

ACADEMIC INTEGRITY PROCEDURES 2022

Issued by: Chair, Academic Board

Dated: 15 November 2022 (commencing 20 February 2023)

Last amended: 24 April 2023 (administrative amendments)
2 February 2024 (administrative amendments)
11 June 2024 (commencing 15 July 2024)

Signature:

Name: Professor Jane Hanrahan

PART 1 PRELIMINARY

1 Purpose and application

- (1) These procedures give effect to the [Academic Integrity Policy](#) and the [Research Code of Conduct](#) (jointly “the policies”).
- (2) These procedures apply to:
 - (a) all coursework award courses;
 - (b) coursework units of study in higher degrees by research;
 - (c) all staff and affiliates;
 - (d) all students;
 - (e) former students who were enrolled at the time the conduct occurred;
and
 - (f) non-award students, exchange students and study abroad students in a unit of study at the University.

2 Commencement

These procedures commence on 20 February 2023.

PART 2 DEFINITIONS

3 Interpretation

- (1) Words and phrases not otherwise defined in this document have the meanings they have in the policies.

Note: see clause 6 of each policy.

administrative unit	means the University administrative unit responsible for candidature management.
Associate Dean (Research)	means, as appropriate: <ul style="list-style-type: none">• the Associate Dean with authority for matters relating to higher degrees by research; or• another person appointed by the Dean to have authority for matters relating to higher degrees by research in a faculty.
census date	means the date on which a student's enrolment in a unit of study becomes final.
code breach	means a failure to comply with Research Code of Conduct , which is not serious enough to be research misconduct Note: See clauses 19 and 20 of the Research Code of Conduct .
course code	means a unique alpha-numeric code which identifies a University course.
coursework student	means: <ul style="list-style-type: none">• any student enrolled in any coursework award course; or• a non-award, exchange or study abroad student enrolled in a coursework unit of study. Note: Higher degree by research students enrolled in coursework units of study are bound by the Academic Integrity Policy .
inappropriate academic practice	means a deviation from accepted academic standards. This includes standards of: <ul style="list-style-type: none">• referencing and due acknowledgement of others' work;• ethics guidelines and ethical practice; or• data management. <p>Inappropriate academic practice may be intentional or negligent. It includes:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none">• academic integrity or code breaches; and• research misconduct.

- progress evaluation panel** has the meaning given in the [Progress Planning and Review for Higher Degree by Research Students](#). That is:
- means a panel established to conduct a progress evaluation in accordance with clause 11 [of that policy].
- submission check** has the meaning given in the [Thesis and Examination of Higher Degrees by Research Policy](#). That is:
- means a review of a higher degree by research thesis undertaken at the point of submission by the central University administrative unit responsible for the processes of candidature management, as specified in clause 13 [of that policy].
- supervisor** has the meaning given in the [Higher Degree by Research Supervision Policy](#). That is:
- means, in relation to a higher degree by research student, a person appointed to discharge the responsibilities set out in clauses 13 and 15 [of that policy].
- suppression of academic record** means denying access to a student's academic record to:
- the student; and
 - any other person outside the University
- except where legally required to do so.
- This includes access to results, grades and evidence of awards.

PART 3 COURSEWORK STUDENTS

4 Education in academic integrity and discipline specific requirements

- (1) All coursework award students must complete an online education module on academic honesty before the census date in their first semester.
- (2) This requirement applies to:
 - (a) students beginning a new award course;
 - (b) students transferring from another institution;
 - (c) exchange students;
 - (d) students commencing honours, where honours has a different course code; and
 - (e) students in a combined degree program where the course code changes during candidature.
- (3) This requirement does not apply to students who have completed the module or an equivalent course approved by the Office of Educational Integrity in the previous five years.



- (4) The Deputy Vice-Chancellor (Education) may suppress a student's academic record if they have not successfully completed the module by the last day of their first semester.
 - (a) The record will be suppressed until the student successfully completes the module.
- (5) Faculties may also:
 - (a) make successful completion of the module an assessment requirement in any course component; or
 - (b) specify additional consequences of failure to complete the module.

5 Requirements for assessment tasks

- (1) Unit of study coordinators must take reasonable measures to minimise the possibility of academic integrity breaches..
 - (a) Measures may include:
 - (i) requiring an oral presentation as part of the assessment;
 - (ii) assessing outlines, and drafts of the written work as it is developed;
 - (iii) requiring students to demonstrate learning outcomes in a supervised examination, with a specified minimum pass threshold, as a requirement of passing the unit of study; or
 - (iv) conducting an oral examination.
- (2) If a quiz or online assessment contributes significantly to the assessment mark for the unit, the unit of study coordinator must take appropriate steps to assure its academic integrity.
- (3) If a quiz or online assessment contributes a small percentage of the assessment mark for the unit, the unit of study coordinator may consider academic integrity assurance on the basis of the complete assessment approach for the unit.
- (4) If class tests and examinations contribute to the assessment mark, the unit of study coordinator must take active measures to mitigate academic integrity risks. These include:
 - (a) appropriate seating arrangements and invigilation for tests or examinations held on campus;
 - (b) invigilation for examinations delivered online;
 - (c) randomising multiple choice questions between candidates; or
 - (d) another appropriate method.

Note: See Schedule One.



6 Reducing risk of breaches in assessments

- (1) All faculties should develop guidelines for assessing the academic integrity risks of the assessment types they use.
- (2) When reviewing and revising assessments, staff should assess the degree of academic integrity risk inherent in each assessment type and implement appropriate mitigations.
 - (a) Staff should evaluate the likelihood of each risk against the contribution of the assessment to the overall mark.
- (3) To assure learning in a program, staff should incorporate:
 - (a) supervised assessments; and
 - (b) assessments that allow students to demonstrate learning outcomes across a range of tasks.
- (4) Reviewing and revising assessment should include the following steps.
 - (a) Unit of study coordinators complete a risk assessment, as provided in Schedule One.
 - (b) For assessments with high or very high risk ratings, the relevant faculty committee may discuss with the unit of study coordinators:
 - (i) whether they should be used; and
 - (ii) if so, appropriate risk mitigations.
 - (c) At the end of each semester, relevant faculty committees should consult the unit of study coordinators to:
 - (i) confirm the initial risk assessment;
 - (ii) discuss the effectiveness of mitigations; and
 - (iii) discuss possible improvements.
 - (d) Faculties should report to the Academic Board on:
 - (i) identified issues with particular assessments or assessment types;
 - (ii) proposed improvements; and
 - (iii) any further mitigations.

7 Reporting academic integrity breaches

- (1) Any person who reasonably believes that a student has breached academic integrity requirements should notify the University using the [online reporting form](#).
- (2) Any person may report contract cheating services or other services that are reasonably likely to promote or facilitate academic misconduct to the Office of Educational Integrity.
 - (a) The University may report this information to relevant government authorities.



8 Managing alleged academic integrity breaches

- (1) Except as provided in subclause 8(3), a unit of study coordinator, Educational Integrity Coordinator or nominated academic must:
 - (a) review the evidence and relevant information. This includes:
 - (i) the student's record;
 - (ii) the student's stage of enrolment;
 - (iii) the severity of the suspected breach;
 - (iv) the volume of inappropriate conduct or unattributed material; and
 - (v) any other relevant matters; and
 - (b) decide if the allegation should be referred to the Registrar or the Director, Research Integrity and Ethics Administration.
- (2) For matters not referred to other decision makers, the unit of study coordinator, Educational Integrity Coordinator or nominated academic must then decide:
 - (a) if an academic integrity breach has been substantiated;
 - (b) if so, its level of severity; and
 - (c) the penalty.
- (3) If the decision maker decides that the conduct does not amount to an academic integrity breach, they must:
 - (a) inform the examiner and the unit of study coordinator; and
 - (b) if the work has not already been assessed, return it to the examiner for assessment.
- (4) If the alleged conduct:
 - (a) relates to contract cheating; or
 - (b) does not relate to a particular assignment (e.g., uploading to a file-sharing platform)

the Office of Educational Integrity may take the steps set out in subclauses 8(1) – 8(3).
- (5) The Office of Educational Integrity will assess anonymous reports and assign them to the appropriate decision maker.
- (6) If a student withdraws from the unit of study or degree in which a potential breach has been reported, the review must still continue to completion.

9 Handling minor breaches

- (1) If, after reviewing work submitted by a student, the unit of study coordinator believes that a student has committed a minor breach of academic integrity, they must:
 - (a) confirm the outcome as a minor breach;
 - (b) direct the student to complete an approved academic development activity;
 - (c) inform the student of any penalty. Penalties may include:



- (i) a reduced mark, in line with the published rubric;
 - (ii) a reduced mark proportionate to the unattributed content; or
 - (iii) submitting a corrected version of the work, usually with a prescribed maximum mark; and
- (d) record the outcome in the central reporting system.
- (2) After an allegation is entered, the central reporting system will check for prior academic integrity breaches by the student. If any are found, the matter will be referred to the Educational Integrity Coordinator or nominated academic for review.
- (3) If a student does not successfully complete an additional development activity, a further penalty may apply.
- (4) The unit of study coordinator must inform the examiner of the outcome and record the outcome on the student's file.
- (5) If:
 - (a) a student has a recorded prior breach; or
 - (b) the unit of study coordinator believes the conduct may constitute a more serious breach;the unit of study coordinator will refer the case to the Office of Educational Integrity or nominated academic.

10 Handling major breaches

- (1) If the relevant decision maker's preliminary assessment is that the alleged conduct constitutes a major breach they must send written notice to the student. The notice must:
 - (a) state the alleged breach in enough detail to allow the student to consider and respond to it;
 - (b) specify, and provide copies of, any supporting material to be used in deciding the matter;
 - (c) inform the student of the process to be followed;
 - (d) specify a reasonable time for providing a response; and
 - (e) include a copy of the [Academic Integrity Policy](#) and these procedures.
- (2) Students are encouraged to:
 - (a) cooperate fully with investigations; and
 - (b) provide evidence of their engagement with an assessment task.
- (3) The decision maker may require the student to provide their notes, working drafts, and resource materials.
- (4) The decision maker may request the student to do either or both of:
 - (a) attend a meeting; or
 - (b) submit a written response.
- (5) The University will provide the student with a reasonable opportunity to attend a meeting if the student requests one.



- (6) The decision maker must inform the student before any meeting of any staff members who will attend it.
- (7) The student may choose not to take part in a meeting. However, if a student who has been given reasonable notice fails to attend without good reason, the decision maker may decide the matter in the student's absence.
- (8) The decision maker may extend the time for a student to provide written responses.
- (9) The decision maker will review the evidence and decide if there has been:
 - (a) no breach;
 - (b) a minor breach;
 - (c) a major breach;
 - (d) conduct which is potentially a code breach or research misconduct. Conduct of this kind will be referred to the Director, Research Integrity and Ethics Administration;
Note: See the [Research Code of Conduct](#)
 - (e) conduct which is potentially student misconduct. Conduct of this kind will be referred to the Registrar.
Note: See [University of Sydney \(Student Discipline\) Rule](#).
- (10) If the decision maker decides there has been no breach, they must:
 - (a) inform the student, and the examiner or unit of study coordinator; and
 - (b) if the work has not already been assessed, return the work to the examiner for assessment.
- (11) If the decision maker decides there has been a minor breach, they must:
 - (a) direct the student to undertake an approved development activity on academic integrity;
 - (b) inform the student of any penalty. Penalties may include:
 - (i) a reduced mark, in line with the published rubric;
 - (ii) a reduced mark proportionate to the unattributed content; or
 - (iii) submitting a corrected version of the work, usually with a prescribed maximum mark.
- (12) If the decision maker decides there has been a major academic integrity breach which does not warrant referral to another decision maker, they may do one or more of the following:
 - (a) apply a mark or grade which reflects its unsatisfactory standard. This may be:
 - (i) a fail grade;
 - (ii) a prescribed mark penalty; or
 - (iii) a mark reflecting its standard, which may be a mark of zero; or
 - (b) apply a fail grade or a mark penalty to the unit of study, which may be a mark of zero; and
 - (c) require the student to take remedial action.



- (13) The decision maker must inform the original examiner, the student and the unit of study coordinator of:
 - (a) their decision; and
 - (b) any penalties imposed.

11 Appeals

- (1) Students may appeal against an academic integrity breach decision, as provided in the [University of Sydney \(Student Academic Appeals\) Rule](#).
- (2) This is:
 - (a) an appeal to the faculty under section 3.1 of the [University of Sydney \(Student Academic Appeals\) Rule](#); and
 - (b) should be determined by the Dean or Associate Dean.

12 Recordkeeping

- (1) The University will keep a record of all allegations of academic integrity breaches and their outcomes.
- (2) This information will include files related to investigations and outcomes. It will be kept on the University's Records Management System.
 - (a) Outcomes are not recorded on the student's academic transcript.

Note: See the [Privacy Policy](#) and [Recordkeeping Policy](#).

PART 4 HIGHER DEGREES BY RESEARCH

13 Reporting allegations

- (1) Supervisors and progress evaluation panels must report any suspected breach by students whom they supervise or evaluate. The report is made using the [online reporting form](#).
- (2) Students or staff members who become aware of suspected breaches by a student must report the allegations using the [online reporting form](#).

14 Handling allegations not involving the Higher Degree by Research examination process

- (1) The decision maker must consider all reports and come to a preliminary view about the reported conduct. They must decide if it potentially constitutes:
 - (a) no academic integrity breach;
 - (b) an academic integrity breach, but not a code breach or research misconduct;
 - (c) a code breach; or



- (d) research misconduct.
- (2) If the decision maker's preliminary view is that the reported conduct:
 - (a) is potentially research misconduct;
 - (b) relates to research work on a project funded by a research grant; or
 - (c) relates to research findings that have been published or which are about to be published;they must refer the matter to the Director of Research Integrity and Ethics Administration.
- (3) If the decision maker's preliminary view is that the reported conduct is potentially a code breach, but not research misconduct, they must:
 - (a) consult with the Director of Research Integrity and Ethics Administration; and
 - (b) refer the matter to the Director of Research Integrity and Ethics Administration if requested.
- (4) Matters referred to the Director of Research Integrity and Ethics Administration will be managed under the [Research Code of Conduct](#).
- (5) If the decision maker's preliminary view is that the reported conduct is potentially:
 - (a) an academic integrity breach; but
 - (b) not a code breach or research misconduct;they must:
 - (c) require the student to undertake additional education;
 - (d) inform the supervisor through the [online reporting form](#); and
 - (e) require the student to make necessary corrections, for appraisal by their supervisor as appropriate.
- (6) The decision maker may also require the student to attend an additional evaluation review in accordance with the [Progress Planning and Review for Higher Degree by Research Students Policy](#).
- (7) If the decision maker is satisfied that there is evidence of persistent breaches by a student, they may treat the matter as a potential code breach.
- (8) If:
 - (a) the decision maker's preliminary view is that the alleged conduct is potentially a code breach but not research misconduct; and
 - (b) the Director of Research Integrity and Ethics Administration has not requested that the case be referred;the decision maker must deal with the matter under subclauses 14(9) – (14).
- (9) In all other cases, the decision maker must:
 - (a) set a time and place for an interview with the student; and
 - (b) provide the student with a written notice that:
 - (i) describes the alleged breach in enough detail to allow the student to consider and respond to it;
 - (ii) specifies any supporting material to be used in deciding the matter;



- (iii) informs the student of the process to be followed;
 - (iv) specifies a reasonable time for providing a response; and
 - (v) includes a copy of the [Academic Integrity Policy](#) and these procedures.
- (10) The decision maker will decide the time and place for the interview.
- (11) The decision maker must inform the student before the interview of any staff members who will attend it.
- (12) All participants in the interview should attend in person. If necessary, interviews may be held by any telecommunications method which permits those present to attend and participate at the same time.
- (13) The student may choose not to take part in an interview. However, if a student who has been given reasonable notice fails to attend without good reason, the decision maker may decide the matter in the student's absence.
- (14) The decision maker may extend the time for a student to provide written responses.
- (15) The student is not required to provide written responses and may choose not to.
- (16) Once:
 - (a) any scheduled interview has been held or the appointed time has passed; and
 - (b) the student has responded or the deadline to do so has passed;then:
 - (c) the decision maker will decide if there has been:
 - (i) potential research misconduct;
 - (ii) potential code breach;
 - (iii) inappropriate academic practice, but not a code breach or potential research misconduct;
 - (iv) other misconduct; or
 - (v) no impropriety.
- (17) The decision maker must inform the student and supervisor in writing of the decision and consequent actions.
- (18) If the decision maker decides there has been potential research misconduct, they must refer the case to the Director of Research Integrity and Ethics Administration.
- (19) If the decision maker decides there has been a potential code breach, but not research misconduct, they:
 - (a) must consult with the Director of Research Integrity and Ethics Administration; and
 - (b) if requested by the Director of Research Integrity and Ethics Administration, refer the case for investigation.
- (20) If the decision maker decides there has been:
 - (a) a potential code breach but not research misconduct, which the Director of Research Integrity and Ethics Administration has not requested to be referred to them; or



- (b) inappropriate academic practice, but not a potential code breach or potential research misconduct;
they must handle the matter under subclause 14(5).
- (21) If the decision maker decides there has been other potential misconduct, they must refer the matter to the Registrar for investigation under the [University of Sydney \(Student Discipline\) Rule](#).
- (22) If the decision maker decides there has been no impropriety they will take no further action.

15 Handling allegations relating to the Higher Degree by Research examination process

- (1) If, after conducting the checks required by the [Progress Planning and Review for Higher Degree by Research Students Policy](#), the administrative unit suspects possible:
 - (a) inappropriate academic practice;
 - (b) code breach; or
 - (c) research misconduct;they must report the matter to the relevant decision maker using the [online reporting form](#).
- (2) The decision maker will:
 - (a) consider the report;
 - (b) form a preliminary view; and
 - (c) decide the required action.
- (3) If the preliminary view is that there is evidence of potential code breach or research misconduct, the decision maker must refer the matter to the Director of Research Integrity and Ethics Administration.
Note: See the [Research Code of Conduct](#).
- (4) If the preliminary view is that the apparent deficiencies in the thesis:
 - (a) constitute minor inappropriate academic practice that could be addressed as emendations; and
 - (b) could not constitute academic dishonesty, a code breach or research misconduct;the decision maker must:
 - (c) forward the thesis for examination; and
 - (d) lodge a report of any changes or emendations required using the [online reporting form](#).
- (5) If the preliminary view is that the apparent deficiencies in the thesis:
 - (a) constitute inappropriate academic practice that could not be addressed by emendations; but
 - (b) could not constitute a code breach or research misconduct;the decision maker:



- (c) must lodge a report of any changes or emendations required using the [online reporting form](#); and
 - (d) must refer the thesis and report to the relevant faculty committee to consider whether the thesis is suitable to examine; and
 - (e) may recommend that the faculty should decline to examine the thesis.
- (6) If the preliminary view is that there is no impropriety in the thesis, the decision maker must:
- (a) forward it for examination; and
 - (b) lodge a report using the [online reporting form](#).
- (7) A report of a decision maker's findings must:
- (a) include any emendations or changes required to address deficiencies;
 - (b) be included in the student's file; and
 - (c) be forwarded to the committee determining the examination outcomes.

Note: The committee deciding the outcome for the examination will be either the relevant faculty committee or the HDR Examinations Subcommittee of the University Executive Research Committee. See the [Thesis and Examination of Higher Degrees by Research Policy](#) and the [Thesis and Examination of Higher Degrees by Research Procedures](#).

- (8) If the faculty committee is asked to consider whether a thesis is suitable to examine after a referral under these procedures, it must do one of:
- (a) decline to examine the thesis;
 - (b) forward the thesis for examination; or
 - (c) refer the matter to the Director of Research Integrity and Ethics Administration under the [Research Code of Conduct](#).
- (9) A report of the faculty committee's findings must:
- (a) include any decision of inappropriate academic practice and any emendations or changes required;
 - (b) be lodged using the [online reporting form](#); and
 - (c) be considered by the committee deciding the examination outcome.

Note: The committee deciding the examination will be either the relevant faculty committee or the HDR Examinations Subcommittee of the University Executive Research Committee. See the [Thesis and Examination of Higher Degrees by Research Policy](#) and the [Thesis and Examination of Higher Degrees by Research Procedures](#).

- (10) Any cases referred to the Director of Research Integrity and Ethics Administration will be managed under the [Research Code of Conduct](#).
- (11) If the Director of Research Integrity and Ethics Administration decides to:
- (a) dismiss a matter; or
 - (b) refer it back to the faculty as a code breach but not research misconduct;

the relevant faculty committee will decide the outcome and any consequent action.



- (12) If the relevant faculty committee declines to examine a thesis, it must:
- (a) report the circumstances and reasons to the HDR Examinations Subcommittee;
 - (b) inform the student in writing of:
 - (i) the reasons;
 - (ii) any changes necessary to make the thesis acceptable for examination; and
 - (iii) any other actions required before examination.
 - (c) recommend to the Dean that the student be either:
 - (i) permitted to re-enrol to complete necessary actions and resubmit the thesis; or
 - (ii) be asked to show good cause why they should be permitted to re-enrol.
- (13) If the relevant faculty committee declines to examine a thesis, the Dean will decide whether the student is permitted to re-enrol or show good cause.
- (14) If there is a decision of any of the following during the examination process:
- (a) inappropriate academic practice;
 - (b) code breach; or
 - (c) research misconduct
- the committee deciding the outcome of the examination must consider the decision report.
- Note:** See the [Thesis and Examination of Higher Degrees by Research Procedures](#)
- (15) If the committee deciding the outcome of examination is the faculty committee, its conclusion must be reviewed by the HDR Examinations Subcommittee.
- (16) All reports by the Associate Dean, postgraduate coordinator, relevant faculty committee, or the Director of Research Integrity and Ethics Administration must be forwarded to the HDR Examinations Subcommittee.
- (17) If any decision maker's report requires changes or emendations, they must be included in the emendations or changes to be addressed under the [Thesis and Examination of Higher Degrees by Research Procedures](#).
- (18) If an examiner reports allegations of potential code breach or research misconduct, the relevant faculty committee must consider the report, as required by the policies and these procedures.

16 Proof-reading and editing of thesis

Students are permitted to use editors or proof-readers in the preparation of their thesis for submission.

Note: See the [Thesis and Examination of Higher Degrees by Research Policy](#) and the [Thesis and Examination of Higher Degrees by Research Procedures](#)

17 Rescissions and replacements

This document replaces the *Academic Honesty Procedures 2016* which is rescinded as from the date of commencement of this document:

SCHEDULE ONE – SUMMARY OF ASSESSMENT TYPES, RISKS AND MITIGATING STRATEGIES

Note: The below table lists common examples of academic integrity risks based on assessment types and suggested mitigation strategies. The list is not exhaustive and additional risks and mitigation strategies should be considered by staff as part of the risk assessment undertaken in accordance the relevant faculty guidelines and clause 6 above.

Assessment category	Assessment type*	Description of Assessment type	Potential Risks	Mitigation Strategies	Risk Rating	Rating After Mitigation
Exam or in-semester test	Final exam	Written exam, written exam with non-written elements, or non-written exam, however administered.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Impersonation • Use of prohibited materials (incl. notes, electronic devices, etc.) • Cheating by collusion or external assistance • Sharing questions and solutions during exam or test 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Identity check • Online proctoring or in person invigilation • Use similarity detection software (if possible) • Avoid reusing past exam questions (even if confidential); substantially rewrite questions if re-use is essential • Have a test bank of suitable questions/scenarios to reduce the likelihood of repetition 	Medium	Low
	In-semester test	Written exam, written exam with non-written elements, or non-written exam, however administered.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Disrupting or obstructing others from completing the exam • Recording or removing secure materials, such as examination papers, question or answer books 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Some randomisation of questions or answers (esp. if synchronous starts) • Minimise use of recall-type and single right answer questions • Require upload of working out/solutions for formula-based questions • Review student performance in exam relative to past tasks 	Medium	Low
	Oral exam		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Impersonation • Sharing of questions • Using translation software or generative artificial intelligence to form responses 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Identity check • In person invigilation (if possible) • Some randomisation of questions 	Medium	Low
Skills-based assessment	Placements	Professional experience placement, internship, or site visit.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Impersonation • Student not attending placement • Contract cheating or external assistance for completed report or reflective diary associated with placement 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Visit or Zoom call to placement site, at least once during course of placement • Require a mid-way “check” of the student • Require student to produce ID card to placement site • Include short interview about placement activities (with instructor if possible) 	Medium	Low

*Assessment type follows those specified within the [Assessment Procedures](#).



Assessment category	Assessment type*	Description of Assessment type	Potential Risks	Mitigation Strategies	Risk Rating	Rating After Mitigation
Skills based assessment	Placements (continued from above)		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Forging signature of external educators on assessment reports or competency documents 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> All assessment pieces with educator signature to be duplicated and forwarded to University for cross check Electronic submission of placement assessment reports Keep a bank of authorised signatures for review Use watermarked documents that clearly identify alterations 	Medium	Low
	Skills based evaluation	Clinical skills assessment or lab skills assessment.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Falsifying data or results 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Require students to submit results or product before leaving the class 	Medium	Low
	Creative assessments / demonstrations	Performance, recital or jury-assessment or exhibition.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Plagiarism or unoriginal submission 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Require written submission to accompany task if suitable and submit it to similarity detection software 	Low	Low
Submitted work	Assignment	Essay, report, case study, proposal, literature review, portfolio, or design.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Plagiarism or inappropriately attributed content (includes reuse, recycling, collusion) External assistance or outsourcing (i.e., contract cheating) Misunderstanding assessment requirements Misusing or not acknowledging use of automated writing tools or generative artificial intelligence 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Use similarity detection software Provide personalised or contextualised questions or topics where possible Design assignments that require higher order thinking Implement scaffolded tasks which demonstrate progress on a task or require submission of draft documents Include an oral component with detailed questions Revise or modify assignment questions in each iteration of the unit 	High	Medium
	Honours thesis or Dissertation	Non-HDR thesis.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Plagiarism or inappropriately attributed content (includes reuse, recycling, collusion) External assistance or outsourcing (i.e., contract cheating) Misusing or not acknowledging use of automated writing tools or generative artificial intelligence 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Use similarity detection software Provide personalised or contextualised questions or topics where possible Implement scaffolded tasks which demonstrate progress on a task or require submission of draft documents Include checkpoints for tracking student progress and giving feedback 	High	Medium

Assessment category	Assessment type*	Description of Assessment type	Potential Risks	Mitigation Strategies	Risk Rating	Rating After Mitigation
In-class assessments	Tutorial quiz, small test or online task		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Sharing of questions or answers External assistance or outsourcing of work (i.e., contract cheating) Misusing or not acknowledging use of automated writing tools or generative artificial intelligence 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> In person invigilation; Quarantine students before/after exam until all students with same questions have finished (if on campus) Multiple versions or test bank of suitable questions or scenarios to reduce the likelihood of students been given "the same" question. Synchronous start and end times for higher weighted tasks Allow multiple attempts for formative tasks of a low weighting Re-test work in a formal (preferably barrier) exam 	High	Medium
	Small continuous assessment		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Impersonation 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Identity check (present ID card) Review performance against other assessments 	Medium	Low
	Presentation	Oral presentation.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Impersonation External assistance or outsourcing (i.e., contract cheating) Misusing or not acknowledging use of automated writing tools or generative artificial intelligence 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Identity check (present ID card) Include detailed questions to test student understanding of content Require transcript to be submitted to similarity detection software 	Medium	Low
	Optional assignment or small test	Includes formative assessments.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Impersonation 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Identity check (present ID card) 	Medium	Low
	Attendance or participation	Requirement to attend lectures, tutorials, laboratory session or other learning experiences	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Impersonation Forging attendance records 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Identity check Keep weighting low, ensure content is retested in formal barrier examination 	Medium	Low
Group work	Presentation		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Plagiarism or inappropriately attributed content (includes reuse, recycling, collusion) External assistance or outsourcing of work (i.e., contract cheating) No or unequal contribution to group submission Missing or not acknowledging use of automated writing tools or generative artificial intelligence 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Use similarity detection software Require written submission of presentation content Require declaration of contribution 	High	Medium



Assessment category	Assessment type*	Description of Assessment type	Potential Risks	Mitigation Strategies	Risk Rating	Rating After Mitigation
	Assignment	Written, non-written elements.	<ul style="list-style-type: none">As above	<ul style="list-style-type: none">As above	High	Medium

SCHEDULE TWO - EDUCATIONAL INTEGRITY OF ASSESSMENTS RISK ASSESSMENT MATRIX

		Potential Significance					
		Learning & Teaching Activity with low weighted contribution to final mark. Content can be retested in formal exam	Low weighted assessment e.g. short quiz. Content can be retested in formal exam	Assessment that contributes to a significant proportion of marks (~30%). Content can be retested in formal exam	Major assessment (~50%) but content can be retested in a formal exam or OSCE.	Major assessment e.g. final exam Honours thesis, dissertation, test of essential professional skills. Cannot be further examined.	
		Not Significant	Minor	Moderate	Major	Highly Significant	
Likelihood	Expected to occur regularly	Almost Certain	Medium	High	Very High	Very High	Very High
	Expected to occur	Likely	Medium	High	High	Very High	Very High
	Moderately likely	Possible	Low	Medium	High	High	Very High
	Not likely to occur	Unlikely	Low	Low	Medium	Medium	High
	May happen, but not often	Rare	Low	Low	Low	Low	Medium

NOTES

Academic Integrity Procedures 2022

Date adopted:	15 November 2022
Date commenced:	20 February 2023
Date amended:	16 March 2023 (administrative amendment) 19 April 2023 (administrative amendment) 2 February 2024 (administrative amendment) 11 June 2024 (commencing 15 July 2024)
Owner:	Deputy Vice-Chancellor (Education)
Review date:	20 February 2028
Rescinded documents:	Academic Honesty Procedures 2016
Related documents:	<i>University of Sydney Act 1989 (as amended)</i> <i>Academic Integrity Policy</i> <i>University of Sydney (Student Academic Appeals) Rule</i> <i>University of Sydney (Student Discipline) Rule</i> <i>Research Code of Conduct</i> <i>Coursework Policy</i> <i>Learning and Teaching Policy</i> <i>Progress Planning and Review of Higher Degree by Research Students Policy</i> <i>Thesis and Examination of Higher Degrees by Research Policy</i> <i>Assessment Procedures</i>

AMENDMENT HISTORY

Provision	Amendment	Commencing
3	Insert new definition for 'inappropriate academic practice'	16 March 2023

Provision	Amendment	Commencing
12(2)	Delete 'Case Management System and the' between 'the' and 'University's Record Management System'	16 March 2023
15(7) note; 15(9) note	replace 'Academic Board' with 'University Executive Research Committee'	24 April 2023
1(1); 3; 10(8)(d) note; 14(4); 15(3) note; 15(8)(c); 15(10); related records	Replaced 'Research Code of Conduct 2019' with 'Research Code of Conduct 2023'	2 February 2024
Throughout	Administrative amendments to remove the year in policy references.	15 July 2024

The following amendments were approved by the Academic Standards and Policy Committee on 11 June 2024 for effect on 15 July 2024. Resolution AB ASPC 2024/07-08.

1(1)	Deleted 'are to'.	15 July 2024
3(1)	Deleted 'central' in definition of 'administrative unit'; Deleted definition of 'copy-editing and proof-reading' and 'editor'; Wording amended to reflect simplified language throughout.	15 July 2024
4	Wording amended to reflect simplified language throughout; Moved subclause 4(1)(a) to 4(3). Consequent renumbering; Added new subclause 4(4)(a).	15 July 2024
5	Wording amended to reflect simplified language throughout.	15 July 2024
6	Deleted 'academic integrity' from title; Added new subclause (3). Consequent renumbering; Wording amended to reflect simplified language throughout.	15 July 2024
7(2)	Deleted 'cheating' after 'academic'.	15 July 2024
8	Added 'the Office of Educational Integrity may take the steps set out in subclauses 8(1) – 8(3)'.	15 July 2024



Provision	Amendment	Commencing
	Wording amended to reflect simplified language throughout.	
9	Deleted 'Process for' in title;	15 July 2024
	Wording amended to reflect simplified language throughout;	
	New subclause (2) inserted. Consequent renumbering.	
10	Deleted 'Process for' in title;	15 July 2024
	Wording amended to reflect simplified language throughout.	
11, 12 and 13	Wording amended to reflect simplified language throughout.	15 July 2024
14	Deleted 'Process for' in title;	15 July 2024
	Wording amended to reflect simplified language throughout;	
	New subclause (13) added, consequent renumbering.	
15	Added new subclause (2). Consequent renumbering.	15 July 2024
	Wording amended to reflect simplified language throughout.	
Schedule 1	Final exam and In-semester test: changed Risk Rating from 'High' to 'Medium' and Rating After Mitigation from 'Medium' to 'Low'; replaced 'in the form' with 'by' before 'collusion'; deleted 'third party' and 'of' and added new examples under Potential Risks; deleted 'or' before 'substantially'; replaced 'students been given "the same" question' with 'repetition' and '/answers' with 'or answers' under Mitigation Strategies;	15 July 2024
	Oral exam: added new row for examples of academic integrity risks.	
	Placements: replaced 'preceptor' with 'instructor' under Mitigation Strategies. Corrected grammatical errors and simplified wording.	
	Skills based evaluation and Creative assessments / demonstrations: simplified wording used for examples.	
	Assignment: deleted 'peer to peer' before 'collusion', replaced 'task' with 'requirements'; deleted 'of work' after 'outsourcing' and added new example under 'Potential Risks'. Added new clause under Mitigation	

Provision	Amendment	Commencing
	<p>Strategies. Added 'in' before 'each' and 'of the unit' after 'iteration'.</p>	
	<p>Honours thesis or dissertation: deleted 'peer to peer' before 'collusion', 'of work' after 'outsourcing' and added new example under column for Potential Risks; added new clause under column for Mitigation Strategies.</p>	
	<p>Tutorial quiz, small test or online task: added new example under column for Potential Risks. Added 'or' and deleted '/' before 'scenarios' under column for Mitigation Strategies.</p>	
	<p>Presentation: added new clause under column for Potential Risks and Mitigation Strategies; deleted 'of work' after 'outsourcing' in column for Potential Risks.</p>	
	<p>Throughout Schedule: simplified wording or corrected grammar where required.</p>	