Student Academic Misconduct Policy

Section 1 - Key Information

Policy Type and Approval Body	Academic – Academic Board
Accountable Executive – Policy	Deputy Vice-Chancellor (Academic)
Responsible Manager – Policy	Director, Integrity Office
Review Date	3 June 2029

Section 2 - Purpose

(1) This Policy outlines how the University meets its responsibilities in promoting and supporting academic integrity across all learning and teaching activities of the University, and in managing allegations of academic misconduct under the Academic Integrity Statute 2015, the Higher Education Standards Framework (Threshold Standards) 2021, and the Education Services for Overseas Students Act 2000.

(2) The Policy should be read in conjunction with the Assessment Policy and the Course Design Policy.

Section 3 - Scope

(3) This Policy applies to:

a. all current students of the University admitted or enrolled in any coursework course or subject, including graduate research candidates, incoming exchange and study abroad students, students enrolled in courses or subjects delivered in partnership with other providers, and former students. This extends to students on any form of leave, including suspension from any course, where the event forming the basis of the allegation occurred while they were enrolled or was directly related to their enrolment;
b. participants in assessed non-award study, including enabling programs, short courses and micro-credentials;
c. all staff, in terms of their responsibilities for the promotion of academic integrity and appropriate management of student academic misconduct. These responsibilities extend to employees of third-party teaching partners where they are responsible for delivering La Trobe coursework subjects or courses.

(4) Students enrolled in the Certificate IV in Aboriginal Cultural Heritage Management are subject to the provisions in this Policy that relate to the management and investigation of allegations but are not required to complete the Academic Integrity Module.

(5) Staff academic integrity and academic misconduct in relation to teaching and learning activities are managed through:

a. the Intellectual Property Policy;

b. the Code of Conduct; and
c. copyright guidance for staff.

(6) Research integrity and misconduct matters for staff and for students undertaking the research components of higher degrees by research are managed under the provisions of the Research Integrity Policy.

Section 4 - Key Decisions

Key Decisions	Role
Referral of an allegation of academic misconduct against a graduate of the University	Deputy Vice-Chancellor (Academic)
Determination as to whether an allegation should be dismissed, investigated or referred	Academic Integrity Advisor
Determination of outcome of initial investigation into Poor Academic Practice or Minor Academic Misconduct	Academic Integrity Advisor
Determination of outcome of investigation into an allegation of Serious Academic Misconduct	Student Academic Misconduct Committee

Section 5 - Policy

Academic Integrity

(7) The University recognises that ensuring academic integrity relies on an institutional culture where the values of academic integrity and the skills of scholarship are thoroughly embedded. All members of the University community are expected to have a thorough understanding of what constitutes appropriate practice and its antithesis, and to accept a shared responsibility for maintaining academic integrity. This means that:

a. students and staff are expected to conduct themselves in a manner that is consistent with academic integrity values and principles;
b. educative resources, guidance and communications are written in Plain English and provided in ways that take account of staff and students' diverse educational and cultural backgrounds;
c. while students are encouraged to seek assistance from academic staff and other university supports as needed, all work submitted by a student for assessment purposes, or a group of students for group assessment purposes, must be their independent and original work. The ideas and work of others, including any that may arise from the use of any artificial intelligence (AI), must be acknowledged appropriately and in accordance with relevant conventions; and
d. academic integrity processes and teaching and learning practice are continuously improved based on feedback and data available through standard and centralised reporting, and regularly updated to reflect contemporary challenges.

Academic Misconduct

(8) Student academic misconduct is defined in the Academic Integrity Statute 2015 (see Definitions in this Policy). Academic misconduct breaches the values and principles of academic integrity and undermines the University's core values, the quality of student learning, and graduate outcomes.

(9) The University ensures that all allegations of academic misconduct are treated seriously and fairly. This means that:

a. it is the responsibility of all members of the university community to report suspected instances of academic misconduct where they believe evidence exists;
b. allegations are managed consistently and transparently;
c. all allegations that are accompanied by sufficient evidence are thoroughly investigated;
d. the determination of whether academic misconduct has taken place is based on the evidence provided and the balance of probabilities and requires decision-makers to:
    i. apply an open, impartial, and unprejudiced mind to their duties;
    ii. base findings and recommendations solely on relevant considerations;
    iii. maintain confidentiality about all matters before them; and
    iv. ensure they have no perceived or actual conflict of interest in the case before them.
e. findings arising out of academic misconduct processes are made in light of:
    i. the context, extent, and seriousness of the misconduct;
    ii. the level/year of the course in which the student is enrolled; and
    iii. whether there have been any prior allegations already recorded for the student.
f. outcomes are applied according to this Policy, and the Schedule of Penalties and Actions (the Schedule);
g. every effort is made to ensure that no person suffers any discrimination or victimisation due to raising an allegation of academic misconduct in good faith;
h. those accused of academic misconduct are:
    i. encouraged to access university support services, including independent advocacy services; and
    ii. afforded natural justice as defined in this Policy.
i. where allegations of academic misconduct overlap with allegations of general misconduct, as defined under other student policies, the Director, Integrity Office will determine under which process each allegation is to be investigated. Relevant decision-makers are informed of the outcome of each investigation; and
j. any attempts by staff members to improperly influence actions or decisions made under this Policy are considered a breach of the Code of Conduct and are managed accordingly.

(10) The University is committed to the responsible use of artificial intelligence in teaching and learning in accordance with the Responsible AI Adoption Policy and the Assessment Policy. This means that:

a. dedicated resources and support are provided for staff and students in the appropriate use of artificial intelligence; and
b. artificial intelligence detection software is not used for the purposes of assessing submitted work for academic misconduct.

(11) The University recognises that a proportion of instances of alleged student academic misconduct will arise from a lack of knowledge or experience of academic conventions and that such cases require educative actions as a response.

Section 6 - Procedures

Part A - Supporting Academic Integrity

(12) The University supports the maintenance of academic integrity throughout the University community, including where partners are involved in teaching La Trobe courses, through:

a. the operations of a dedicated Academic Integrity Unit (AIU). The functions of the AIU are to:
    i. support the promotion of academic integrity;

ii. provide process support for allegations of academic misconduct;
iii. maintain all records associated with allegations;
iv. provide regular reporting of academic misconduct allegations and trends to university committees; and
v. co-design academic integrity initiatives with students, including student representatives.

b. the appointment and training of at least three Academic Integrity Advisors (AIA) per school. AIAs act as the main point of contact for academic integrity matters and receive referrals for and investigate allegations of academic misconduct within and between schools;
c. the requirement for staff and students to undertake academic integrity training;
d. the provision of specifically designed academic integrity support and development resources for students;
e. the provision of dedicated resources for staff including:
    i. guidance in the design of assessment to reduce the risk of academic misconduct;
    ii. suggested learning activities to embed in the curriculum to promote awareness of academic integrity; and
    iii. professional development and resources to support the identification of different types of academic misconduct, especially contract cheating and the inappropriate use of artificial intelligence.
f. the establishment of a Student Academic Misconduct Committee (SAMC) to investigate and determine allegations of Serious Academic Misconduct; and
g. the adoption of specific measures to reduce the incidence of cheating including:
    i. the blocking of access to contract cheating services through the University network;
    ii. specific advice to students about avoiding any contact with such services;
    iii. monitoring the emergence of relevant material on contract cheating sites, issuing alerts to staff and working to have such content removed where possible; and
    iv. guidance to students about the appropriate use of artificial intelligence.

(13) The respective Academic Integrity Modules (AIM) for staff and students must be successfully completed as follows:

a. staff are required to complete the staff AIM during their induction; and
b. students are required to complete the student AIM before the end of their first teaching period of their course. Students returning to study from a period of exclusion due to academic misconduct are required to complete the AIM again before the end of the first teaching period after re-admission.

(14) Where students do not complete the AIM within the designated time period:

a. sanctions will be placed on the release of their official results and their access to results; and
b. they cannot be deemed to have completed the requirements of their course until the AIM has been completed.

(15) Students taking subjects as part of VCE or a pathway program are encouraged to complete AIM. Failure to complete the module will not result in sanctions unless the requirement to do so is part of a penalty applied under this Policy.

Part B - Recordkeeping and Confidentiality

(16) The University maintains a secure database through which all student academic misconduct allegations and associated evidence are submitted and records are kept, in accordance with the University's Records Management Policy. The AIU collects and retains the following summary information:

a. information relating to the allegation and investigation:

i. the student and the course in which the student is enrolled at the time of the allegation;
ii. a summary of the allegation; and
iii. who carried out the investigation and details regarding meetings held.

b. information in relation to findings:
i. which of the possible findings has been determined (No Case To Answer [including Poor Academic Practice], Minor, or Serious Academic Misconduct);
ii. the factors taken into consideration;
iii. the information on which the decision is based;
iv. the outcome and reasons for the outcome; and
v. outcomes of any appeals lodged in relation to the findings of an investigation.

(17) The AIU notifies students against whom an allegation has been made of the outcome of any determination (and any penalty as applicable), and relevant staff as outlined in each stage of this Procedure.

(18) Where a penalty includes suspension, exclusion, or revocation of an award, the action takes effect on the date of the notification of outcome or at the conclusion of any appeal that may be lodged, whichever is the later.

(19) Apart from designated relevant staff, all information associated with an allegation remains confidential and is only used for the purpose for which it was provided, unless:

a. the student gives their express consent in writing;
b. the information gives the University grounds for concern about the security of people or property;
c. procedural fairness requires the information to be shared;
d. access to the information is required by law;
e. the University is obliged or able to do so under the University's Privacy Policy; and
f. such information is required by regulators, government agencies (eg, TEQSA, the current Commonwealth department responsible for education [especially in relation to international students], Auditor-General's Department, professional bodies, or sponsors of international students.

(20) If a student appeals the outcome of a decision made under the Academic Integrity Statute 2015 and the matter proceeds to the University Appeals Committee, the University Appeals Committee will have access to:

a. the information regarding the initial investigation;
b. any information associated with the SAMC meeting (if undertaken); and
c. summary details of any cases of academic misconduct recorded for that student (including cases where there was a finding that no misconduct occurred).

(21) Students may seek access to any information held by the University about allegations of academic misconduct against them by contacting the AIU.

Part C - Initial Management of Allegations

Identification of Suspected Academic Misconduct

(22) Suspected academic misconduct may be identified by staff, students, or external sources.

(23) The University uses various methods to identify academic misconduct, including:

a. work submitted by students for assessment may be checked using text, code, or other comparative software, or manually reviewed using web search engines, checking of student sources, comparison with other assignments,

and consultation with colleagues; and

b. information in the Learning Management System (LMS) about the submission may be compared with activity or access logs.

Reporting of Allegations and Collation of Evidence

(24) All individuals who identify a case of suspected academic misconduct in any academic work other than an examination must submit a report with evidence to the AIU as soon as practicable, allowing for the time required to gather appropriate evidence. This should normally be within five (5) business days of the issue being identified, or no later than four (4) weeks from the submission date of the assessment task. Reports submitted outside these timeframes must be accompanied by a reason for the delay.

(25) The different types of academic misconduct that may be referred are as follows:

Academic Misconduct Type	Description of Suspected Student Action
Supervised Assessment (including exams)	
Cheating	fails to comply with any reasonable direction relating to conduct in supervised assessments (which may or may not include inappropriate use of AI)
Any Assessment Type (supervised or unsupervised)	
Cheating – Other	fails to comply with any reasonable direction relating to academic conduct or any other academic misconduct not listed that provides the student with an unjustified or unfair advantage
Collusion	colludes or attempts to collude with another student to prepare assessment work that was intended to be completed individually, either deliberately or by not taking reasonable care to protect their own work
Contract Cheating	outsources all or part of their assessment to a third party (which may or may not include a commercial provider, AI, current or former student, family member or acquaintance, paid or unpaid). It includes organising another person to take any assessment in place of the intended student
Contract Cheating – File Sharing Sites	uploads any student work or copyright material to a file-sharing website that allows anyone to download the documents, or accesses such a site with a view to gain access to any documents that may or may not provide academic advantage to the student
Fabrication	fabricates any information and/or references in any assessment submission – which may or may not include references fabricated as a result of the use of AI
Falsification	tampers with any documents or misrepresents information related to any assessment or application to the University that leads to academic advantage
Plagiarism	uses ideas, concepts, words, or structures without appropriately acknowledging the source(even if the source is AI)
Self-Plagiarism	presents text, ideas or data from their own previous submitted scholarly work without written permission from the Subject Coordinator

(26) All allegations undergo a preliminary assessment by the AIU to determine that sufficient documentation has been provided to allow the allegation to be properly investigated. All reports are submitted to the relevant AIA, with the following exceptions:

a. allegations from external sources are submitted directly to the SAMC; and

b. following a preliminary investigation by the AIU, allegations against graduates of the University are notified to the Deputy Vice-Chancellor (Academic) (DVCA) for management under the provisions of the Degrees, Diplomas

and other Awards Statute 2009.

(27) An individual who has submitted a report to the AIU may apply to withdraw the report where relevant subsequent information becomes available. The withdrawal of a report can only occur prior to any notification being made to the student, and with the approval of the Director, Integrity Office.

(28) Where the alleged misconduct takes place in an examination, the Chief Invigilator records all details in an Examination Misconduct Report and submits the report to the Deputy Director, Academic Services or nominee (see Assessment Procedure - Examinations) who then submits a copy of the report to the AIU as soon as possible for referral to the appropriate AIA.

(29) The complete portfolio of evidence compiled for all allegations may include:

a. the Subject Learning Guide and any other contextual information where it is not included in the Guide, such as the assessment design, submission method, and any academic integrity materials or instruction provided in the subject;
b. the assessment task;
c. any results from the use of text or code comparative software (with the exception of artificial intelligence detection software), plagiarism detection software, or web search engines;
d. outcomes from any review of the sources cited by the student, comparison with other assignments, and consultation with other relevant academic staff;
e. any discipline-specific information regarding the case; and
f. any additional evidence gathered, including but not limited to evidence of student learning and access to university systems (inclusive of that found through detection tools embedded within learning platforms), emails, texts/messaging and social media posts.

(30) The portfolio of evidence is accompanied by supplementary information where there are any other prior or current allegations recorded for the student (for any course of enrolment). The allegation at hand is investigated on the basis of the available evidence for that allegation only; however, any supplementary information may be used to facilitate discussions with the student about their overall studies and progress, or to determine an appropriate penalty.

(31) In assembling and considering the portfolio of evidence, the AIA, SAMC, or AIU is permitted to:

a. request further information from the Subject Coordinator, according to the guidance provided in the Guidelines for Managing and Investigating Student Misconduct Allegations (staff only);
b. request records of student access to relevant University computerised systems including times, locations, and related information; and
c. seek information from any relevant person.

Part D - AIA-Led Investigations

Initial Review

(32) Having reviewed the available evidence an AIA may make any of the following initial determinations:

a. the allegation lacks sufficient evidence to warrant further investigation. In this case the AIA will direct that:
    i. the report be dismissed;
    ii. the relevant work be accepted for marking; and
    iii. the Subject Coordinator and the person who made the allegation be provided with a written outcome of

their determination.

b. the report contains sufficient evidence of Poor Academic Practice or Minor Academic Misconduct to warrant further investigation. In this case an investigation will proceed; and
c. the report contains sufficient evidence of Serious Academic Misconduct to warrant referral to SAMC. In this case the AIA refers the case, with any outcomes of their initial review, to the AIU. The AIU then refers the allegation and accompanying evidence to the SAMC and advises the student (see Part E).

Communication With Students

(33) Where the AIA determines to proceed with an investigation, they direct the AIU to notify the student of the allegation. This is done in writing via the student's University email account, or last known address in the case of former students, as soon as practicable and within ten (10) business days of receiving a report. The email uses the standard Notification Letter and:

a. provides information about the alleged academic misconduct;
b. advises of a date for an online meeting no less than five (5) business days from the date of the Notification Letter, and informs the student that they may also respond to the allegation in writing (students may request an extension to the date where required);
c. includes a link to this Policy and its associated documents;
d. includes a copy of the portfolio of evidence provided to the AIA and any supplementary information;
e. offers an opportunity for the student to provide any relevant additional information; and
f. advises the student of their right to have a support person at the meeting and provides information about relevant University support services.

(34) If the student agrees to participate in a meeting with the AIA, they are entitled to be accompanied to any meeting by a support person. The support person may be any person, including disability support worker or a student advocate from a student association. The support person may not be any person who has a law degree or who is a legal practitioner. The support person may not represent or advocate for the student unless permitted by the AIA.

(35) The student should respond as soon as practicable but must respond within five (5) business days of the issue of the Notification Letter and advise:

a. whether they will attend the meeting and/or if they will respond to the allegation in writing; and
b. if they are to attend the meeting whether they will be accompanied by a support person and the identity of that person.

(36) Where a student chooses to respond to the allegation in writing, their response should be submitted at least 24 hours before the scheduled day and time of the meeting.

Investigations

(37) Where a meeting is held, a member of professional or academic staff may attend as an administrative officer, or for training purposes with the consent of the student. A written record of the meeting must be made and submitted to the AIU.

(38) The AIA may determine the outcome in the absence of a response from the student.

(39) During their investigation, the AIA is permitted to speak to any person they consider might help them to reach a decision.

Outcomes of Investigations

(40) After consideration of the evidence, the AIA makes one of the following determinations, as close as possible to the date of the scheduled meeting:

a. No Case to Answer – no academic misconduct has occurred for one of the following reasons:
    i. there is insufficient evidence to support, on the balance of probabilities, a finding of academic misconduct. The AIA will direct that the work be marked and no further action be taken; or
    ii. the incident is a result of Poor Academic Practice. The AIA will direct that the work be marked and that the student be provided with academic counselling or other educative options from the Schedule.
b. Minor Academic Misconduct – there is sufficient evidence to support, on the balance of probabilities, a finding of Minor Academic Misconduct. The AIA will direct that a minor penalty and educative action be applied according to the options available in the Schedule.
c. Serious Academic Misconduct – there is sufficient evidence of Serious Academic Misconduct to warrant referral to the SAMC.

(41) Within ten (10) business days of the AIA making their decision the AIU ensures that:

a. the student (via their University email account), the Subject Coordinator, and the staff member (but not member of public or student) who submitted the original allegation are provided with a written outcome of the AIAs determination including:
    i. their findings;
    ii. a summary of the evidence on which those findings are based;
    iii. any actions or penalties that were determined;
    iv. a brief statement of reasons;
    v. the details of how and where the student may appeal the decision and/or penalty and within what timeframe; and
    vi. information regarding available support services.
b. appropriate records are stored;
c. the Director of Student Advising (for international student support and advice)and the Pro Vice-Chancellor (Recruitment and International Operations) or their nominees are notified where the student is an international student and any penalty imposed could have consequences for the student's visa.

(42) The Subject Coordinator, or the relevant assessor, is responsible for ensuring that any relevant actions or penalties specified in the outcome are applied in a timely manner in order to facilitate timely results processing and release in accordance with the assurance of results provisions in the Assessment Procedure - Validation and Moderation.

Part E - Cases Referred to the Student Academic Misconduct Committee

Referral

(43) Cases are referred to the SAMC by the AIU:

a. directly, where the allegation has been reported by a source external to the University; and
b. following a referral by an AIA where, after a preliminary investigation the evidence appears to indicate Serious Academic Misconduct may have occurred.

(44) The AIU ensures that referred reports are accompanied by a comprehensive portfolio of evidence, including any supplementary information and the outcomes of any initial investigations by the relevant AIA.

Communication with Students

(45) When it is determined that a case is to be referred to the SAMC, the AIU sends a SAMC Notification Letter to the student via their University email account, or last known address in the case of former students, as soon as practicable and at least ten (10) business days before the SAMC is due to meet. The email:

a. provides information about the alleged academic misconduct;
b. requests that the student attend the online meeting of the Committee in person and informs the student that they may also respond to the allegation in writing;
c. includes a copy of the portfolio of evidence to be provided to the Committee, and any supplementary information;
d. includes a link to this Policy and associated documents;
e. offers the student an opportunity to provide any relevant additional information;
f. advises the student of their right to have any relevant support person at the meeting; and
g. provides the student with information about relevant University support services.

(46) If the student agrees to participate in a meeting with the SAMC, they are entitled to be accompanied to any meeting by a support person. The support person may be any person, including a disability worker or a student advocate from a student association. The support person may not be any person who has a law degree or who is a legal practitioner. The support person may not represent or advocate for the student unless permitted by the SAMC.

(47) The student should respond as soon as practicable but must respond within ten (10) business days of the issue of the SAMC Notification Letter. When responding to the request to attend the meeting, the student must advise:

a. whether they will attend a meeting and/or respond to the allegation in writing; and
b. if they are to attend a meeting whether they will be accompanied by a support person and the identity of that person.

(48) If the student does not respond to the SAMC Notification Letter within ten (10) business days, the SAMC meeting will proceed in their absence.

Conduct of the Student Academic Misconduct Committee Meeting

(49) The membership of the SAMC is as required in the Terms of Reference (staff only). The SAMC is supported by a member of professional staff from the AIU.

(50) The SAMC has access to the portfolio of evidence compiled by the AIU.

(51) The members of the SAMC are responsible for maintaining the confidentiality of third parties where required when documents are circulated.

(52) The Chair of the SAMC is permitted to speak to any person they consider might help the Committee reach a decision.

Outcomes of a SAMC Meeting

(53) After consideration of the evidence the SAMC makes one of the following determinations:

a. No Case to Answer - no academic misconduct has occurred for either one of the following reasons:

i. there is insufficient evidence to support, on the balance of probabilities, a finding of academic misconduct. The SAMC will direct that the work be marked and no further action be taken; or
ii. the incident is a result of Poor Academic Practice. The SAMC will refer the matter back to the relevant AIA for the application of academic counselling or other educative options from the Schedule.

b. Minor Academic Misconduct – there is sufficient evidence to support, on the balance of probabilities, a finding of Minor Academic Misconduct. The SAMC will refer the matter back to the relevant AIA for the application of a penalty and appropriate actions according to the options available in the Schedule;
c. Serious Academic Misconduct – there is sufficient evidence to support, on the balance of probabilities, a finding of Serious Academic Misconduct. The SAMC will direct that one or more penalties for Serious Academic Misconduct be applied, and an educative response where appropriate, according to the options available in the Schedule.

(54) In some cases, the matter may also be referred by the Deputy Vice-Chancellor (Academic) to TEQSA, police and/or other relevant authorities, or to another area of the University for managing under other policies such as the Student Conduct Management Policy.

(55) Within ten (10) business days of the SAMC meeting the AIU:

a. provides to the student (via their University email account), the Subject Coordinator, and the staff member (but not a member of the public or student) who submitted the original allegation a written outcome including:
i. the findings;
ii. a summary of the evidence on which those findings are based;
iii. any educative actions and/or penalties to be applied;
iv. a brief statement of reasons;
v. the details of how and where the student may appeal the decision and/or a penalty and within what timeframe; and
vi. information regarding available support services.
b. ensures appropriate records are stored;
c. as applicable, notifies the following:
i. the Director, Academic Services, or their nominee, where a penalty includes suspension or exclusion;
ii. the relevant Course Coordinator(s);
iii. the Director, Student Advising (for international support and advice);
iv. the Pro Vice-Chancellor (Recruitment and International Operations) or their nominee where the student is an international student and any penalty imposed could have consequences for the student's visa; and
v. the relevant Academic Integrity Advisor.

(56) The Subject Coordinator, or the relevant assessor, is responsible for ensuring that any actions or penalties specified in the outcome are applied in a timely manner in order to assist the student and to facilitate timely results processing and release in accordance with the assurance of results provisions in the Assessment Procedure - Validation and Moderation.

Part F - Appeals

(57) Students may appeal a determination of minor or serious academic misconduct made under this Policy, including any penalty, within twenty (20) business days of receiving the notice of decision. Appeals must be lodged in writing with the University Appeals Committee (UAC), accompanied by appropriate evidence, and can only be made where the student can demonstrate that:

a. this Policy and Procedure were not appropriately followed in the reaching of the determination or penalty; or
b. there was bias towards the student on the part of any individual involved with the findings; or
c. more evidence has become available that was not available to decision-makers at the time.

(58) Where a penalty is suspension or exclusion, no action may be taken to implement the penalty associated with an allegation before:

a. the conclusion of the 20-day appeal period, even if the student has not yet lodged an appeal; and
b. the UAC has completed its review and issued its findings, where the student has lodged a timely appeal against any penalty.

(59) The decision of the UAC is the final decision of the University. The University Ombudsman is not able to review decisions made by the UAC, however students who have concerns about any aspect of the process or the way in which this Policy has been applied (as opposed to the decision or outcome) may lodge a complaint with the Office of the University Ombudsman.

(60) Students who remain dissatisfied after all University processes have been exhausted may choose to lodge a complaint with the National Student Ombudsman.

Part G - Quality Assurance and Governance

(61) Data on academic misconduct is monitored at each subject review and any required actions are included in subject action plans as outlined in the Course and Subject Management Procedure - Monitoring and Review. Academic misconduct data for third-party teaching partners is reviewed through annual reporting and overseen by the relevant Joint Management Committee.

(62) All data collected on academic misconduct in learning and teaching activities is monitored and analysed by the Director, Integrity Office. Reports comprising de-identified data are:

a. generated quarterly for internal monitoring; and
b. submitted to Education Committee once a year for oversight and monitoring of trends across the University, prior to submission to Academic Board.

(63) Copies of all reports are provided to schools to inform curriculum and local improvements.

Section 7 - Definitions

(64) For the purposes of this Policy and Procedure:

a. academic integrity: being honest in academic work and taking responsibility for learning and implementing the conventions of scholarship.
b. academic misconduct: according to Section 1 of the Academic Integrity Statute 2015 academic misconduct includes:
    i. cheating, plagiarism or any other conduct engaged in by a student with a view to gaining for himself, herself, themself or another person an unfair or unjustified advantage in a formal examination or assessment or in relation to or for a formal examination or assessment, whether such advantage occurs or not (cheating means cheating in relation to a formal examination or assessment and includes a failure to comply with any reasonable direction or instruction of an officer, employee or agent of the University relating to the conduct of the formal examination or assessment);
    ii. conduct which constitutes a breach of any rules relating to a formal examination or assessment;

iii. conduct engaged in by a student with a view to gaining for himself, herself, themself or another person an unfair or unjustified advantage in relation to any other requirements of a course or subject, including without limitation class attendance or participation requirements and requirements pertaining to placements, whether such advantage occurs or not; and

iv. any prescribed conduct.

c. artificial intelligence: a machine-based system or application that, for explicit or implicit objectives, infers, from the input it receives, how to generate outputs such as predictions, content, recommendations, or decisions that can influence physical or virtual environments. Different AI systems vary in their levels of autonomy and adaptiveness after deployment. (Source: OECD 2023) See the OECD Explanatory memorandum on the updated OECD definition of an AI system | OECD Artificial Intelligence Papers | OECD iLibrary (oecd-ilibrary.org) for explanatory material about the definition.

d. business day: a day upon which the University is open for business.

e. exclusion: the temporary or permanent prohibition of an individual from accessing any or all University facilities and services or participating in University activities. A temporary prohibition may be for a specific period or until a condition or conditions have been met. Where a student or participant is excluded from a course, short course or subject, their enrolment in the course, short course or subject is cancelled, and where not prevented by the terms of their exclusion, they must reapply for admission.

f. Minor Academic Misconduct: academic misconduct which, in all the circumstances, falls short of serious academic misconduct (Academic Integrity Statute 2015).

g. natural justice: procedural fairness. The principle of natural justice as applied to this Policy means:

i. students are provided with copies of all relevant evidence that has been submitted for an allegation and links to all relevant policies and schedules prior to any meeting or hearing being conducted; and

ii. students are entitled to have a fair and impartial hearing and to make written and/or oral submissions on their behalf.

h. Plain English: language that aligns with the University's Brand and Editorial Style Guide and the Student Communications Policy that is easily understood by a diverse audience.

i. Poor Academic Practice: inappropriate academic practice that is judged not to be academic misconduct. A finding of Poor Academic Practice is a possible outcome from the initial assessment of a report or any investigation.

j. sanction: a temporary administrative restriction placed on a student's enrolment that prevents a specific action by the student in relation to their course.

k. Serious Academic Misconduct (Academic Integrity Statute 2015, Section 3, a-c): includes academic misconduct which:

i. is, or appears from the available evidence to be, accompanied by a clear or demonstrable intention to flout or contravene the University's requirements for academic honesty (including those set out in the Statute (Academic Integrity Statute 2015) and the AIP (Academic Integrity Policy and Procedure [Student Academic Misconduct Policy]), the GRP (Graduate Research Policy and Procedures) or any other policy or procedure regarding academic misconduct);

ii. is, or appears from the available evidence to be, carefully and deliberately planned, repetitive, organised or systematic in nature; and

iii. is, or appears from the available evidence to be, significant in scale or scope.

l. student: a person who was an enrolled student at a time when (they are) alleged to have engaged in academic misconduct (definition from Academic Integrity Statute 2015)

m. supervised assessment: an evaluation of student learning where students complete tasks under direct supervision. These assessments are used for measuring learning outcomes that assure CILOs, via mapped SILOs/MILOs in designated subjects. They are designed to ensure integrity through the following measures:

i. tasks are conducted in a controlled setting that incorporates direct observation;

ii. the identity of students is verified;
iii. access to external resources and unapproved technology and materials is restricted; and
iv. the use of AI is not permitted, except where AI use is being directly assessed.

n. suspension: the temporary prohibition of a student from participating in University activities and accessing University facilities and services. A temporary prohibition may be for a specific period or until a condition or conditions have been met. A student's rights will be restored, including the ability to re-enrol in the original or equivalent course or subject, at the conclusion of the suspension.
o. unsupervised assessment: an evaluation of student learning where students complete tasks individually or in a group. These assessments support self-directed learning typically:
    i. in an uncontrolled setting; and
    ii. with access to resources chosen by students.

Section 8 - Authority and Associated Information

(65) This Policy is made under the La Trobe University Act 2009.

(66) Associated information includes:

a. Student Academic Misconduct – Schedule of Penalties and Actions
b. Student Academic Misconduct Committee – Terms of Reference
c. Academic Integrity Statute 2015
d. Degrees, Diplomas and Other Awards Statute 2009
e. Assessment Procedure – Validation and Moderation

(67) Guidelines and other resources to support the implementation of this Policy are available on the Academic Integrity Intranet page (staff only).

Status and Details

Status	Current
Effective Date	17th June 2026
Review Date	3rd June 2029
Approval Authority	Academic Board
Approval Date	3rd June 2026
Expiry Date	Not Applicable
Responsible Manager - Policy	Allan Cormack Director, Integrity Office
Enquiries Contact	Quality and Standards

Glossary Terms and Definitions

"suspension" - The temporary prohibition of a student from participating in University activities and accessing University facilities and services. A temporary prohibition may be for a specific period or until a condition or conditions have been met. A student’s rights will be restored, including the ability to re-enrol in the original or equivalent course or subject, at the conclusion of the suspension.