

# ACADEMIC HONESTY PROCEDURES 2016

Issued by: Chair, Academic Board  
Date approved: 17 August 2016  
Date commenced: 25 August 2016  
Last amended: 27 July 2017 (administrative amendments)  
5 November 2020 (commencing 1 January 2021)  
3 May 2022 (commencing 16 May 2022)

Signature:  
Name: Professor Jane Hanrahan

## **PART 1 - PRELIMINARY**

---

### **1 Purpose and application**

- (1) These procedures are to give effect to the [Academic Honesty in Coursework Policy 2015](#) and the [Research Code of Conduct 2019](#) (jointly, “the policies”).
- (2) These procedures apply to:
  - (a) staff;
  - (b) affiliates;
  - (c) all students enrolled in a coursework award course;
  - (d) all higher degree by research students; and
  - (e) non-award students, exchange students and study abroad students enrolled in a unit of study at the University.

### **2 Commencement**

These procedures commence on 26 August 2016.

## PART 2 - DEFINITIONS

---

### 3 Interpretation

Words and phrases used in these procedures and not otherwise defined in this document have the meanings they have in the policies.

**Note:** see clause 6 of each policy.

<b>academic dishonesty</b>	has the meaning given in clause 7 of the <a href="#">Academic Honesty in Coursework Policy 2015</a> .
<b>administrative unit</b>	means the central University administrative unit responsible for the processes of candidature management.
<b>Associate Dean</b>	means, as appropriate: <ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>• the Associate Dean of a faculty or University school with authority for matters relating to higher degrees by research within the faculty;</li><li>• the Deputy Chairperson of a Board of Studies; or</li><li>• a person appointed by the Dean or Head of School and Dean (University school) to have authority for matters relating to higher degrees by research within a faculty or University school.</li></ul>
<b>census date</b>	means the date on which a student's enrolment in a unit of study becomes final.
<b>code breach</b>	has the meaning given in clause 19 of the <a href="#">Research Code of Conduct 2019</a> .
<b>copy editing and proof reading</b>	means identifying errors in, and correcting, the presentation of a text so as to conform with standard usage and conventions, including: <ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>• spelling</li><li>• quotations</li><li>• use of italics</li><li>• lists</li><li>• word usage</li><li>• punctuation</li><li>• graphs</li><li>• charts</li><li>• citations</li><li>• references</li><li>• heading hierarchies</li><li>• symbols and equations</li><li>• headers and footers</li><li>• style of numbers</li></ul>



<b>collusion</b>	means co-operation that is not legitimate co-operation.
<b>course code</b>	means a unique alpha-numeric code which identifies a University course.
<b>coursework student</b>	<p>means any student enrolled in any coursework award course or a non-award, exchange or study abroad student enrolled in a coursework unit of study.</p> <p><b>Note:</b> Higher Degree by Research students enrolled in coursework units of study are bound by the <a href="#">Academic Honesty in Coursework Policy 2015</a>. See clause 13 of these procedures.</p>
<b>editor</b>	means any person (whether or not accredited by an external organisation) undertaking paid or unpaid copy editing or proof-reading.
<b>inappropriate academic practice</b>	<p>means a deviation (whether intentional or negligent) from accepted academic standards, including standards of:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>• referencing and due acknowledgement of the work others;</li><li>• ethics guidelines and ethical practice; or</li><li>• data management.</li></ul> <p>It includes academic dishonesty, code breaches and research misconduct.</p>
<b>relevant decision maker</b>	<p>means a person authorised to make decisions regarding academic honesty in the faculty.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>• For coursework matters, this is the Educational Integrity Co-ordinator or a nominated academic.</li><li>• For higher degrees by research, this is the Associate Dean or a postgraduate co-ordinator.</li></ul>
<b>research misconduct</b>	has the meaning given in clause 20 of the <a href="#">Research Code of Conduct 2019</a> .
<b>Review Panel</b>	means a panel established to conduct a progress review in accordance with clause 14 of the <a href="#">Progress Planning and Review for Higher Degree by Research Students Policy 2015</a> .
<b>submission check</b>	means a review of a higher degree by research thesis at the point of submission for examination, as required by clause 13 of the <a href="#">Thesis and Examination of Higher Degrees by Research Policy 2015</a> .
<b>supervisor</b>	means, in relation to a higher degree by research student, any person appointed to discharge the responsibilities set out in clause 14 of the <a href="#">Higher Degree by Research Supervision Policy 2020</a> . This includes any or all of research supervisors, co-ordinating supervisors, and auxiliary supervisors.
<b>suppression of academic record</b>	means that access to the student's academic record is denied to the student and to anyone outside the University, in the absence of legal compulsion to provide it. This includes access to results, grades and evidence of awards.

## PART 3 – COURSEWORK STUDENTS

---

### 4 Education in academic honesty and discipline specific requirements

- (1) Faculties must provide education in the academic writing and referencing conventions of their discipline, as required by the [Learning and Teaching Policy 2019](#), and consistently with this clause.  
**Note:** See clause 23 of the *Learning and Teaching Policy 2019* and clause 10 of the [Academic Honesty in Coursework Policy 2015](#).
- (2) All students commencing a coursework award course after 1 January 2016 must complete an online education module on academic honesty prior to the census date in their first semester of enrolment, unless they have completed the module or an equivalent course approved by the Office of Educational Integrity in the previous ten years.
- (3) Students commencing a coursework award course include:
  - (a) students commencing a new award course;
  - (b) students transferring award courses within the University or 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.
- (4) If a student does not successfully complete the module by the last day of their first semester of enrolment, the student's academic record may be suppressed until the module is successfully completed.
- (5) Students who successfully complete the module will have the date of completion recorded on their academic transcript.
- (6) Faculties may do either or both of the following:
  - (a) make successful completion of the module an assessment requirement in a unit of study or other component;
  - (b) specify additional consequences of failure to complete the module.

### 5 Requirements for assessment tasks

- (1) Where there is a possibility that ghost-writing or contract cheating (that is, commissioning another person to write all or part of an assessment) might occur, the unit of study co-ordinator must take reasonable steps to eliminate or minimise the opportunity to do so, so that examiners can be reasonably satisfied that the submitted work was written by the student without assistance except for legitimate co-operation. Such measures may include, but are not limited to:
  - (a) requiring an oral presentation of the work as part of the assessment;
  - (b) assessing outlines, drafts and other iterations of the written work as it is developed;

- (c) requiring that students demonstrate learning outcomes in a supervised examination, where the student is required to pass, or reach a reasonable threshold in, the examination in order to pass the unit of study;
  - (d) conducting an oral examination.
- (2) If a quiz or online assessment contributes significantly to the assessment mark for the unit, the unit of study co-ordinator must take appropriate steps to assure its academic integrity, consistently with the policies and these procedures.
  - (3) If a quiz or online assessment contributes a small percentage of the overall unit mark, academic integrity should still be considered as part of its design but assurance of the overall academic integrity of assessment for the unit may be through consideration of the complete assessment approach for the unit.
  - (4) If class tests and mid-semester or faculty or University school coordinated examinations contribute to the assessment mark, the unit of study co-ordinator must take active measures to provide seating arrangements which prevent copying. Where it is not possible to ensure students cannot see another student's paper one of the following techniques should be used:
    - (a) sorted seating where students are sitting with adjacent students taking different examinations;
    - (b) scrambling multiple choice questions between candidates; or
    - (c) another appropriate method.

**Note:** See also Schedule One.

## 6 Reducing risk of educational dishonesty in assessments

- (1) As part of reviewing and revising assessments, staff should consider the degree of risk to educational integrity inherent in each assessment type, and should implement appropriate mitigating measures.
- (2) Staff should also consider the likelihood of the risk, measured against the contribution of that particular assessment to the overall mark.
- (3) All faculties should develop guidelines for considering the degree of risk to educational integrity of the assessment types used within their faculty.
- (4) The process used should include the following steps.
  - (a) Unit of study co-ordinators complete a risk evaluation to determine the assessment risks and relevant mitigation strategies to employ as set out in Schedule One.
  - (b) If an assessment has a risk that is high or very high, the relevant faculty committee may wish to discuss the use of that particular assessment with the unit of study co-ordinators and the implementation of mitigating strategies.
  - (c) Relevant faculty committees should follow-up at the end of semester to:
    - (i) confirm the initial risk assessment;
    - (ii) confirm the success of mitigating strategies; and
    - (iii) discuss what may be implemented in the future if the initial strategy was not successful.

- (d) Faculties should report to the Academic Board on:
  - (i) any issues that have been identified with particular assessments or assessment types;
  - (ii) any consequential proposed changes to assessment or assessment types; and
  - (iii) any further strategies to mitigate these issues.

## 7 Allowable assistance with work, including proof-reading and editing

- (1) The unit of study co-ordinator may determine whether students are permitted to use editors (including proof-readers) in the preparation of written assignments.
- (2) If a unit of study co-ordinator determines that editors or proof-readers are not to be used, this must be specified in the unit of study outline.
- (3) Where not otherwise specified in the unit of study outline, editors and proof-readers are permitted in accordance with the [Academic Honesty in Coursework Policy 2015](#) and these procedures.
- (4) Students permitted to use an editor for anything more than proof-reading and correction of typographical errors should provide the editor with a copy of these procedures.
- (5) Students permitted to use a professional editor must provide the editor with a copy of these procedures.

**Note:** Clause 8A of the [Academic Honesty in Coursework Policy 2015](#) sets out the requirements for legitimate cooperation. As at the date of these procedures the [Australian Standards for Editing Practice \(ASEP\) 2013](#) can be found at the [website of the Institute of Professional Editors Limited](#)

- (6) An editor may only be used for:
  - (a) copy-editing and proof-reading; and
  - (b) providing advice about:
    - (i) matters of structure (the need to structure and reword, deletions, additions);
    - (ii) conventions of grammar and syntax;
    - (iii) using clear language;
    - (iv) logical connections between phrases, clauses, sentences, paragraphs and sections;
    - (v) voice and tone; and
    - (vi) avoiding ambiguity, repetition and verbosity.
- (7) Students must acknowledge any assistance provided in preparing work submitted for assessment, including, but not limited to:
  - (a) any feedback from other people (or for group work, people outside the group) on drafts of written work, whether or not that feedback resulted in changes;
  - (b) any copy-editing or proof-reading.

- (8) Acknowledgement must:
- (a) be made in writing on the front of the work submitted for assessment, or in an appropriate footnote or other reference; and
  - (b) state:
    - (i) the name of the person;
    - (ii) a brief description of the nature of the assistance, including whether it constituted editing or proof-reading; and
    - (iii) the person's current or former area of academic specialisation or expertise if this is related to the topic of the assessment item.

## 8 Process after preliminary assessment of failure to understand referencing requirements

- (1) This clause applies where the relevant decision maker has made a preliminary assessment that alleged conduct is likely to have been caused by a failure fully to understand referencing requirements rather than dishonesty.
- Note:** See clause 16 of the [Academic Honesty in Coursework Policy 2015](#).
- (2) If the relevant decision maker's preliminary view is that the alleged conduct is likely to have been caused by a failure fully to understand referencing requirements rather than dishonesty, they must check the student's record.
- (3) If, after checking the student's record, the relevant decision maker still considers that the alleged conduct is likely to have been caused by a failure fully to understand referencing requirements and not dishonesty, they must:
- (a) direct the student to attend and successfully complete, within a specified time, an additional development course on academic integrity approved by the Office of Educational Integrity; and
  - (b) take action as prescribed by either subclause 8(3)(c) or 8(3)(d).
  - (c) Provided that to do so would not confer an unfair advantage on any student, the decision maker may permit the student to resubmit the work for assessment or undertake alternative assessment:
    - (i) within a specified time; and
    - (ii) if appropriate, for a specified maximum mark or with a specified mark penalty;
- or
- (d) the decision maker may apply a specified maximum mark or mark penalty to the work.
- (4) The Office of Educational Integrity must record the student's completion of, and success or otherwise at, any University-wide additional development course.

**Note:** See the [University Recordkeeping Policy 2017](#).

- (5) If a student who has been required to attend and successfully complete an additional development course:
- (a) successfully completes the course; and
  - (b) if directed to, satisfactorily resubmits corrected work or undertakes an alternative assessment in accordance with the requirements imposed;
- the relevant decision maker must:
- (c) record 'development course completed' as the outcome;
  - (d) make no formal determination in relation to the allegation; and
  - (e) take no further action.
- (6) If a student who has been required to attend and successfully complete an additional development course:
- (a) fails to do so; or
  - (b) does not satisfactorily resubmit corrected work or undertake an alternative assessment in accordance with the requirements imposed;
- the relevant decision maker must, unless subclause 8(7) applies, require the student to respond to the allegation and follow the process set out in clause 9.
- (7) If the student has already participated in an interview under clause 9, the decision maker may apply a penalty under subclause 11(5).
- (8) The relevant decision maker must inform the examiner and the unit of study co-ordinator of the outcome of the preliminary assessment process, and record that outcome on the student's file.

## **9 Process after preliminary assessment of potential impropriety but no failure to understand referencing requirements**

- (1) This clause applies where the relevant decision maker has made a preliminary assessment that alleged conduct contains potential impropriety but:
- (a) is not likely to have been caused by a failure fully to understand referencing requirements rather than dishonesty; and
  - (b) is not required to be referred to either the Registrar or the Director, Research Integrity and Ethics Administration.
- Note:** See clause 16 of the [Academic Honesty in Coursework Policy 2015](#).
- (2) The relevant decision maker must provide the student with:
- (a) a clear expression of the allegation in sufficient detail to enable them to understand the precise nature of the allegations and to properly consider and respond to them;
  - (b) any supporting material to be used in the determination of the matter;
  - (c) the opportunity to respond to the allegation within a specified reasonable time; and
  - (d) a copy of these procedures.
- (3) Having given due consideration to procedural fairness, the relevant decision maker will determine the time and place for interviews.



- (4) The relevant decision maker must inform the student in advance of any staff members who will attend an interview. This will usually include the decision maker and another member of professional staff.
- (5) All participants in an interview should attend in person. However, if necessary, interviews may be held by telephone or other telecommunications method.
- (6) The relevant decision maker may extend the time for a student to provide written responses to the allegations.
- (7) The student is not required to provide written responses and may choose not to do so.
- (8) The student may choose not to participate in an interview. However if a student who has been given reasonable notice fails to attend without good reason, the relevant decision maker may determine the matter in the student's absence.
- (9) Once:
  - (a) any scheduled interview has been held or the appointed time for interview has passed; and
  - (b) the student has responded to the allegations or the deadline to do so has passed;then
  - (c) the relevant decision maker will make a determination in accordance with clause 17 of the [Academic Honesty in Coursework Policy 2015](#).
- (10) If, after meeting with the student, the relevant decision maker determines that the alleged conduct is likely to have been caused by a failure fully to understand referencing requirements rather than dishonesty, they must follow the process prescribed by subclauses 8(3)-(5).
- (11) If the relevant decision maker determines that there is a credible allegation that:
  - (a) if proven, would warrant a penalty more serious than failure in the relevant unit of study; or
  - (b) involves the commissioning or delivery of contract cheating.
- (12) they must refer the matter to the Registrar for investigation under the [University of Sydney \(Student Discipline\) Rule 2016](#). If the relevant decision maker determines that there is a credible allegation that, if proven, would constitute:
  - (a) a code breach; or
  - (b) research misconductthey must refer the matter to the Director of Research Integrity and Ethics Administration for investigation under the [Research Code of Conduct 2019](#).

## 10 Consequences - determination of no impropriety

If the relevant decision maker determines that the student has engaged in no impropriety:

- (a) the decision maker must inform:
  - (i) the student;
  - (ii) the examiner;

(iii) the unit of study co-ordinator;

and

(b) if the work has not already been assessed, it must be returned to the examiner for assessment on its academic merit.

## 11 Consequences - determination of plagiarism or academic dishonesty

- (1) If the relevant decision maker determines that the allegation of plagiarism or academic dishonesty is substantiated, they must inform the following:
- (a) the student;
  - (b) the examiner;
  - (c) the unit of study co-ordinator; and
  - (d) if not the decision maker, the Educational Integrity Co-ordinator.
- (2) If the relevant decision maker determines:
- (a) that the work contains plagiarism but not dishonest plagiarism; and
  - (b) after consulting the student record, that the plagiarism is due to a failure fully to understand referencing requirements;

the decision maker must:

- (c) direct the student to attend and successfully complete, within a specified period, an additional development course on academic integrity approved by the Office of Educational Integrity;
  - (d) inform the unit of study co-ordinator and, if not the decision maker, the Educational Integrity Co-ordinator, of the outcome; and take action as prescribed by either subclause 11(2)(e) or 11(2)(f).
  - (e) Provided that to do so would not confer an unfair advantage on any student, the decision maker may permit the student to resubmit the work for assessment or undertake alternative assessment:
    - (i) within a specified time; and
    - (ii) if appropriate, for a specified maximum mark or with a specified mark penalty;
- or
- (f) the decision maker may apply a specified maximum mark or mark penalty to the work.
- (3) The Office of Educational Integrity must record the student's successful completion of any University-wide additional development course.

**Note:** See the [University Recordkeeping Policy 2017](#).

- (4) If a student who has been required to undertake and successfully complete an additional development course fails to do so, the decision maker must:
- (a) apply one or more of the actions specified in sub-clause 11(5); and
  - (b) inform the following of this decision:
    - (i) the student;
    - (ii) the Educational Integrity Co-ordinator, if not the decision maker;
    - (iii) the examiner; and
    - (iv) the unit of study co-ordinator.
- (5) Subject to subclause 11(6), if the relevant decision maker concludes:
- (a) that the work contains plagiarism which is not of the kind to which subclause 11(2) applies; or
  - (b) that the student has engaged in academic dishonesty;
- the decision maker must take one or more of the following actions:
- (c) refer the matter to the Registrar for action under the [University of Sydney \(Student Discipline\) Rule 2016](#) (if appropriate);
  - (d) provided that to do so would not confer an unfair advantage on any student, require the student to resubmit the work for assessment or undertake alternative assessment:
    - (i) within a specified time; and
    - (ii) for a specified maximum mark;
  - (e) require the student to undertake other remedial action;
  - (f) apply a fail grade, a mark penalty or a mark to the work which reflects its unsatisfactory standard (which may be a mark of zero); or
  - (g) apply a fail grade or a mark penalty to the unit of study, which may be a mark of zero.
- (6) If the conduct would, if proven, constitute academic misconduct, the decision maker must:
- (a) refer the matter to the Registrar for investigation under the [University of Sydney \(Student Discipline\) Rule 2016](#); and
  - (b) if satisfied that the conditions of subclause 9(11) have been met, may also:
    - (i) apply a fail grade, a mark penalty or a mark to the work which reflects its unsatisfactory standard (which may be a mark of zero).
- (7) The decision maker must inform the original examiner, the student and the unit of study co-ordinator of any determination made under subclause 11(5), and any penalties, resubmission or other remedial action imposed.

## **PART 4 – HIGHER DEGREE BY RESEARCH STUDENTS**

---

### **12 Higher degree by research students undertaking research activities**

- (1) The obligations of higher degree research students undertaking research activities are set out in the [Research Code of Conduct 2019](#).
- (2) Any allegation of code breach, research misconduct, academic dishonesty or other inappropriate academic practice by a higher degree by research student in relation to research activity will be managed according to the [Research Code of Conduct 2019](#) and these procedures.
- (3) Conduct that is found not to be research misconduct may still be found to be any or all of:
  - (a) a code breach;
  - (b) inappropriate academic practice;
  - (c) academic dishonesty; or
  - (d) other misconduct.

### **13 Higher degree by research students enrolled in coursework units of study**

- (1) A higher degree by research student enrolled in a coursework unit of study is subject to the [Academic Honesty in Coursework Policy 2015](#) and Part 3 of these procedures in relation to work undertaken in, or in relation to, that unit of study.
- (2) A suspected or alleged breach by such a student of the [Academic Honesty in Coursework Policy 2015](#) will be managed according to that policy and these procedures

**Note:** See Part 3.

### **14 Reporting allegations**

- (1) Supervisors and Review Panels must report any suspected academic dishonesty, code breach, or research misconduct by students whom they supervise or review, using the [online reporting form](#).
- (2) Students or staff members who become aware of suspected academic dishonesty or research misconduct by a student must report the allegations, using the [online reporting form](#).

### **15 Handling allegations not relating to the examination process**

- (1) The relevant decision maker must consider all reports and come to a preliminary view as to whether the reported conduct potentially constitutes:
  - (a) no impropriety;
  - (b) inappropriate academic practice, but not a potential code breach or potential research misconduct;

- (c) a potential code breach; or
  - (d) potential research misconduct.
- (2) If the relevant decision maker's preliminary view is that the alleged 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;
- the decision maker must refer the matter to the Director of Research Integrity and Ethics Administration.
- (3) If the relevant decision maker's preliminary view is that the alleged conduct is:
- (a) potentially a code breach; but
  - (b) not potential research misconduct;
- the decision maker must
- (c) consult with the Director of Research Integrity and Ethics Administration; and
  - (d) 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 in the manner set out in the [Research Code of Conduct 2019](#).
- (5) If the relevant decision maker's preliminary view is that the alleged conduct is:
- (a) inappropriate academic practice; but
  - (b) not a potential code breach; and
  - (c) not potential research misconduct;
- the decision maker must:
- (d) require the student to undertake additional education;
  - (e) inform the supervisor through [the online reporting form](#); and
  - (f) require the student to make corrections to data, findings, drafts, papers or other research work for appraisal by the supervisor as appropriate;
- and the decision maker may additionally:
- (g) require the student to attend an additional progress review in accordance with the [Progress Planning and Review for Higher Degree by Research Students Policy 2015](#).
- (6) If the relevant decision maker is satisfied that there is evidence of persistent inappropriate academic practice by a student, they may treat the matter as a potential code breach
- (7) If:
- (a) the relevant 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 relevant decision maker must deal with the matter in accordance with subclauses (8) – (14) of this clause.



- (8) In all other cases, the relevant decision maker must:
  - (a) set a time and place for an interview with the student; and
  - (b) provide the student with:
    - (i) a clear expression of the allegation in sufficient detail to enable them to understand the precise nature of the allegations and to properly consider and respond to them;
    - (ii) any supporting material to be used in the determination of the matter;
    - (iii) the opportunity to respond to the allegation within a reasonable time; and
    - (iv) a copy of these procedures.
- (9) Having given due consideration to procedural fairness, the relevant decision maker will determine the time and place for interviews.
- (10) The relevant decision maker must inform the student in advance of any staff members who will attend an interview. This will usually include the decision maker and a member of professional staff.
- (11) All participants in the interview should attend in person. However, if necessary, interviews may be held by telephone or other telecommunications method.
- (12) The relevant decision maker may extend the time for a student to provide written responses to the allegations.
- (13) The student is not required to provide written responses and may choose not to do so.
- (14) The student may choose not to participate in an interview. However, if a student who has been given reasonable notice fails to attend without good reason, the relevant decision maker may determine the matter in the student's absence.
- (15) Once:
  - (a) any scheduled interview has been held or the appointed time for interview has passed; and
  - (b) the student has responded to the allegations or the deadline to do so has passed;then:
  - (c) the relevant decision maker will make one of the following available determinations:
    - (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.
- (16) The relevant decision maker must inform the student and co-ordinating supervisor of the determination and consequent actions in writing.
- (17) If the relevant decision maker makes a determination of potential research misconduct, they must refer the case to the Director of Research Integrity and Ethics Administration for investigation.

- (18) If the relevant decision maker makes a determination of potential code breach but not potential 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.
- (19) If the relevant decision maker makes a determination of:
- (a) potential code breach but not potential research misconduct, which is not requested to be referred to the Director of Research Integrity and Ethics Administration; or
  - (b) inappropriate academic practice but not a potential code breach or potential research misconduct;
- they must proceed in the manner specified in subclauses 15(5) (d)-(g).
- (20) If the relevant decision maker makes a determination of other misconduct, the must refer the matter to the Registrar for investigation under the [University of Sydney \(Student Discipline\) Rule 2016](#)
- (21) If the relevant decision maker makes a determination of no impropriety no further action will be taken.

## 16 Handling allegations relating to the examination process

- (1) If, after conducting the checks required by the [Thesis and Examination of Higher Degrees by Research Policy 2015](#), the administrative unit suspects possible inappropriate academic practice, code breach or research misconduct, the administrative unit will use the [online reporting form](#) to refer the matter to the relevant decision maker.
- (2) Based on the evidence in the reports received from the administrative unit, the relevant decision maker will come to a preliminary view, and determine the required action according to this clause.
- (3) If the preliminary view is that there is evidence of potential code breach or research misconduct, the relevant decision maker must refer the matter to the Director of Research Integrity and Ethics Administration.

**Note:** See the [Research Code of Conduct 2019](#).

- (4) If the preliminary view is that the apparent deficiencies in the thesis:
- (a) constitute minor inappropriate academic practice that could be satisfactorily addressed by emendations to the thesis; and
  - (b) could not possibly constitute academic dishonesty, a code breach or research misconduct;
- the relevant decision maker must
- (c) forward the thesis to examiners for examination; and
  - (d) lodge a report of any changes or emendations required to address deficiencies in the thesis using the [online reporting form](#).

- (5) If the preliminary view is that the apparent deficiencies in the thesis:
- constitute inappropriate academic practice that could not be satisfactorily addressed by emendations to the thesis; but
  - could not constitute a code breach or research misconduct;
- the relevant decision maker:
- must lodge a report of any changes or emendations required to address deficiencies in the thesis using the [online reporting form](#); and
  - must refer the thesis and report to the relevant faculty committee to consider whether the thesis is suitable to examine in the light of information discovered in the submission check; and
  - may make a recommendation to the relevant faculty committee that the faculty should decline to examine the thesis.
- (6) If the preliminary view is that there is no impropriety in the thesis, the relevant decision maker must:
- forward the thesis to examiners for examination; and
  - lodge a report of their investigation using the [online reporting form](#).
- (7) A report of the relevant decision maker's findings, including any emendations or changes required to address deficiencies in the thesis, must be:
- included on the student's file; and
  - forwarded to the committee determining the examination outcome for their consideration.
- Note:** The committee determining the outcome for the examination will be either the relevant faculty committee or the HDR Examinations Subcommittee of the Academic Board. See the [Thesis and Examination of Higher Degrees by Research Policy 2015](#) and [Thesis and Examination of Higher Degrees by Research Procedures 2020](#).
- (8) If the relevant faculty committee is asked to consider whether the thesis is suitable to examine on the referral of the relevant decision maker or an investigation managed by the Director of Research Integrity and Ethics Administration, it must do one of the following:
- decline to examine the thesis;
  - forward the thesis to examiners for examination; or
  - refer the matter to the Director of Research Integrity and Ethics Administration in accordance with clause 21(1) of the [Research Code of Conduct 2019](#).
- (9) A report of the findings of the relevant faculty committee, including any determination of inappropriate academic practice and any emendations or changes required to address deficiencies in the thesis, must be:
- lodged using the [online reporting form](#); and
  - considered by the committee determining the examination outcome for their consideration,
- Note:** The committee determining the outcome for the examination will be either the relevant faculty committee or the HDR Examinations Subcommittee of the Academic Board. See the [Thesis and Examination of Higher Degrees by Research Policy 2015](#) and [Thesis and Examination of Higher Degrees by Research Procedures 2020](#).



- (10) Any cases referred to the Director of Research Integrity and Ethics Administration will be managed in accordance with the [Research Code of Conduct 2019](#).
- (11) Where the Director of Research Integrity and Ethics Administration determines either 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 determine the outcome and any consequent action consistently with this clause.
- (12) If the relevant faculty committee declines to examine a thesis, it must:
- (a) report the circumstances and reasons for the decision to the HDR Examinations Subcommittee;
  - (b) inform the student in writing of:
    - (i) the reasons for declining to examine the thesis;
    - (ii) any changes necessary to make the thesis acceptable for examination; and
    - (iii) any other actions required to be completed prior to examination.
  - (c) recommend to the Dean that the student be either:
    - (i) permitted to re-enrol in order to complete the necessary actions and changes 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 will be permitted to re-enrol or required to show good cause.
- (14) If, during the examination process, there is a determination of any of:
- (a) inappropriate academic practice;
  - (b) code breach; or
  - (c) research misconduct
- the committee determining the outcome of the examination must consider the reports of those determinations when forming its conclusion.
- Note:** See the [Thesis and Examination of Higher Degree by Research Procedures 2020](#).
- (15) If the committee determining the outcome of examination is the relevant faculty committee, the committee's conclusion must be referred to the HDR Examinations Subcommittee for review.
- (16) All reports by the Associate Dean, postgraduate co-ordinator, relevant faculty committee, or the Director of Research Integrity and Ethics Administration must be forwarded to the HDR Examinations Subcommittee.
- (17) If the reports of the relevant decision maker or any subsequent decision maker require changes or emendations to address deficiencies in the thesis, these changes or emendations must be included in the emendations or changes required to be addressed under the [Thesis and Examination of Higher Degree by Research Procedures 2020](#).

- (18) If an examiner of a thesis reports allegations of potential code breach or research misconduct, the relevant faculty committee will refer these matters for consideration, as required by the policies and these procedures.

## 17 Proof-reading and editing of theses

Students are permitted to use editors or proof-readers in the preparation of their thesis for submission, as provided in the [Thesis and Examination of Higher Degree by Research Policy 2015](#) and the [Thesis and Examination of Higher Degree by Research Procedures 2020](#).

## 18 Rescissions and replacements

This document replaces the *Academic Dishonesty and Plagiarism in Coursework Procedures 2012*, which commenced on 1 January 2012, and which are rescinded as from the date of commencement of this document:

### Schedule One – Summary of assessment types, risks and mitigating strategies

Assessment Type	Risks	Suggested Mitigating Strategies
Invigilated Quiz	Identity of student	Identity Check
	Non-exam room setting, or poor spacing in room	Multiple versions of same paper Randomisation of the question order Try to book bigger room or even 2 rooms to spread class out
	Multiple quizzes run on different days with similar but not identical questions (may be electronic or paper based)	Questions with answers likely to be memorized and shared through social media – ensure no mobile phones, difficult to totally mitigate for, content should be retested in formal examination.  Password protected entry to quiz if electronically accessed. Automatic closure of exam after time is completed
Formal Invigilated Exam	Identity of student	Identity Check
	Confidential papers removed from exam room	Maintain strict exam conditions Don't use confidential papers if possible Always change at least some questions

Assessment Type	Risks	Suggested Mitigating Strategies
	Questions from confidential papers memorized and then reproduced	<p>Don't use confidential papers if possible</p> <p>Always change at least some questions</p> <p>Give sample, practice or past papers/questions</p>
Invigilated Oral Exam (vivas, OSCEs, patient examinations)	<p>Identity of student</p> <p>Reuse of questions</p>	<p>Identity Check</p> <p>Quarantine students before/after exam until all students with same questions have finished</p> <p>Re-test work in a formal (preferably barrier) exam</p> <p>Have a test bank of suitable questions/scenarios to reduce the likelihood of students been given "the same" question.</p>
Non-invigilated Quiz	No assurance of identity of student at all	<p>Impossible to assure identity, therefore ensure that it is a low weighted assessment and re-test work in a formal (preferably barrier) exam.</p> <p>Consider the use of technology such as Examity</p>
Assignment/Essay/Take home exam/ Self-Directed Learning Project/ Lab report/Creative work/Composition/ Dissertation/Thesis/Computer Program	<p>Plagiarism</p> <p>Identity of student completing work</p>	<p>Use Turnitin for submitted written work</p> <p>Include an oral component with detailed questions</p>

Assessment Type	Risks	Suggested Mitigating Strategies
Assignment (as above) with scaffolding or periodic submission of sections	Identity of student completing work	Include an oral component with detailed questions
Oral Presentation	Identity of student of who prepared presentation and speech?	Include detailed oral questions about topic
Pre-lab/pre-tutorial work	Identity of student who completed work	Ensure that weighting of pre-class work is low, retest in formal (preferably barrier) exam
Lab class	Source of results were used for write up	Require students to submit results or product before leaving the class
	Plagiarism of Lab report	Use Turnitin for submitted written work
	If lab is a repeat no assurance of identity of person who obtained results	Include 5 min viva on lab experiment with detailed questions, and/or retest in final barrier exam
Practical exams	Identity of student	Identity Check
	Multiple exams run on different days with similar but not identical questions	<p>Questions with answers likely to be shared through social media – ensure no mobile phones, difficult to totally mitigate for, ensure content is retested in formal barrier examination.</p> <p>Have a test bank of suitable questions/scenarios to reduce the likelihood of students been given “the same” question.</p>

Assessment Type	Risks	Suggested Mitigating Strategies
Participation	If repeat class no assurance of identity of person who prepared work.	Keep weighting low, ensure content is retested in formal barrier examination
Placement	<p>Did student attend placement at all?</p> <p>Plagiarism of report or reflective diary used to assess placement</p> <p>Forgery of signature of external educators on assessment reports or competency documents</p> <p>Identity of who completed report, reflective diary etc associated with placement</p>	<p>Visit or Skype call to placement site, at least once during course of placement</p> <p>Have a mid-way "check" of student.</p> <p>Require student to produce ID card to placement site.</p> <p>Use Turnitin for submitted work</p> <p>All assessment pieces with educator signature to be duplicated and forward to University for cross check. Consider electronic submission of placement assessment reports. Keep a bank of authorized signatures for review. Use watermarked documents that allow alterations to be clearly identified</p> <p>Include short interview about placement activities, include preceptor if possible</p>
Live Performances	Identity of student	Identity check

## Schedule Two - Educational Integrity of Assessments Risk Assessment Matrix

		<b>Potential Significance</b>					
		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.	
		<b>Not Significant</b>	<b>Minor</b>	<b>Moderate</b>	<b>Major</b>	<b>Highly Significant</b>	
<b>Likelihood</b>	Expected to occur regularly	<b>Almost Certain</b>	<b>Medium</b>	<b>High</b>	<b>Very High</b>	<b>Very High</b>	<b>Very High</b>
	Expected to occur	<b>Likely</b>	<b>Medium</b>	<b>High</b>	<b>High</b>	<b>Very High</b>	<b>Very High</b>
	Moderately likely	<b>Possible</b>	<b>Low</b>	<b>Medium</b>	<b>High</b>	<b>High</b>	<b>Very High</b>
	Not likely to occur	<b>Unlikely</b>	<b>Low</b>	<b>Low</b>	<b>Medium</b>	<b>Medium</b>	<b>High</b>
	May happen, but not often	<b>Rare</b>	<b>Low</b>	<b>Low</b>	<b>Low</b>	<b>Low</b>	<b>Medium</b>

## NOTES

### Academic Honesty Procedures 2016

Date adopted:	17 August 2016
Date commenced:	25 August 2016
Date amended:	1 March 2017 27 July 2017 (administrative amendments) 5 November 2020 (commencing 1 January 2021) 3 May 2022 (commencing 16 May 2022)
Administrator:	Chair, Academic Board
Review date:	25 August 2021
Related documents:	University of Sydney Act 1989 (as amended) University of Sydney (Student Appeals Against Academic Decisions) Rule 2006 University of Sydney (Student Discipline) Rule 2016 Research Code of Conduct 2019 Academic Honesty in Coursework Policy 2015 Coursework Policy 2014 Learning and Teaching Policy 2015 Progress Planning and Review of Higher Degree by Research Students Policy 2015 Thesis and Examination of Higher Degrees by Research Policy 2015 Assessment Procedures 2011

## AMENDMENT HISTORY

Provision	Amendment	Commencing
4(1) note; 7(5) note; 8(1) note; 9(1) note	Correction to cross-referencing to clauses in <i>Academic Honesty in Coursework Policy 2015</i>	29 August 2016



Provision	Amendment	Commencing
16(7) note; 16(9) note; 16(12(a)); 16(15); 16(16)	Administrative amendment – references to PhD Award Sub-Committee changed to HDR Examinations Subcommittee	1 March 2017
3; 5(4)	Consequential amendments arising from organisational design changes	27 July 2017
9(10); 11(5)(b); 11(6); 15(20); Related documents	Replace references to University of Sydney By-law with <i>University of Sydney (Student Discipline) Rule 2016</i>	27 July 2017
1(1); 9(11); 12(1); 12(2); 15(4); 16(3) note; 16(8); 16(10)	Administrative amendment – references to Research Code of Conduct 2013 changed to <i>Research Code of Conduct 2019</i>	1 January 2021
4(4)	Administrative amendment	1 January 2021
6(4)(a); Schedule One	Consequential amendments arising from system solution	1 January 2021
9(10); 11(5); 11(6)	Amendment of procedures to match provisions in <i>Academic Honesty in Coursework Policy 2015</i>	1 January 2021
8(3)(b)	New subclause added, consequent renumbering	16 May 2022
8(6)	“unless subclause 8(7) applies” added before “require the student to respond”	16 May 2022
8(7)	New subclause added, consequent renumbering	16 May 2022
9(10)	New subclause added, consequent renumbering	16 May 2022
10((b); 11(1)(d)	Notes deleted	16 May 2022
11(d)	“take action as prescribed by either subclause 11(2)(e) or 11(2)(f)” added after “; and”	16 May 2022
11(e)	“the decision maker may” added before “permit the student”; “or undertake alternative assessment” added after “resubmit the work for assessment”	16 May 2022
11(6)(b)	Reference to “subclause 9(10)” replaced by “subclause 9(110)”	16 May 2022