

EXAMINATION MISCONDUCT - OVERVIEW OF SCHOOL-LEVEL PROCESSES AND POSSIBLE OUTCOMES

School-level procedures for allegations of exam misconduct (which is to be referred by the Unit Coordinator to the Dean).

Note: all allegations of misconduct in examinations are regarded as substantial allegations of misconduct and cannot be treated as minor misconduct.

Examinations Supervisor in Charge (or any other person), suspects academic misconduct in an examination - he or she must provide the relevant Unit Coordinator a report, setting out information and any evidence relating to the suspected academic misconduct.

Within five working days, the Unit Coordinator refers the allegation to the School Dean.

Dean of School (or formally appointed nominee) calls meeting with the student and representative of Academic Registrar (information may also be sought from UC).

Possible outcomes:

- If investigation and interview reveal no misconduct, dismiss allegation. Advise student, in writing.
- If find substantial misconduct, outcome may include academic counselling and/or a penalty (as per Policy). Advise student, in writing.
- Student may choose to appeal Dean of School's decision to the Student Academic Misconduct Committee.

OR

- If Dean of School finds substantial misconduct that is either threat to the integrity of the University's assessment processes, or is misconduct by a student whose level of experience suggests he or she should be aware of appropriate standards of ethical scholarship, refer to Student Academic Misconduct Committee. Advise student, in writing.

[Student may appeal a decision by a Unit Coordinator to Dean of School or a Dean of School's decision to the Student Academic Misconduct Committee]

[Student may appeal a decision of a Student Academic Misconduct Committee to Senate Appeals and Integrity Committee]

Principles of procedural fairness are to be followed at all times, including:

1. Student to be advised clearly of specific allegation, together with evidence claimed for it.
2. Student entitled to a fair hearing, including opportunity to challenge.
3. University representatives must deal with the particular allegation on the merits and strive to avoid bias, including bias on basis of any knowledge of student's prior record of misconduct.
4. University representatives must, where appropriate, initiate further enquiries to minimise doubt or obscurity concerning the facts of the case.
5. University representatives must provide reasons (brief) for decisions.
6. Student to have right to appeal decision on grounds specified in Appeals section of the Policy.

Standard of proof

"Balance of probability," **not** "beyond reasonable doubt."