances, references, etc.

You should advise me [on TELEPHONE NUMBER] if you will be attending the interview and submit any statements and documentation to me by before the meeting./ Please mail or organise delivery to: “[OFFICER’S NAME], University of Wollongong, Wollongong, NSW, 2522”, and mark “Urgent Attention: Investigation”.

If you choose not to attend, the investigation will be conducted in your absence. [AS NECESSARY ADD - Please note that your assessment results will be withheld pending the outcome of the investigation.]

Yours sincerely,

[NAME]
Primary Investigation Officer
Sample Letter 2 – Primary Investigation Outcome Notice

[DATE]
[STUDENT’S NAME]
[ADDRESS]

Dear Mr/Ms

I have completed my investigation of the allegation(s) against you that you [DETAIL] and have concluded, on the balance of probabilities, that

OPTION 1 … the allegation(s) should be dismissed.

I wish to thank you for your co-operation in the investigation process. You will understand that the University is committed to investigating allegations of misconduct very carefully to protect the University’s standards and to ensure that all students are treated and assessed fairly.

OPTION 2 … in view of the seriousness of the allegation, the matter should be referred to the Faculty Investigation Committee/Student Conduct Committee/ PVC(R), DVC(R) or the Research Misconduct investigation Committee. You will be hearing from the Secretary of that Committee shortly.

OPTION 3 … you have breached [relevant RULE, POLICY or CODE] by [DETAIL].

I have decided that you are to be [DETAILS OF PENALTY AND HOW IT IS TO BE ADMINISTERED - refer to Appendix D of these Rules].

Please note that this matter may be taken into account when determining penalties for any future breaches of the Rules for Student Conduct and Discipline.

The University is committed to protecting standards and to ensuring that all students are treated and assessed fairly. [OPTIONAL: The (ALLEGATION) is a serious offence which contravenes the University’s Guiding Principle of … (e.g. “high ethical standards, including honestly, cooperation, tolerance and acceptance of obligations as well as rights”, “accountability to students, the University community, the public and governments”, “the principles of equal opportunity and social justice”). You may regard this letter as a reprimand for your behaviour.]

You may appeal against my decision under rule 6.3 of the Rules for Student Conduct and Discipline (or 10.6 for cases of Research Misconduct). An application for appeal must:

a. be lodged, in writing, with the Academic Registrar [or another nominated officer where the Academic Registrar is the Primary Investigation Officer] within ten working days of receiving this notice;

b. state fully the reasons for your appeal; and

c. include any relevant documentary evidence to support your appeal.

Yours sincerely,

[NAME]
Primary Investigation Officer
Cc: Academic Registrar [where the Academic Registrar is not the Primary Investigation Officer]
Director RSC (for HDR students)
Sample Letter 3 – Investigation Committee Notice

[DATE]
[STUDENT’S NAME]
[ADDRESS]

Dear

I am writing to inform you that, in accordance with the Rules for Student Conduct and Discipline, a formal complaint has been referred to the [FACULTY INVESTIGATION COMMITTEE/STUDENT CONDUCT INVESTIGATION COMMITTEE, PVC(R), DVC(R) or the Research Misconduct investigation Committee alleging that you breached [section … of RULE, POLICY or CODE]:

[QUOTE]

The complaint alleges that you [DETAIL].

You are invited to attend a meeting of the Committee to be held at [TIME], [DATE] in [LOCATION] to investigate the allegation against you. A copy of the documentation available to the Committee is attached, together with a copy of the Rules for Student Conduct and Discipline and the [cite & attach RELEVANT RULES, POLICIES or CODES].

You have the opportunity to:
1. provide a written statement of how you wish to answer the allegation(s);
2. present your case in person [In the case of allegations of research misconduct by students add: or in writing if you are not able to attend in person];
3. submit any supporting information, such as psychologist’s/counsellor’s report, statement of extenuating circumstances, references, etc;
4. provide the names of any witness and any person supporting you during the meeting.

You should advise me [on TELEPHONE NUMBER] as to whether you will be attending the interview and submit any statements and documentation before the meeting. Please mail or organise delivery to: “Secretary, Faculty Investigation Committee/Student Conduct Investigation Committee, RSC, Faculty of [NAME], University of Wollongong, Wollongong, NSW, 2522”, and mark “Urgent Attention: Investigation”.

If you choose not to attend, the investigation will be conducted in your absence. [AS NECESSARY- Please note that your Examination Results will be withheld pending the outcome of the investigation.]

Yours sincerely,

[NAME]
Secretary, Faculty Investigation Committee/Student Conduct Investigation Committee/Director RSC (for cases of Research misconduct)
Sample Letter 4 – Investigation Committee Outcome Notice
[Adapt where reprimand by VC is to be included]

[DATE]
[STUDENT’S NAME]
[ADDRESS]

Dear Mr/Ms

The Faculty Investigation Committee/Student Conduct Committee/ PVC(R), DVC(R) or the Research Misconduct investigation Committee has completed its investigation of the allegation(s) against you and has concluded, on the balance of probabilities, that

OPTION 1 … the allegation(s) should be dismissed.

I wish to thank you for your co-operation in the investigation process. You will understand that the University is committed to investigating allegations of misconduct very carefully to protect the University’s standards and to ensure that all students are treated and assessed fairly.

OPTION 2 (For Faculty Investigation Committee only) … in view of the seriousness of the allegation, the matter should be referred to the Student Conduct Committee. You will be hearing from the Secretary to the Committee shortly.

OPTION 3 (For PVC(R), DVC(R) or the Research Misconduct investigation Committee only) … in view of the seriousness of the allegation, the matter should be referred to the PVC(R), DVC(R) or the Research Misconduct investigation Committee You will be hearing from the PVC(R), DVC(R) or the Research Misconduct investigation Committee shortly.

OPTION 3 … you have breached [section … of RULE, POLICY or CODE] by [DETAIL]. The Committee has decided that you are to be [DETAILS OF PENALTY AND HOW IT IS TO BE ADMINISTERED – see Appendix D of these Rules]

Please note that this matter may be taken into account when determining penalties for any future breaches of the Rules for Student Conduct and Discipline.

The University is committed to protecting standards and to ensuring that all students are treated and assessed fairly. [OPTIONAL: The (ALEGATION) is a (very) serious offence which contravenes the University’s Guiding Principle of … (e.g. “high ethical standards, including honestly, cooperation, tolerance and acceptance of obligations as well as rights”, “accountability to students, the University community, the public and governments”, “the principles of equal opportunity and social justice”). You may regard this letter as a (severe) reprimand for your behaviour.]

[Insert explanation of appeal processes, where appropriate, as follows:]

OPTION 1 - FOR FACULTY INVESTIGATION COMMITTEE:
You may appeal against the decision of the committee under rule 7.3 of the Rules for Student Conduct and Discipline. An application for appeal by you must:
   a. be lodged, in writing, with the Academic Registrar within ten working days of receiving this notice;
   b. state fully the reasons for your appeal; and
   c. include any relevant documentary evidence to support your appeal.

OPTION 2 - PVC(R), DVC(R) or the Research Misconduct investigation Committee
You may appeal against the decision of the committee under rule 10.6 of the Rules for Student Conduct and Discipline on the ground that it did not follow due process or relevant new or additional information is now available. An application for appeal by you must:
   a. be lodged, in writing, with the Academic Registrar within ten working days of receiving this notice;
   b. state fully the reasons for your appeal; and
   c. include any relevant documentary evidence to support your appeal.
OPTION 3 - FOR STUDENT CONDUCT COMMITTEE:
You may appeal against the decision of the committee under rule 8.3 of the Rules for Student Conduct and Discipline on the ground that it did not follow due process or relevant new or additional information is now available. An application for appeal by you must:

d. be lodged, in writing, with the Vice-Principal (Administration) within ten working days of receiving this notice;

e. state fully the reasons for your appeal; and

f. include any relevant documentary evidence to support your appeal.

Yours sincerely,

[NAME]
Chair, Faculty Investigation Committee/Student Conduct Investigation Committee/ PVC(R), DVC(R) or the Research Misconduct investigation Committee (or nominee)

Cc: Academic Registrar (and Director Research Student Centre in the case of research misconduct by students)
Sample Letter 5 – Committee Appeal Outcome Notice

[DATE]
[STUDENT’S NAME]
[ADDRESS]

Dear

The Faculty Investigation Committee/Student Conduct Committee has completed its investigation of your appeal against the decision of Primary Investigation Officer/Faculty Investigation Committee/ PVC(R), DVC(R) or the Research Misconduct investigation Committee and has

OPTION 1 … upheld your appeal. I wish to thank you for your co-operation in the investigation process. You will understand that the University is committed to investigating allegations very carefully to protect the University’s standards and to ensure that all students are treated and assessed fairly.

OPTION 2 … affirmed the finding of the Primary Investigation Officer/Faculty Investigation Committee/Thesis Investigation Committee/Pro Vice-Chancellor (Research) that you breached [section … of RULE, POLICY or CODE] by [DETAIL]. The committee has also affirmed the penalty imposed, that is, that you are to be [DETAILS OF PENALTY AND HOW IT IS TO BE ADMINISTERED].

Please note that this matter may be taken into account when determining penalties for any future breaches of the Rules for Student Conduct and Discipline.

OPTION 3 … concluded, after this further review, that the decision of the Primary Investigation Officer/Faculty Investigation Committee/ PVC(R), DVC(R) or the Research Misconduct investigation Committee should be varied as follows: [DETAILS OF CHANGE TO FINDING AND/OR PENALTY].

[Insert explanation of appeal processes, where appropriate, as follows:]

OPTION 1 - FOR FACULTY INVESTIGATION COMMITTEE:
You may appeal against the decision of the committee under rule 7.3 of the Rules for Student Conduct and Discipline. An application for appeal by you must:
 a. be lodged, in writing, with the Academic Registrar within ten working days of receiving this notice;
 b. state fully the reasons for your appeal; and
 c. include any relevant documentary evidence to support your appeal.

OPTION 2 - FOR STUDENT CONDUCT COMMITTEE:
You may appeal against the decision of the committee under rule 8.3 of the Rules for Student Conduct and Discipline on the ground that it did not follow due process or relevant new or additional information is now available. An application for appeal by you must:
 a. be lodged, in writing, with the Vice-Principal (Administration) within ten working days of receiving this notice;
 b. state fully the reasons for your appeal; and
 c. include any relevant documentary evidence to support your appeal.

Yours faithfully,

NAME: Chair, Faculty Investigation Committee/Student Conduct Investigation Committee/ PVC(R), DVC(R) or the Research Misconduct investigation Committee

Cc: Academic Registrar (and Director Research Student Centre in the case of research misconduct by students)
Sample Letter 6 – Council Appeal Outcome Notice

[DATE]
[STUDENT’S NAME]
[ADDRESS]

Dear

The University Council Committee of Appeal (Student Discipline) has completed its investigation of your appeal, on the grounds of due process, against the decision of the Student Conduct Investigation Committee meeting held on [DATE].

OPTION 1: I wish to inform you that, after review of the process, the Appeal Committee has upheld your appeal and referred the matter back to the Student Conduct Committee for a new hearing in accordance with the provisions of the Rules for Student Conduct and Discipline. The Secretary to that Committee will contact you shortly about arrangements for the investigation meeting.

OPTION 2: I wish to inform you that, after review of the process, the Committee of Appeal has concluded that the Student Conduct Committee followed due process in its investigation. The Committee’s decisions regarding the misconduct and penalty are therefore affirmed. [INSERT DETAILS OF PENALTY AND HOW IT IS TO BE ADMINISTERED]

Please note that this matter may be taken into account when determining penalties for any future breaches of the Rules for Student Conduct and Discipline.

Yours sincerely,

[NAME]
Secretary, University Council Committee of Appeal

Cc: Academic Registrar (and Director Research Student Centre in the case of research misconduct by HDR students)
Schedule 1 - Application of Rules to Students Offshore

1. Definitions

*Offshore partner institution* – an institution located overseas with which UOW has an agreement for the delivery of UOW courses at or in conjunction with that institution.

*Offshore student* – a student enrolled at UOW who is undertaking research at an offshore location other than the University of Wollongong Dubai (UOWD).

2. Application

2.1 The Rules for Student Conduct and Discipline (the Rules) apply to the following alleged misconduct by a student enrolled in a UOW program delivered at an offshore partner institution: (i) alleged academic misconduct (as defined in rule 4.1) by that student; (ii) alleged research misconduct (as defined in rule 4.2) by that student; (iii) breaches by that student of the University's IT Acceptable Use Policy (IT misconduct – rule 4.4); or (iv) conduct detrimental to the proper conduct or reputation of UOW (rule 4.5(c)). With the exception of misconduct specified in (ii) or (iii), alleged non-academic misconduct is dealt with by the offshore partner institution in accordance with the policies or rules governing that institution, unless there is a specific agreement between UOW and the offshore partner institution to the contrary.

2.2 Where the Rules apply, as specified in clauses 1.1 and 1.2, all the procedures in the Rules apply unless specifically modified as set out in clauses 3 to 7 of this Schedule.

2.3 Where a student is enrolled in a WUC program delivered offshore, this Policy applies with the modification to procedures as set out in clause 6.3 of this Schedule.

2.4 Alleged misconduct by students enrolled in programs delivered at, or undertaking higher degree research at, UOWD is dealt with in accordance with the UOWD Rules for Student Conduct and Discipline.

3. Primary Investigation of an Allegation – Stage 1

3.1 A member of staff of UOW, an offshore partner institution or an external examiner of an HDR thesis may refer an allegation of misconduct by a student to an appropriate Primary Investigation Officer as soon as possible after the alleged misconduct has occurred.

3.2 The appropriate Primary Investigation Officer is:

   a. in the case of alleged misconduct by a coursework or Honours student, the UOW offshore course coordinator or their nominee (to be approved by the Dean of the relevant faculty); or
   
   b. in the case of alleged misconduct by an offshore HDR student, the Dean of the relevant Faculty.

4. Faculty Investigation Committee – Stage 2

The Faculty Investigation Committee comprises:

   a. a member of academic staff from UOW appointed by the Dean, as Chair; and
   
   b. a member of academic staff from either UOW or the partner institution appointed by the Chair in consultation with the Dean.

The Chair has the casting vote.
5. **Student Conduct Committee – Stage 3**

The Student Conduct Committee comprises:
- a Deputy Vice-Chancellor or Chair of Academic Senate or nominee as Chair;
- a senior member of staff of UOW appointed by the Chair; and
- a student appointed by the Vice-Chancellor.

6. **University Council Committee of Appeal (Student Discipline) – Stage 4**

With the exception of the procedural matters specified in clause 7 below, the provisions of the Rules governing Stage 4 of the discipline process (rule 9) apply without modification.

7. **Procedural Matters**

7.1 An offshore partner institution must notify the UOW Academic Registrar of the outcome of any investigation under that institution’s own policies or rules of alleged non-academic misconduct by a student enrolled at UOW.

7.2 An appeal by a student against a decision of the Primary Investigation Officer, Faculty Investigation Committee, Research Misconduct Investigation Committee or Student Conduct Committee must be lodged in accordance with the procedures in rules 6.3, 7.3, 10.6 or 8.3 respectively with either:
- a. the Academic Registrar (or equivalent) of the offshore partner institution;
- b. the UOW Academic Registrar, for appeals against decisions of a Primary Investigation Officer, Faculty Investigation Committee or Research Misconduct Investigation Committee;
- c. the Vice-Principal (Administration), for appeals against decisions of the Student Conduct Committee.

An appeal lodged with the Academic Registrar (or equivalent) of the offshore partner institution must be referred to the UOW Academic Registrar or Vice-Principal (Administration) as appropriate.

7.3 An investigation or appeal meeting at any Stage of the discipline process may be conducted by tele- or video-conference. In such a case, a member of staff of UOW or an offshore partner institution may be present to assist the student at the partner institution. This does not preclude the right of the student to nominate their own support person in accordance with Appendix C, clause 3.3(e).

7.4 The time limit for serving a student with a written Investigation Notice under rule 6.2.1 or 11.2.1 is twenty (20) working days.

7.5 The time limit for serving a student with written notice of the outcome of the investigation and appeal processes under Appendix C, clause 4.1 is twenty (20) working days.

7.6 The Vice-Chancellor has the power to waive any of the time limits set out in the Rules where there is a compelling reason to do so. This does not preclude the power of a committee Chair to extend time limits under Appendix C, clause 5.