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WELCOME
The Chair welcomed all members, invitees and observers to the meeting.
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No declarations for potential or perceived conflicts of interest were recorded.
1. MINUTES – REF: F12154

RESOLVED – 11
That the minutes of the Teaching and Learning Committee meeting held on 5th June 2014 and the noting of decisions made on the 15th August and 9th September 2014 by way of circular, be confirmed.

2. ITEMS FOR COMMUNICATION TO BE DEALT WITH EN BLOC
The following items were noted en bloc:

2.1 Teaching and Learning Committee – end of year reports from standing committees – File Ref: F30175 and F27833
2.2 Open Online Education Working Party – Progress Report – File Ref: F50224
2.3 Teaching and Learning Committee – Budget Summary for 2014 – File Ref: F12152

3. CENTRE FOR THE ADVANCEMENT OF TEACHING AND LEARNING (CATL) – ANNUAL REPORT – FILE REF F1209
Members had before them the annual report on the activities of the Centre for the Advancement of Teaching and Learning (CATL) which had been moved to part three for discussion. It was noted that events associated with teaching and learning week had reduced over time from 16 events in 2010 to only four in 2014 with a commensurate drop in attendance – 555 in 2010 to 257 in 2014.

Members briefly discussed the role of SPOT and SURF and noted that the two instruments were administered separately (CATL and IRU respectively). It was suggested that it might be timely to review these instruments in light of Education Futures and the aims of the leading transition program, in particular the ‘exploding the lecture’ concept (refer item 4), and revisit the purpose of each survey tool.

4. UWA EDUCATION FUTURES LEADING TRANSITION PROGRAM – FILE REF: F50263
In May 2014, the Education Futures Vision for UWA had been launched, supported by a small working group, led by Professor Helen Wildy, and an Education Futures Project Leadership Team comprising a broadly representative group of passionate educators from across UWA. During 2014, the Education Futures Team had developed a set of strategic projects to achieve the Education Futures Vision.

In October 2014, Professor Gilly Salmon, the newly appointed Pro Vice-Chancellor (Education Innovation) commenced her appointment with a specific focus on education innovation, exploiting current and emerging technology for education at UWA. Professor Salmon had initiated a number of exciting initiatives that would ensure UWA leads in the adaption and development of innovative education, through enabling digital and physical learning environments and technologies with a strong focus on creating the future for learning at UWA through design principles.

In addition, Professor Salmon and the Education Futures Team had combined, synthesized and multiplied their efforts and were ready to announce a set of initiatives that would provide a pathway to transform the education experience at UWA. Members noted that Professor Salmon had undertaken overall leadership of the Education Futures Team, with many thanks to the initiating working group led by Professor Wildy. Projects would continue to be developed and launched to strategically achieve excellence in the seven focus areas identified in the Education Futures Vision.

At the Chair’s invitation, Professor Salmon briefly addressed the Committee and advised members regarding progress to date, with a focus on capability and capacity, learning environments and innovation and scholarship. Members noted that proposed changes to the University’s learning management system (LMS) were anticipated to take effect in mid-2015, however it was also anticipated that virtual classrooms would be available from February 2015.

Professor Salmon and the Chair also provided a brief overview of the aims and goals of the three programs that had commenced as part of the leading transition program, namely

- commencing student orientation (working title ‘Blast’);
- transforming teaching through new learning design and delivery (working title ‘Exploding the Lecture’); and
- Enabling, Rewarding and Prioritising Teaching (working title TBA).
The presentation is available on the teaching and learning website at:
http://www.teachingandlearning.uwa.edu.au/staff/committees/teachinglearningcommittee/agenda-and-minutes
In closing discussion the Chair thanked Professors Wildy and Salmon for their leadership in the Education Futures program to date.

5. UNIVERSITY POLICY ON ACADEMIC CONDUCT–PROPOSED AMENDMENTS – FILE REF: F37631
The University Policy on Academic Conduct [currently University Policy on Academic Conduct, Ethical Scholarship, Academic Literacy and Academic Misconduct] had been under review by the Centre for the Advancement of Teaching and Learning and had been referred to the Committee, by way of circular, in September 2014.

In undertaking this review, the Director of CATL had advised that the changes had been minimal since the policy had recently been noted as an exemplar of one of the best and most comprehensive academic integrity policies in the country. (ALTC project: Academic integrity standards: Aligning policy and practice in Australian universities). With this in mind the main point of revisions had been to update the language which had changed in the field more recently away from a focus on misconduct to one of an institutional culture of academic integrity with shared responsibility. This also sat well with the present ethos surrounding Education Futures. The role of the Academic Conduct Advisers had also been made explicit in the policy which was previously missing from the document.

Feedback from members in September had indicated some concern regarding the proposed amendments to the policy and as such, it had been requested that the item be held over for discussion. Additionally, members had requested that the proposed “Guide to Good Practice on the use of text matching software” be considered at the same time. UWA has a license for University staff and students to use the Turnitin commercial software, which is available as an activity within an LMS unit and set up at the discretion of academic staff. The Good Practice Guide provided further clarity on the use of Turnitin, where adopted by teachers as an aid to ethical scholarship.

Members had before them the proposed amendments to the policy, a proposed assignment coversheet and the draft Good Practice Guide on Use of Text Matching Software (Turnitin). It was also noted that CATL would update the University’s Academic Conduct website to align with these proposed changes in due course.

At the Chair’s invitation, Assistant Professor Shannon Johnston briefly introduced the item on behalf of the Director of CATL and the Chair opened the item for discussion.

A member raised the question as to how cases of academic misconduct were formally recorded and how this information was shared across faculties, in particular with the introduction of new courses. The Executive Officer briefly advised members that instances of academic misconduct were kept on confidential records as part of the relevant student file via the University’s record keeping system (TRIM). A member questioned whether this information was available across faculties and it was agreed that the Executive Officer would provide further clarity by way of the minutes.

[Executive Officer’s note: There is a strict procedure for the management of information relating to cases of academic misconduct that provides a uniform recording system across all faculties, ensures protection of the rights of individuals involved, facilitates the process of managing the case and fulfils the University’s legislative obligations. These procedures are included in the University Policy on Academic Conduct (both proposed and current) - refer first “show procedure” box embedded in the policy at the above link or attachment F15 on the agenda papers, namely “1. Recording Procedures in Cases of Academic Misconduct”. This procedure is further clarified on the teaching and learning website at http://www.teachingandlearning.uwa.edu.au/staff/policies/conduct/procedure. This web link is also embedded in the policy’s procedures.]

There was wide-ranging discussion regarding the Good Practice Guide for Turnitin and the following key points were noted:
- A member questioned the intellectual property of students which was an historical issue raised by some schools and faculties, but was noted as no longer an issue if students had been advised prior that the use of text matching software was integrated into the unit – some faculties, including the Business School, included this information in the unit outline and assessment mechanism statement.
• It was unclear why level 1 unit assignments were not included into the Turnitin databank as recommended in Good Practice #13. In response CATL advised that it was intended that level 1 students should be encouraged to use Turnitin for educative purposes but it was further agreed that the final assignment at level 1 should be included in the databank and that the Guide should be amended accordingly.
• There was general discussion as to whether the Good Practice Guide should be broadened for all text matching software, and not specific to Turnitin. Bearing in mind that the Guide was currently incorporated into the University Policy on Academic Conduct, and Turnitin was deemed the preferred system, it was agreed that the Guide remain as Turnitin specific, and in addition CATL be asked to work with the Associate Deans to formulate a generic Good Practice Guide that could be adopted for other than text matching software.
• It was noted that Turnitin was broader than text matching software and that the system had other attributes, for example marking tools, and it was agreed that the Pro Vice-Chancellor (Education Innovation) would review the University's license and use of the system within the UWA context.
• A member queried whether it was appropriate for the good practice guides that referred to broader policies issues and were not specifically Turnitin related should be included in the Guide, for example #21, #22, #23 and #25. It was agreed that CATL would revisit non-specific clauses and, where appropriate, remove them from the Guide after clarifying that the issues were adequately covered in the policy.

In general members were supportive of the adoption of a Good Practice Guide focussing on Turnitin and agreed that its use was predominantly as an educative tool, but also its use to detect possible plagiarism was acceptable where Turnitin was adopted by a faculty or school. A member queried whether locally-specific policies needed to be developed (Good Practice Guide #6) and it was noted that some faculties might want to provide greater clarity on its use within the context of their discipline.

In closing discussion, it was agreed that the above minuted amendments be made by CATL to the Good Practice Guide and it was

RESOLVED – 12

(i) That the proposed amendments to the attached (Attachment A) University Policy on Academic Conduct, Ethical Scholarship, Academic Literacy and Academic Misconduct, including a change in title to University Policy on Academic Conduct be endorsed by the Teaching and Learning Committee and referred to the Academic Council for approval; and
(ii) That the proposed Good Practice Guide on Use of Text Matching Software (Turnitin), amended in light of the above minuted discussion, be endorsed by the Teaching and Learning Committee and referred to the Academic Council (Attachment B), for approval as a Good Practice Guide within the context of the University Policy on Academic Conduct.

RESOLVED – 13

That the Centre for the Advancement of Teaching and Learning (CATL), in consultation with Associate Deans (Teaching and Learning/Education) formulate a generic Good Practice Guide to support the use of other than text matching software for consideration by the Teaching and Learning Committee (or Education Committee) in due course.

6. CENTRE FOR THE ADVANCEMENT OF TEACHING AND LEARNING - UWA SESSIONAL STAFF REPORT — FILE REF: F12090

Members had before them a report, referred by CATL, detailing the most recent findings from a 2014 study into the status of sessional staff at UWA. The report examined the responses of current sessional staff, school managers and unit coordinators from across the University to questions about employment processes, support, professional development and recognition. It also benchmarked the University's practices with respect to the management of sessional staff across 13 criteria in a national benchmarking exercise. Based on the data obtained, the report rated the practices of the University as a whole and each individual faculty separately on a scale from unsustainable – minimum standard – good practice.
In addition, the report had included four recommendations made by the Director of CATL, Winthrop Professor Denise Chalmers that were relevant at the institutional level and the faculty level.

In the absence of Winthrop Professor Chalmers, Professor Sid Nair spoke to the report outlining the following key issues identified as being applicable to sessional staff members at UWA;

- a lack of preparation to teach and a feeling of being ‘thrown in at the deep end’;
- a general lack of awareness of professional development activities;
- lack of appreciation and job security;
- lack of transparency of employment contracts;
- untimely preparation of contracts and payments;
- inconsistent experiences across the University.

The Chair opened the item for discussion and the following key points were noted:

- The increasing trend for faculties to employ sessional staff; that sessional staff were an important resource and should be part of the University’s strategies to improve standards of teaching at UWA. In particular the strategies identified as part of the Education Futures Program (refer Item 4) should incorporate sessional staff.
- The increasing reliance upon sessional staff at UWA should not compromise the University’s teaching; the use of sessional staff was quite legitimate when combined with appropriate support and assistance.
- It was noted that sessional staff members were often our own Higher Degree by Research students and that specific strategies to assist in their development should be addressed and highlighted in the report.
- Two faculties were noted as providing good support to sessional staff, namely the Faculties of Education and Business, and that the report might include examples of good practice that could be emulated. For example, it was noted that the Business School provided a teaching award for sessional staff to indicate that they were valued; workshops were provided for new tutors, plus appropriate inductions for new lecturers.
- Members noted that there were four recommendations contained within the report, including a proposal to develop a University policy related to the management, support and development of sessional staff. It was noted that there were current HR policies that provided barriers to appointing sessional staff and that these should also be addressed within the context of any policy development. A member also commented that the recommendations would not, on their own, fix the problem – more creative and innovative approaches would be needed.
- A member indicated that the report was really interesting, but disappointing for UWA as it clarified the lack of preparedness for sessional staff. However, this was an opportunity to delve further into the data that was captured at the faculty level and formulate more specific evidence-based outcomes, this would however require further work by CATL.

On the whole, it was felt that the recommendations included in the report didn’t go far enough to fix the identified problems concerning sessional staff and that a more forward looking, creative approach would be necessary, it was

**RESOLVED – 14**

- (i) to forward the report to the Dean of Coursework Studies for discussion at the next Associate Deans (Teaching and Learning/Education) network meeting with a view to formulating specific recommendations based on the evidence in the report together with suggestions for a good practice guide for consideration at the faculty level;
- (ii) to request the Associate Deans, following the network discussion, to refer the report and additional information to their faculty teaching and learning committees for discussion and feedback to CATL;
- (iii) to request CATL, following engagement with the faculties regarding any feedback, to formulate a good practice guide related to the management, support and development of sessional teachers, including best practice examples from UWA.

In so resolving, it was noted that the formulation of a University policy would be considered by the Education Committee (refer item 7) upon receipt and consideration of the good practice guide.
The Deputy Vice-Chancellor (Education), as Chair of the three key Academic Council Standing Committees within the education portfolio (Admissions, Teaching and Learning, and Board of Coursework Studies) had requested a review of the governance arrangements in place, with a view to achieving a more effective use of committees within the portfolio.

The review was timely due to a number of key issues:

- The Boards of Studies had been established to manage the major task of introducing and implementing new courses. The first cohort of students would graduate at the end of 2014 and the high level of curriculum related work at the undergraduate level had greatly reduced.
- Changes in the management structure over the last couple of years and the new portfolio positions established including Pro Vice-Chancellor (International), Dean of Coursework Studies, and Pro Vice-Chancellor (Education Innovation) had provided the opportunity for improved delegations and responsibilities.
- Improved policies over the last few years enabled more efficient decision-making.
- Improved use of technology and systems to provide curriculum data (CAIDi) had streamlined agenda documentation, and provided greater transparency and accountability.
- Early feedback from the University community, via stage one of the functional review process, had indicated a general consensus that the University’s decision-making process via the committee system were “often slow and involves duplication of effort across multiple layers involving committees, boards and councils” and “the amount of committee involvement (44+ separate bodies) and consultation is seen as excessive, time consuming and restricting UWA’s capacity to adapt within a changing environment”.

Members had before them a proposal introduced by the Chair to rationalise the eleven current education-related committees to three committees and noted that the key issues were as follows:

- Proposed disestablishment of the Teaching and Learning Committee and its two current standing committees – Awards and Grants and Schemes;
- That the role of the Teaching and Learning Committee would continue and be managed via the proposed Education Committee and the Education Futures Strategy Group.
- The Committee’s two standing committees would be replaced by smaller selection groups to undertake the day-to-day operation of education-related schemes and the awards selection process under the delegated authority of the Education Futures Strategy Group, as required.
- Continued involvement of the academic body in education-related issues – both strategic and operational – by way of membership on all three committees. In particular Deans of Faculties, Associate Deans (Teaching and Learning/Education), Chairs of faculty teaching and learning committees, and Chair or representative of the Academic Board.

There was strong support from members regarding the proposed rationalisation, in particular it was noted that all faculties would be represented on all three committees, which had been an issue of contention in the past with regard to the Board of Coursework Studies. In response to a query, it was further noted that the proposal was in line with the current functional review process being undertaken by the Office of Operational Excellence (OOE) and that the proposal had also been referred to OOE for its information and received positive feedback from the OOE team.

In turning to the committee constitutions, in particular the membership, two issues were raised regarding representation from the International Centre and the Office of the Dean of Graduate Research and Postdoctoral Training. During discussion it was agreed that:

- the membership of the Education Committee be amended to include the Dean of Graduate Research and Postdoctoral Training;
- further advice be sought from the Dean as to whether his representation on the Curriculum Committee should remain given this additional representation on the Education Committee;
- the membership of the Curriculum Committee be amended to include representation from the...
International Centre;

- Representation from the International Centre on the Education Futures Strategy Group would be picked up, at the discretion of the Chair of the Group in liaison with the Pro Vice-Chancellor (International) by way of the two co-opted members provided in the constitution.

It was agreed that the final membership of the committees would be endorsed by the Chair prior to referral to the Academic Council and it was

**RESOLVED – 15**
That the Teaching and Learning Committee support the report entitled ‘Proposal to Rationalise the Education Committee Structure’ and as a consequence recommend to the Academic Council that the Teaching and Learning Committee be disestablished and its constitution rescinded, with effect from 1st January 2015.

**RESOLVED – 16**
to recommend to the Academic Council that:
(i) the proposed Education Committee be established as a standing committee of the Academic Council, with effect from 1st January 2015; and
(ii) the proposed constitutions for the following committees, with minor amendments as attached (Attachment C), be approved:
- Education Committee and its standing committees as follows:
  - Curriculum Committee; and
  - Education Futures Strategy Group

**RESOLVED – 17**
That the Teaching and Learning Committee, as a consequence of its own proposed disestablishment, disestablish its two standing committees with effect from 1st January 2015, namely:
- Grants and Schemes Standing Committee
- Awards Standing Committee

In so resolving, members noted that the two standing committees would be replaced by smaller selection groups supported by the current executive officers and that these selection groups would be formulated as soon as possible in liaison with the Chair of the Education Futures Strategy Group.

The Chair concluded discussion and expressed his appreciation to:
- the Director, Academic Policy Services (Ms Sue Smurthwaite) for undertaking the analysis and producing the report entitled ‘Proposal to Rationalise the Education Committee Structure’; and
- all members for their support and contribution to the University’s Teaching and Learning Committee and its standing committees.

**8. NEXT MEETING**
Members noted that this was the last meeting of the University’s Teaching and Learning Committee and that meeting dates for the three new committees – Education Committee, Curriculum Committee and Education Futures Strategy Group - would be formulated and disseminated in due course.
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To update the language which has changed in the field more recently away from a focus on misconduct to one of an institutional culture of academic integrity with shared responsibility.
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Purpose of the policy and summary of issues it addresses:
This policy is intended to assist faculty and other staff in teaching and supervision roles to understand the academic conduct expected of students. It promotes ethical scholarship, academic literacy and the minimising of academic misconduct (including plagiarism and other forms of cheating). It encourages academic integrity. The University believes that success in promoting ethical scholarship and developing skills in academic literacy is crucial to fostering an institutional culture of academic integrity and will help reduce instances of academic misconduct. Whilst this policy's academic misconduct provisions pertain to postgraduates as well as undergraduates, Whilst this policy relates to both undergraduate and postgraduate students, it should be read in the context of the existing University Policy on: Code of Conduct for the Responsible Practice of Research (http://www.governance.uwa.edu.au/procedures/policies/policies-and-procedures?method=document&id=UP12/25) Guidelines on Research ethics and Research conduct for postgraduate students (a link to which is at http://www.postgraduate.uwa.edu.au/students/policies).

Definitions:
Ethical Scholarship entails the pursuit of scholarly enquiry marked by honesty and integrity. It is reflected both in individual and group approaches to study and assessment tasks, and is part of a broader institutional commitment to maintain and extend robust, defensible and transparent educational standards and practices.
Academic Literacy may be defined as the capacity to undertake study and research, and to communicate findings and knowledge, in a manner appropriate to the particular disciplinary conventions and scholarly standards expected at university level.
Academic Integrity or Academic Conduct "means acting with the values of honesty, trust, fairness, respect and responsibility in learning, teaching and research." 1 -

1 Exemplary Academic Integrity Project (EAIP): Embedding and extending exemplary academic integrity policy and support frameworks across the higher education sector (2013), Plain English definition of Academic Integrity, Office for Learning and Teaching Strategic
**Breach of Academic Misconduct** is any activity or practice engaged in by a student that breaches explicit guidelines relating to the production of work for assessment, in a manner that compromises or defeats the purpose of that assessment. Students must not engage in academic misconduct. Any such activity undermines an ethos of ethical scholarship. Breaches include, but are not limited to:

- **Scope of Academic Misconduct and Associated Penalties.** Academic misconduct includes, but is not limited to cheating, or attempting to cheat through:
  - (a) collusion
  - (b) inappropriate collaboration
  - (c) plagiarism
  - (d) misrepresenting or fabricating data or results or other assessable work
  - (e) inappropriate electronic data sourcing/collection
  - (f) breaching rules specified for the conduct of examinations in a way that may compromise or defeat the purposes of assessment.

**Levels of Breaches of Academic Conduct** relates to the severity of the breach and are defined as:

- Level 1: Minor Breach of Academic Conduct
- Level 2: Moderate Breach of Academic Conduct
- Level 3: Major Breach of Academic Conduct

**Academic Conduct Advisor (ACA)** is the staff member within each faculty tasked with managing the implementation and procedural aspects the policy. Roles include monitoring the levels of reported breaches of academic conduct within the faculty; liaising with ACAs from other faculties at least twice yearly at meetings convened by the Dean of Coursework Studies; and providing relevant information and advice to staff in relation to the Academic Conduct Policy.

**Policy statement:**

1. **Principles of Academic Misconduct**

   This policy is underpinned by the following principles:
   
   I. An institutional culture of academic integrity
   II. Transparency in the transmission of relevant information to staff and students
   III. Shared responsibility between staff and students in creating and maintaining a culture of academic integrity
   IV. An educative focus on the creation and maintenance of a culture of academic integrity
   V. An integration with best practice in assessment
   VI. An integration with other University support systems and resources including LMS, ACE, CARS and Study Smarter

   Penalties for academic misconduct vary according to the seriousness of the case, and may include the requirement to do further work or repeat work, deduction of marks; the award of zero marks for the assessment; failure of one or more units; suspension from a course of study; exclusion from the University, non-conferral of a degree, diploma or other award to which the student would otherwise have been entitled.

2. **The Use of Common Definitions**

Staff must adhere to the following previously stated definitions that have been adopted within the university, for inclusion in its documents, websites and associated information provided to staff and students:

Ethical scholarship entails the pursuit of scholarly enquiry marked by honesty and integrity. It is reflected both in individual and group approaches to study and assessment tasks, and is part of a broader institutional commitment to maintain and extend robust, defensible and transparent educational standards and practices.

Academic literacy may be defined as the capacity to undertake study and research, and to communicate findings and knowledge, in a manner appropriate to the particular disciplinary conventions and scholarly standards expected at university level.

Academic misconduct is any activity or practice engaged in by a student that breaches explicit guidelines relating to the production of work for assessment, in a manner that compromises or defeats the purpose of that assessment. Students must not engage in academic misconduct. Any such activity undermines an ethos of ethical scholarship.

Scope of Academic Misconduct and Associated Penalties. Academic misconduct includes, but is not limited to cheating, or attempting to cheat—through:
(a) collusion
(b) inappropriate collaboration
(c) plagiarism
(d) misrepresenting or fabricating data or results or other assessable work
(e) inappropriate electronic data sourcing/collection
(f) breaching rules specified for the conduct of examinations in a way that may compromise or defeat the purposes of assessment

3 The Articulation and Embedding of Information for Students and Staff

3.1 Information provided to members of the University regarding breaches of academic misconduct must also refer the reader to relevant information regarding academic literacy and ethical scholarship.

3.2 Furthermore, an ethos of ethical scholarship and academic literacy must be embedded in University policies where appropriate. For example, the University’s Strategic Plan, Teaching and Learning Management Plan, and the Charter of Student Rights and Responsibilities, and Education Futures amongst others.

4 Severity of Breaches of Academic Misconduct

Severity of breaches of academic conduct Academic misconduct at UWA, for both undergraduate and postgraduate students, must be defined according to a system of three levels, as follows:
4.1 Level 1: Minor Breach of Academic Conduct

4.1.1 Instances of academic misconduct breaches are deemed MINOR where the misconduct activity may be reasonably judged to result from careless practices and/or neglect of specific guidelines relating to assessment requirements by students, whose outcome compromises the purpose of an assessment to a limited extent only.

4.1.2 Misconduct - The activity does not include relatively trivial breaches by an entry level student in their first 24 points of study in a course, which in the opinion of the relevant unit coordinator may routinely occur in the course of learning the techniques, methodologies and presentation conventions within an area or discipline.

4.1.3 Instances of Level 1 minor academic misconduct breaches may arise most often, although not exclusively, in relation to first year undergraduate student assessment items. Examples of minor academic misconduct breaches may include but are not limited to:

(i) minor plagiarism (refer Section 6) such as inadequate or inconsistent referencing, paraphrasing too close to the original;
(ii) minor copying of material, such as copying one or two sentences including copying where a student utilises a verbatim transcription in their notes and presents it as their own words;
(iii) copying of answers to questions at the end of laboratory practicals.

4.2 Level 2: Moderate Breach of Academic Conduct

4.2.1 Instances of academic misconduct breaches are deemed MODERATE where the misconduct activity may be reasonably judged to be a moderate breach of ethical scholarship and includes (but is not limited to):

(i) moderate plagiarism (refer Section 6), in an assessment item other than a thesis or dissertation;
(ii) recycling an item of assessment from one unit and re-submitting it in complete or substantial form for another assessment;
(iii) fabricating or falsifying data, experimental results or sources of information in an assessment item other than a thesis or dissertation;
(iv) colluding with another student about assessable work and representing that as individual work when such collusion has not been specified as acceptable within unit outlines or other assessment requirements.

4.3 Level 3: Major Breach of Academic Conduct

4.3.1 Instances of academic misconduct breaches are deemed MAJOR where the misconduct activity may be reasonably judged to be a serious and substantial breach of ethical scholarship and includes (but is not limited to):

(i) cheating in examinations, including:
(a) bringing in and/or referring to unauthorised material in an examination, including (but not limited to) written notes, formulae or other prompts whether stored on or within some object or device, or on paper or on the student's body;

(b) communicating (or attempting to communicate) in an unauthorised manner with others during examinations (whether by speaking or other means);

(c) reading (or attempting to read) the work of other examinees during the exam;

(d) engaging in or agreeing to any act of imposture whereby an enrolled examinee's examination is undertaken by another who assumes their identity.

(ii) Major plagiarism (refer Section 6), particularly in a thesis or dissertation;

(iii) Fabricating or falsifying data, experimental results or sources of information in a thesis or dissertation

5 The Provision of Counselling and the Application of Penalties

The following framework of academic counselling of students, and academic misconduct penalties and associated warnings, should be used as a standard guide within all faculties and teaching/supervision units, in cases of breaches of academic misconduct:

(NB. This framework takes into account the scope of the proven misconduct breach, the level of experience of a student, and any previous history of misconduct reported instances. It should be noted that particular emphasis upon educational counselling is provided for students in their first 48 points of study in a course, and that a 'fair warning'/further counselling principle is embedded in all levels. Levels, penalties, and counselling procedures are summarised in the flow charts of Proposed Levels, Penalties and Procedures in Cases of Academic Misconduct at http://www.teachingandlearning.uwa.edu.au/staff/policies/conduct/?a=399465 http://www.teachingandlearning.uwa.edu.au/page/59146)

5.1 Level 1: Minor Breach of Academic Conduct

5.1.1 Students in their first 48 points of undergraduate study within a course at UWA

5.1.1.1 Level 1, First instance

For a first instance in the first 48 points of a student's study in a course at UWA, no grading penalty will be applied. A student will usually be given the opportunity to revise and resubmit the assessment if practicable, and
counselling by academic staff about the nature of the academic misconduct and positive strategies for its future avoidance, by way of a ‘Notice of Academic Counselling’ (http://www.teachingandlearning.uwa.edu.au/400067). Resubmitted work will be marked employing the usual scale of assessment in that unit. If the opportunity to revise and resubmit the assessment is not practicable, then the student should be required to undertake a similar assessment for marking purposes.

5.1.1.2 Level 1, Second instance

For a second instance in the first 48 points of a student's study in a course at UWA, marks will be deducted consistent with the level of the breach. The student will not usually be provided with the opportunity to revise and resubmit.

5.1.1.3 Level 1, Third instance

For a third instance in the first 48 points in a student's study in a course, the student will usually be given zero marks for the relevant assessment.

5.1.2 Students who have completed 48 points of undergraduate study in a course at UWA, and postgraduate students:

5.1.2.1 Level 1, First instance

For a first instance after completion of 48 points of study within a course at UWA, marks will be deducted consistent with the level of the academic misconduct breach. The student will not usually be provided with the opportunity to revise and resubmit.

5.1.2.2 Level 1, Second instance

For a second instance after completion of 48 points of study within a course at UWA, the student will be given zero for the assessment, and warned that further breaches of academic conduct will be referred to the Dean of Faculty/Dean of Graduate Research and Postdoctoral Training as appropriate.

5.1.2.3 Level 1, Third instance

For a third instance after completion of 48 points of study within a course at UWA, a zero grade will be applied to the assessment, and the case will be referred to the Dean of the Faculty/Dean of Graduate Research and Postdoctoral Training (as appropriate) for an official warning that, in the case of any subsequent breaches within the course, a grade of N-Fail may be expected to be applied to the unit in which the breach occurs. The student should also be advised that receiving an N-Fail may lead to penalties for unsatisfactory progress.
5.2 Level 2: Moderate Breach of Academic Conduct

5.2.1 Level 2, First instance

5.2.1.1 Students in their first 24 points of study within a course at UWA

(i) In cases where no previous record of breaches of academic misconduct has been recorded, the Head of School or Faculty Academic Conduct Advisor may determine that no grading penalty should be imposed, but that revision and resubmission of the assessment is permissible; in such instances, academic counselling will be provided by the unit coordinator, and/or referral to other support services for advice about academic literacy. Resubmitted work will be marked employing the usual scale of assessment in that unit. If the opportunity to revise and resubmit the assessment is not practicable, then the student should be required to undertake a similar assessment for marking purposes.

(ii) In cases where a previous record of a breach of academic misconduct has been recorded, marks will be deducted consistent with the extent level of the academic misconduct breach as indicated in Item 6, Plagiarism. Counselling will be provided by the unit coordinator, and/or referral to other support services for advice about academic literacy.

5.2.2 Level 2, First instance

5.2.2.1 Students in their second 24 points of study within a course at UWA

(i) In cases where no previous record of a breach of academic misconduct has been recorded, a deduction of marks consistent with the extent level of the academic misconduct breach as indicated in Item 6, Plagiarism, will be applied. Counselling will be provided by the unit coordinator, and/or referral to other support services for advice about academic literacy.

(ii) In cases where a previous record of academic misconduct breach has been recorded, a mark of zero will usually be awarded for the item of assessment. Counselling will be provided by the Head of School or the Faculty Academic Conduct Advisor, and/or referral to other support services for advice about academic literacy.

5.2.3 Level 2, First instance

5.2.3.1 Students who have completed 48 points of study in a course at UWA, and postgraduate students

A mark of zero will be awarded for the item of assessment. Counselling will be provided by the Head of School or faculty Academic Conduct Advisor, and/or referral to other support services for advice about academic literacy.

5.2.4 Level 2, Second instance
5.2.4.1 All students

For a second instance at Level 2, students will usually be awarded the grade N-Fail for the unit in which the academic misconduct breach has occurred, and will be warned that subsequent Level 2 breaches will be referred to the Dean of the Faculty/Dean of Graduate Research and Postdoctoral Training (as appropriate) and may result in the award of the grade N-Fail for all other units concurrently enrolled within the Faculty. The student should also be advised that receiving an N-Fail may lead to penalties for unsatisfactory progress (see Student Rules: Rule 35).

5.2.5 Level 2, Third instance

5.2.5.1 All students

For a third instance at Level 2, students will usually be awarded the grade N-Fail for the unit, and be referred to the Dean of the Faculty/Dean of Graduate Research and Postdoctoral Training (as appropriate) who will usually award the grade N-Fail for all units in which the student is concurrently enrolled within the Faculty. The student should also be advised that receiving an N-Fail for one or more units may lead to penalties for unsatisfactory progress (see Student Rules: Rule 35).

5.3 Level 3: Major Academic Misconduct

5.3.1 Level 3, First instance

5.3.1.1 All students

For a first instance at Level 3, students will usually be awarded the grade N-Fail for the unit in which the academic misconduct has occurred, and will be warned that further breaches will be referred to the Dean of the Faculty/Dean of Graduate Research and Postdoctoral Training (as appropriate) and may result in the award of the grade N-Fail for all other units concurrently enrolled within the Faculty. The student should also be advised that receiving an N-Fail may lead to penalties for unsatisfactory progress (see Student Rules: Rule 35).

5.3.2 Level 3, Second instance

5.3.2.1 All students

For a second instance at Level 3, students will usually be awarded the grade N-Fail for the unit in which the academic misconduct breach has occurred, and will be referred to the Dean of the Faculty/Dean of Graduate Research and Postdoctoral Training (as appropriate) who will typically apply the grade N-Fail for all other units in which the student is concurrently enrolled within the Faculty. The student should also be advised that receiving an N-Fail for one
or more units may lead to penalties for unsatisfactory progress (see Student Rules: Rule 35).

5.3.3 Level 3, Third instance

5.3.3.1 All students

For a third instance at Level 3, students will usually be awarded the grade N-Fail for the unit in which the academic misconduct breach has occurred, and will be referred to the Dean of the Faculty/Dean of Graduate Research and Postdoctoral Training (as appropriate) who will typically apply the grade N-Fail for all other units in which the student is concurrently enrolled within the Faculty. The student should also be advised that receiving an N-Fail in one or more units may lead to penalties for unsatisfactory progress (see Student Rules: Rule 35). However, in addition, the Dean may under the Regulations for Student Conduct and Discipline recommend to the Senior Deputy Vice-Chancellor that a student be excluded from enrolment in all courses or units offered by the University for a period of up to one academic year or that a student’s current enrolment in any course or unit offered by the University be cancelled. Instances beyond a third breach at Level 3 may result in referral to a Board of Discipline and consequent expulsion from the University or non-conferral of a degree, diploma or other award to which the student would otherwise have been entitled.

5.4 Order of Instances: Breaches of Academic Misconduct

5.4.1 Subsequent Instances

If a student who has committed a higher level breach then commits a subsequent breach at a lower level, that subsequent breach will not be considered as a first offence. In such cases, the subsequent breach will automatically be treated as at least a second breach for that higher level, and will attract the appropriate penalty. For example, a student who has committed Level 2 plagiarism in their first 48 points of study at UWA and has been afforded the opportunity of rewriting and resubmitting their work without penalty on that occasion, would not then be afforded the same opportunity in relation to a subsequent Level 1 instance. Such a subsequent breach would automatically be classified as at least a Level 2 breach, and would result in a deduction of marks consistent with a subsequent breach at that level.

5.4.2 Concurrent Instances

In cases where students submit items for assessment concurrently in different units, and those items are found to exhibit evidence of breaches of academic misconduct, such collective breaches should, for the purposes of a penalty, be treated as a single instance only. Such leniency should only occur if it is clear that the student as a result of a concurrent or near concurrent submission schedule has not been in a position to benefit from remedial
counselling, has not previously received counselling for an earlier instance, and is likely to have committed the breaches without intent.

6 Plagiarism

Text matching software is utilised at UWA as an educative tool for students and may be used by staff to confirm suspected or indicate potential breaches related to Plagiarism (See GuidelinesGood Practice Guide on use of text matching software).

6.1 The following scale has been adopted across the University for the purposes of preliminary classification in cases of plagiarism:

- less than 10% Level 1 (minor);
- 10-25% Level 2 (moderate);
- more than 25% Level 3 (major)

Such a scale should be established on the clear understanding that a final level of breach will be determined after consideration of relevant contextual factors (level of study; previous record of academic misconduct; evidence of intent; other mitigating factors). Faculty policies should state clearly that a Head of School or Dean will consider such factors in finalising judgment about the level of plagiarism and the penalty applied in the case.

Such percentages will relate to the substantive content of the work (i.e. word length excluding properly referenced quotes, and footnotes/endnotes except where plagiarism is contained in the latter). The extent of plagiarism will be calculated to include both unattributed verbatim copying; work in which minor amendments have been made to unattributed source material (through substitution, transposition or exclusion of words); and the close paraphrase of the words and/or specific ideas of another person.

Such a scale should be established on the clear understanding that a final level of breach will be determined after consideration of relevant contextual factors (level of study; previous record of academic misconduct; evidence of intent; other mitigating factors). Faculty policies should state clearly that a Head of School or Dean will consider such factors in finalising judgment about the level of plagiarism and the penalty applied in the case.

6.16.2 In relation to forms other than written assessment, such as visual and digital media, computer codes, musical composition and performance, and oral presentations, an estimate of the level of seriousness will be made in relation to the extent to which the plagiarism breaches the intention of the assessment and the guidelines provided for that assessment item (see Plagiarism at http://www.teachingandlearning.uwa.edu.au/401047).
7 Mitigating Circumstances

7.1 In the process of determining the level severity (Level) of the breach of academic misconduct that has occurred and the appropriate penalty to be applied once a case has been established, Heads of School and Deans may take into account one or more mitigating circumstances that are deemed to bear upon the case.

7.2 Such factors may include, but not be limited to:

(i) differing educational, cultural and/or linguistic backgrounds of students at entry level (defined as students engaged in their first 24 points of study within a course);

(ii) documented medical or personal circumstances of a nature to indicate serious impairment of responsibility at the time the academic misconduct occurred.

8 Principles Relating to the Handling of Alleged Breaches of Academic Misconduct

The following principles are to be observed in all cases of alleged academic misconduct breaches:

8.1 Cases of alleged and established breaches of academic misconduct must be treated confidentially by staff. Discussion of cases should be limited to those who have a direct line of procedural responsibility in such matters (the relevant unit coordinator, Head of School, Academic Conduct Adviser, Dean and those officers of the University beyond the faculty who are responsible for overseeing procedures relating to breaches of academic misconduct).

8.2 Lines of responsibility for investigating cases of a suspected misconduct breach must be rigorously adhered to in all faculties and teaching/supervision sections of the University (see Procedural Responsibilities in the Handling of Alleged Academic Misconduct). The only exceptions to the principles of face-to-face interview protocols, timely handling, and lines of responsibility in determining levels and penalties, may occur in the instance of transnational programs where distance factors may demand alternative arrangements. This may include, for example, the delegation of Head of School authority to an appropriately trained senior staff member who co-ordinates and teaches within such programs. Any envisaged variation to these procedures in relation to existing transnational programs must conform as closely as possible to the policy, and those arrangements communicated to students. Variations to procedures in any proposal for future transnational programs must be clearly stated, to be included for consideration as part of the normal approval processes for such programs.
8.3 Unit coordinators must advise students that they are suspected of committing academic misconduct no later than when assessment items are returned to other students. This advice must be confidential and coupled with procedural information so that the student understands what will occur next.

8.4 Established protocols for recording academic misconduct must be adhered to in all faculties and teaching/supervision units of the University.

9 Appeals

In relation to procedures for appeal against findings of academic misconduct, and/or the penalty imposed in such cases, the existing 'Regulations for Student Conduct and Discipline - Section 19: Appeals' (http://www.teachingandlearning.uwa.edu.au/staff/policies/conduct/procedure), details a student's right of appeal against a decision of a staff member via written appeal within ten University working days of notification to the next most senior staff member or body under academic misconduct procedures.
Procedures

1. Recording Procedures in Cases of Academic Misconduct
The following procedures for the generation and keeping of confidential records relating to academic misconduct must be followed centrally, as well as within all faculties and teaching and supervision units at UWA (see ‘Recording Misconduct’ at http://www.teachingandlearning.uwa.edu.au/400067 )

1.1 that all faculties, teaching and supervision units at UWA utilise (downloadable) pro forma documents for recording defined instances of academic misconduct at all levels and in all cases, without exception;

1.2 that proformas include ‘Notice of Academic Counselling’ (for use at Level 1 where no penalties are applied) and ‘Academic Misconduct Investigation and Recording’ (at http://www.teachingandlearning.uwa.edu.au/400067 );

1.3 that relevant proformas be signed after due deliberation, by the relevant Head of School or Dean as appropriate;

1.4 that a copy of the signed pro forma be provided to the student for their records;

1.5 that all signed proformas be sent to a faculty’s Academic Conduct Adviser, who will enter the relevant notation and information as it appears on the pro forma on a confidential student record, such record not to appear upon a student’s academic transcript;

1.6 that the Academic Conduct Adviser send all paper copies of notices to Central Records for confidential safekeeping;

1.7 that access to a student’s confidential record be generally restricted to those University staff members and officers who are nominated under the University’s guidelines as being directly responsible for:

(i) decisions relating to the formulation of appropriate penalties;
(ii) the oversight of an appeal against an academic misconduct penalty;
(iii) the re-admission of a student after a period of exclusion;
(iv) the collation and reporting of de-identified data relating to academic misconduct for the purposes of centralised monitoring and planning.
(v) external reporting, where necessary.

2. Use of Signed Coversheets/Declarations

2.1 All individual essays and other written work submitted for assessment by students at UWA must be accompanied by a signed coversheet or declaration (proforma to be included at http://www.teachingandlearning.uwa.edu.au/page/59146 ) stating that the student is aware of extant policy relating to academic misconduct, that the work is their own, that it complies with the guidelines for assessment for that assessment item, and acknowledges that the work may be electronically scanned for detection of plagiarism.

2.2 Further, all group assessments must be accompanied by a coversheet (proforma to be included at http://www.teachingandlearning.uwa.edu.au/page/59146 ) signed by each group member stating that they are aware of the faculty’s extant policy relating to academic misconduct, that their contribution to the group product has been their own work, that they have complied with the guidelines for assessment for that assessment item, and acknowledge that the work may be electronically scanned for detection of plagiarism.
# Procedural Responsibilities in the Handling of Alleged Academic Misconduct

It is advisable that the following responsibilities according to role be adhered to within all faculties and teaching/supervision units of the University in the handling of alleged cases of academic misconduct:

## 3.1 Teaching staff (including sessional staff) other than unit coordinators

### 3.1.1 Teaching staff including tutors, demonstrators, and other sessional and full-time staff

(i) Immediately notify the relevant unit coordinator and supply the unit coordinator with details and evidence relating to the matter. In the case of suspected plagiarism, this information should include the relevant work, and reference to the material upon which the work allegedly draws. In other cases of alleged misconduct, staff must furnish unit coordinators with written details of the time, place and circumstances of the alleged misconduct. The matter will then be handled further by the unit coordinator.

(ii) Beyond the provision of relevant information to unit coordinators, teaching staff in a unit of study:

(i) Should neither pursue a suspected case of academic misconduct, nor interview a student in relation to it, nor communicate with anyone other than the relevant unit coordinator, Head of School, Dean or other nominated University officer as requested, regarding any alleged case of misconduct.

(ii) Must neither impose independently any penalty for alleged misconduct, nor formulate alternative assessments for the student involved, nor engage in any other procedure outside the existing University and faculty guidelines.

(iii) Must be informed by the relevant unit coordinator at the commencement of each semester of their role and responsibilities in relation to alleged academic misconduct.

## 3.2 Unit Coordinators

In undergraduate study, the unit coordinator is the official examiner of that unit under University procedures. Therefore:

(i) Unit coordinators may not devolve their responsibilities in relation to academic misconduct to other teaching staff within the unit. In cases where the unit coordinator is unexpectedly ill or otherwise indisposed, the responsibility for initial decisions relating to academic misconduct will be assumed by the Head of School.

(ii) Unit coordinators must brief all relevant staff engaged in teaching and assessment of the unit at the beginning of semester regarding procedures for the handling of academic misconduct within the unit, and particular elements of assessment requirements as they occur in the course of the unit and are notified to students in the unit guide and/or assessment mechanism statement. Particular attention must be given to protocols relating to group work and its assessment, where this element is included for assessment in the unit.

(iii) Unit coordinators will be responsible for advising students that they are suspected of committing academic misconduct no later than when assessment items are returned to other students. This advice must be confidential and coupled with procedural information so that the student understands what will occur next.

(iv) Unit coordinators will report all cases of alleged academic misconduct, except those leading to an advisory ‘Notice of Academic Counselling’ (http://www.teachingandlearning.uwa.edu.au/staff/policies/conduct/procedure), to Heads of School for consideration.

(v) Unit coordinators may issue a ‘Notice of Academic Counselling’ to a student without reference to a Head of School. However, a record of such advice must be forwarded to the Academic Conduct Adviser for central recording purposes, and a signed copy provided to the student.

(vi) Unit coordinators will be responsible for the provision of appropriate academic counselling to students who receive a ‘Notice of Academic Counselling’, which may consist of direct discussion and advice, and/or referral to appropriate support services and materials.

(vii) For instances that unit coordinators believe should lead to deduction of marks for the assessment item, unit coordinators will propose an appropriate deduction of marks, and will forward a ‘Notice of Academic Misconduct’ to the Head of School for confirmation of the proposed deduction.

(viii) Unit coordinators must refer all other higher level instances to Heads of School for handling. In so referring cases, unit coordinators must provide to Heads of Schools the student's work that is under consideration; supporting details and clear evidence relating to the matter (including copies of relevant material in cases of suspected plagiarism, details of time and circumstances concerning other cases of alleged misconduct, and information provided to students concerning the item of assessment under consideration); and their written advice regarding the level of academic misconduct they believe is evidenced within the work, and, if deemed appropriate, a suggested penalty.
### 3.3 Heads of School (also Academic Conduct Advisers where Head’s Responsibilities have been Formally Delegated)

3.3.1 The role and responsibilities of Heads of School in relation to academic misconduct may be formally devolved to an appropriately trained Academic Conduct Adviser. For single school faculties where the Head of School and Dean are the same person, it will be necessary for the Dean to appoint a nominee to undertake the role of Head of School as outlined in these Guidelines.

3.3.2 In cases notified to the Head of School for deliberation, the Head of School will review the evidence of academic misconduct and the advice brought before them by the unit coordinator. If a case of misconduct has been established, the Head of School will make further investigation regarding the level of misconduct by accessing a student’s confidential record to assess whether the case is a first or subsequent breach.

3.3.3 The Head of School will then offer an interview to the student concerned, attended by the unit coordinator and the Head, at which the academic misconduct and its level will be discussed as well as evidence of relevant mitigating circumstances. The student may be accompanied by another person.

3.3.4 The Head of School will then make a final determination about the level of academic misconduct where established, and an appropriate penalty for the academic misconduct on the basis of the evidence, the previous record of the student, and any mitigating circumstances relevant to the case.

3.3.5 The Head of School will complete the relevant ‘Notice of Academic Misconduct’, forwarding a signed copy both to the student, and to the Academic Conduct Adviser in the Faculty, within ten working days of determining the outcome of a case.

3.3.6 In any case of academic misconduct that, according to the University guidelines, are at a level that may attract penalties exceeding failure within a specific unit of study, namely - the concurrent failure of other units; a period of suspension; exclusion from the faculty; expulsion from the University; and non-conferment of a degree, or that demands referral for warning to the Dean of the Faculty/Dean of Graduate Research and Postdoctoral Training the Head of School will provide full details of the case to the Dean for their consideration. The Head will also provide advice concerning the previous record of the student, the conduct of the matter to date, and the penalty they believe should be applied in the case.

### 3.4 Academic Conduct Advisers (ACAs)

The Academic Conduct Adviser’s role in all faculties would include:

1. Periodic monitoring of levels of reported academic misconduct within the faculty.
2. Liaison with ACAs from other faculties at twice yearly meetings convened by the Dean of Undergraduate Coursework Studies to discuss issues arising from the policy or procedures, to ensure ongoing monitoring of procedures and alterations as required. It is envisaged that the University Policy on: Academic Conduct - Ethical Scholarship, Academic Literacy and Academic Misconduct be reviewed by this group at the end of 2005 and then on a cyclical basis every two years.
3. Provision of relevant information and advice to staff in relation to academic misconduct policy.
   
   Heads of School may also choose to devolve some or all of their responsibilities in relation to the handling of academic misconduct to a faculty’s trained ACA. In all such circumstances, the ACA would, in policy terms, exercise the same role as a Head of School, and staff within the School should be informed of the details of any such decision as it may bear on the handling of particular cases.

4. Where responsibilities with respect to managing aspects of academic conduct been have formally delegated from the Head of School, the ACA’s role would include those of the Head of School listed in 3.3.
3.5 Deans

3.4.1 In cases notified to the Dean for deliberation, the Dean will review the evidence of academic misconduct and the advice brought before them by the Head of School.

3.4.2 The Dean will then offer an interview to the student concerned, attended by the Head of School, at which the academic misconduct and its level will be discussed as well as evidence of relevant mitigating circumstances. The student may be accompanied by another person.

3.4.3 The Dean will then make a final determination about the level of academic misconduct where established, and an appropriate penalty for the academic misconduct on the basis of the evidence, the previous record of the student, and any mitigating circumstances relevant to the case.

3.4.4 The Dean will complete the relevant 'Notice of Academic Misconduct', forwarding a signed copy both to the Head of School, the student, and to the Academic Conduct Adviser in the Faculty, within ten working days of determining the outcome of a case.

3.4.5 A proposed penalty for academic misconduct that includes expulsion from the University or non-conferral of a degree, diploma or other award to which the student would otherwise have been entitled must be referred to the Senior Deputy Vice-Chancellor, with appropriate evidence, for referral to a Board of Discipline.

3.5 Beyond the Faculties

The powers and responsibilities of the Senior Deputy Vice-Chancellor and the associated University Board of Discipline as constituted under the ‘Regulations for Student Conduct and Discipline’ (http://www.governance.uwa.edu.au/regulations/student-conduct) will be retained within the new framework.

4. Recording Procedures within Faculties

The following procedures for the generation and keeping of records relating to academic misconduct must be established, and adhered to by all faculties and teaching and supervision units at UWA:

4.1 Level 1, first 48 points of study, first instance

4.1.1 These instances must be recorded by the relevant unit coordinator on a proforma document entitled 'Notice of Academic Counselling' (http://www.teachingandlearning.uwa.edu.au/staff/policies/conduct/procedure) to best emphasise the positive educational orientation of UWA's approach. A copy of the document will be retained by the unit coordinator after discussion with the student. A copy of the document will also be provided to the student who will be asked to acknowledge its receipt.

4.1.2 The 'Notice of Academic Counselling' (http://www.teachingandlearning.uwa.edu.au/staff/policies/conduct/procedure) will then be forwarded by the unit coordinator to the Faculty's Academic Conduct Adviser, who will ensure that the document's details are entered on a student's central confidential record.

4.1.3 Such recording is not intended to be punitive: it will, however, provide an efficient basis for academic staff to identify students who continue to engage in academic misconduct. Such records will also, in de-identified aggregate, provide faculty-wide information against which to assess the ongoing effectiveness of educational strategies to diminish minor misconduct.
4.2 All Other levels

4.2.1 Outcomes of cases must be recorded by Heads of School or Deans on the relevant proforma documents pertaining to the level of academic misconduct that has been established (http://www.teachingandlearning.uwa.edu.au/page/59146). Copies of the document will be provided to the student, and to the Faculty's Academic Conduct Adviser to arrange recording of the document's details on a student's confidential electronic record indicating the level and penalty imposed.

5. Appeals

(i) Faculties and other teaching and supervision units must ensure that information relating to appeals cites the correct set of appeal procedures relating to such cases. The relevant appeal regulations are those contained in 'Regulations for Student Conduct and Discipline' section 19: the mechanisms for 'Appeals process in the case where there is dissatisfaction with an assessment result and/or progress status' do not pertain in such cases, and must not be used.

(ii) Any notification of a finding of academic misconduct to a student must include clear information regarding their rights of appeal, the process to be followed and the relevant time limits relating to notification of an appeal if such an option is to be pursued.

(iii) Within the context of an interview with the student by a Head of School, Academic Conduct Adviser or Dean, a student's right of appeal must be reiterated.

(iv) Faculty websites, handbooks and other information relating to academic misconduct provided to students and staff must include information relating to right of appeal.

(v) In the event of a successful appeal leading to dismissal of a finding, a student's confidential electronic record must be amended to remove any reference to the original finding and/or penalty in the case, and relevant paperwork associated with the case and the appeal stored securely in central records. In the event that an appeal results in the modification of a finding and/or penalty, a student's electronic record must be amended to remove the original finding and to reflect the modified finding and/or penalty only. The relevant paperwork associated with the case and the appeal must be transmitted to central records for secure storage.

6. Specific Faculty Definitions and Use of Levels

6.1 All faculties and teaching/supervision units at UWA must put in context the common definition of academic misconduct, using the Level 1 (Minor)/2 (Moderate)/3 (Major) framework, and emphasise those elements of academic misconduct of particular relevance to teaching and learning in the faculty.

6.2 In particular, faculties must provide to students upon enrolment, via faculty and other relevant websites and printed material, specific information including:

(i) clear definitions that best reflect the principle concerns within any faculty regarding academic misconduct, including local definitions of plagiarism, group work protocols, open book examination protocols and/or appropriate laboratory/research procedures;

(ii) a guide about the quantity of plagiarism within an assessment that will equate to preliminary findings of Level 1 ('minor'), Level 2 ('moderate') and Level 3 ('major') misconduct, set at less than 10%, 10-25%, and more than 25%, respectively; and that close paraphrase and 'cut and paste' techniques are encompassed by the policy;

(iii) advice to students:
(a) regarding the avenues of guidance they may seek to improve their understanding of both academic literacy and academic misconduct (tutors, lecturers, student service advisers, online programs such as those provided by the library);
(b) that they must inform themselves about any more detailed individual assessment item guidelines that will be provided within unit guides and/or Assessment Mechanism Statements (c) directly or via links to other relevant support material to assist them to develop appropriate skills in note-taking, writing and referencing, to meet faculty standards;
(d) concerning the approaches to group work used within the faculty, including assessment
and the handling of suspected misconduct within items submitted by a group for assessment;
(e) about the avenues of support within the faculty through which further advice concerning
plagiarism and its avoidance may be gained;
(f) about the scope of sources to which plagiarism policy may relate, including visual, digital,
musical and other media forms, and computer codes;
(g) about appropriate local referencing conventions;
(h) that they must read and sign an appropriate declaration or coversheet to be attached to
each item of assessment within a unit;
(i) concerning procedures in the investigation of academic misconduct;
(j) concerning penalties for established cases of misconduct at different levels;
(k) that qualitative factors will also be used in finalising judgments relating to seriousness of
plagiarism;
(l) that all cases of established misconduct will be centrally recorded as part of a confidential
record, such record not to appear on a student's official academic transcript;
(m) concerning their rights and responsibilities in relation to appeal mechanisms in cases of
academic misconduct, and the availability of advice in such instances from the Guild
Education Office;
(n) about protocols for transnational students, ensuring that principles and practices conform
to University policy.

6.3 All Faculty guidelines should be made available in electronic form and facilitate a direct
link to the central website regarding academic misconduct, for ease of use by students and
staff.

Information in Unit Outlines and Assessment Guides

7.1 Within unit outlines and/or Assessment Mechanism Statements, unit coordinators should
direct students to relevant academic misconduct (including plagiarism) policies, associated
penalties and appeal information for the faculty in which the unit is offered.

7.2 Information to students relating to any individual item of assessment should be included
either in the unit outline, or in detailed assessment instructions, and should include explicit
guidelines to clarify:

(i) the extent, if any, of permissible collaboration (group discussion; and/or collaborative
research; and/or sharing of notes; and/or collaborative writing);

(ii) in the case of group work where it constitutes part of unit assessment, an instruction for
students to retain such items as research notes and a record of their individual input, and any
further measures to ensure accountability, that may later be called upon in the investigation of
cases of suspected academic misconduct (see 'Group Work' at

Related forms: (Link)

Academic Misconduct Investigation and Recording:
http://www.teachingandlearning.uwa.edu.au/400067

Notice of Academic Counselling
http://www.teachingandlearning.uwa.edu.au/400067
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**Related Policies or legislation:**
This policy must be considered within the context of:


University Policy on: Academic Conduct:

Purpose of the policy and summary of issues it addresses:
This policy is intended to assist faculty and other staff in teaching and supervision roles to understand the academic conduct expected of students. It promotes ethical scholarship, academic literacy and encourages academic integrity. The University believes that success in promoting ethical scholarship and developing skills in academic literacy is crucial to fostering an institutional culture of academic integrity.

Definitions:
Ethical Scholarship entails the pursuit of scholarly enquiry marked by honesty and integrity. It is reflected both in individual and group approaches to study and assessment tasks, and is part of a broader institutional commitment to maintain and extend robust, defensible and transparent educational standards and practices.
Academic Literacy may be defined as the capacity to undertake study and research, and to communicate findings and knowledge, in a manner appropriate to the particular disciplinary conventions and scholarly standards expected at university level.
Academic Integrity or Academic Conduct “means acting with the values of honesty, trust, fairness, respect and responsibility in learning, teaching and research”. ¹

Breach of Academic Conduct is any activity or practice engaged in by a student that violates explicit guidelines relating to the production of work for assessment, in a manner that compromises or defeats the purpose of that assessment. Any such activity undermines an ethos of ethical scholarship. Breaches include, but are not limited to:

(a) collusion
(b) inappropriate collaboration
(c) plagiarism
(d) misrepresenting or fabricating data or results or other assessable work
(e) inappropriate electronic data sourcing/collection
(f) breaching rules specified for the conduct of examinations in a way that may compromise or defeat the purposes of assessment.

Levels of Breaches of Academic Conduct relates to the severity of the breach and are defined as:

- Level 1: Minor Breach of Academic Conduct
- Level 2: Moderate Breach of Academic Conduct
- Level 3: Major Breach of Academic Conduct

Academic Conduct Advisor (ACA) is the staff member within each faculty tasked with managing the implementation and procedural aspects of the policy. Roles include monitoring the levels of reported breaches of academic conduct within the faculty; liaising with ACAs from other faculties at least twice yearly at meetings convened by the Dean of Coursework Studies; and providing relevant information and advice to staff in relation to this policy.

¹ Exemplary Academic Integrity Project (EAIP): Embedding and extending exemplary academic integrity policy and support frameworks across the higher education sector (2013), Plain English definition of Academic Integrity, Office for Learning and Teaching Strategic Commissioned Project 2012-2013, http: www.unisa.edu.au/EAIP .
Policy statement:

1 Principles

This policy is underpinned by the following principles:
I. An institutional culture of academic integrity
II. Transparency in the transmission of relevant information to staff and students
III. Shared responsibility between staff and students in creating and maintaining a culture of academic integrity
IV. An educative focus on the creation and maintenance of a culture of academic integrity
V. An integration with best practice in assessment
VI. An integration with other University support systems and resources including LMS, ACE, CARS and Study Smarter.

2 The Use of Common Definitions

Staff must adhere to the previously stated definitions that have been adopted within the university, for inclusion in its documents, websites and associated information provided to staff and students.

3 The Articulation and Embedding of Information for Students and Staff

3.1 Information provided to members of the University regarding breaches of academic conduct, must also refer the reader to relevant information regarding academic literacy and ethical scholarship.
3.2 Furthermore, an ethos of ethical scholarship and academic literacy must be embedded in University policies where appropriate. For example, the University's Strategic Plan, the Charter of Student Rights and Responsibilities, and Education Futures amongst others.

4 Severity of Breaches of Academic Conduct

Severity of breaches of academic conduct at UWA, for both undergraduate and postgraduate students, must be defined according to a system of three levels, as follows:

4.1 Level 1: Minor Breach of Academic Conduct

4.1.1 Breaches are deemed MINOR where the activity may be reasonably judged to result from careless practices and/or neglect of specific guidelines relating to assessment requirements by students, whose outcome compromises the purpose of an assessment to a limited extent only.
4.1.2 The activity does not include relatively trivial breaches by an entry level student in their first 24 points of study in a course, which in the opinion of the relevant unit coordinator may routinely occur in the course of learning the techniques, methodologies and presentation conventions within an area or discipline.

4.1.3 Instances of Level 1 minor breaches may arise most often, although not exclusively, in relation to first year undergraduate student assessment items. Examples of minor breaches may include but are not limited to:

(i) minor plagiarism (refer Section 6) such as inadequate or inconsistent referencing, paraphrasing too close to the original;
(ii) minor copying of material, such as copying one or two sentences including copying where a student utilises a verbatim transcription in their notes and presents it as their own words;
(iii) copying of answers to questions at the end of laboratory practicals.

4.2 Level 2: Moderate Breach of Academic Conduct

4.2.1 Breaches are deemed MODERATE where the activity may be reasonably judged to be a moderate breach of ethical scholarship and includes (but is not limited to):

(i) moderate plagiarism (refer Section 6), in an assessment item other than a thesis or dissertation;
(ii) recycling an item of assessment from one unit and re-submitting it in complete or substantial form for another assessment;
(iii) fabricating or falsifying data, experimental results or sources of information in an assessment item other than a thesis or dissertation;
(iv) colluding with another student about assessable work and representing that as individual work when such collusion has not been specified as acceptable within unit outlines or other assessment requirements.

4.3 Level 3: Major Breach of Academic Conduct

4.3.1 Breaches are deemed MAJOR where the activity may be reasonably judged to be a serious and substantial breach of ethical scholarship and includes (but is not limited to):

(i) cheating in examinations, including:

(a) bringing in and/or referring to unauthorised material in an examination, including (but not limited to) written notes, formulae or other prompts whether stored on or within some object or device, or on paper or on the student's body;

(b) communicating (or attempting to communicate) in an unauthorised manner with others during examinations (whether by speaking or other means);
(c) reading (or attempting to read) the work of other examinees during the exam;

(d) engaging in or agreeing to any act of imposture whereby an enrolled examinee’s examination is undertaken by another who assumes their identity.

(ii) Major plagiarism (refer Section 6), particularly in a thesis or dissertation;

(iii) Fabricating or falsifying data, experimental results or sources of information in a thesis or dissertation

5 The Provision of Counselling and the Application of Penalties

The following framework of academic counselling of students, and academic misconduct penalties and associated warnings, should be used as a standard guide within all faculties and teaching/supervision units, in cases of breaches of academic conduct:

(NB. This framework takes into account the scope of the proven breach, the level of experience of a student, and any previous reported instances. It should be noted that particular emphasis upon educational counselling is provided for students in their first 48 points of study in a course, and that a 'fair warning'/further counselling principle is embedded in all levels. Levels, penalties, and counselling procedures are summarised in the flow charts of Proposed Levels, Penalties and Procedures in Cases of Academic Misconduct at http://www.teachingandlearning.uwa.edu.au/staff/policies/conduct/?a=399465)

5.1 Level 1: Minor Breach of Academic Conduct

5.1.1 Students in their first 48 points of undergraduate study within a course at UWA

5.1.1.1 Level 1, First instance

For a first instance in the first 48 points of a student's study in a course at UWA, no grading penalty will be applied. A student will usually be given the opportunity to revise and resubmit the assessment if practicable, and counselled by academic staff about the nature of the academic misconduct and positive strategies for its future avoidance, by way of a ‘Notice of Academic Counselling’ (http://www.teachingandlearning.uwa.edu.au/400067). Resubmitted work will be marked employing the usual scale of assessment in that unit. If the opportunity to revise and resubmit the assessment is not practicable, then the student should be required to undertake a similar assessment for marking purposes.

5.1.1.2 Level 1, Second instance
For a second instance in the first 48 points of a student's study in a course at UWA, marks will be deducted consistent with the level of the breach. The student will not usually be provided with the opportunity to revise and resubmit.

5.1.1.3 Level 1, Third instance

For a third instance in the first 48 points in a student's study in a course, the student will usually be given zero marks for the relevant assessment.

5.1.2 Students who have completed 48 points of undergraduate study in a course at UWA, and postgraduate students:

5.1.2.1 Level 1, First instance

For a first instance after completion of 48 points of study within a course at UWA, marks will be deducted consistent with the level of the academic conduct breach. The student will not usually be provided with the opportunity to revise and resubmit.

5.1.2.2 Level 1, Second instance

For a second instance after completion of 48 points of study within a course at UWA, the student will be given zero for the assessment, and warned that further breaches of academic conduct will be referred to the Dean of Faculty/Dean of Graduate Research and Postdoctoral Training as appropriate.

5.1.2.3 Level 1, Third instance

For a third instance after completion of 48 points of study within a course at UWA, a zero grade will be applied to the assessment, and the case will be referred to the Dean of the Faculty/Dean of Graduate Research and Postdoctoral Training (as appropriate) for an official warning that, in the case of any subsequent breaches within the course, a grade of N-Fail may be expected to be applied to the unit in which the breach occurs. The student should also be advised that receiving an N-Fail may lead to penalties for unsatisfactory progress.

5.2 Level 2: Moderate Breach of Academic Conduct

5.2.1 Level 2, First instance

5.2.1.1 Students in their first 24 points of study within a course at UWA

(i) In cases where no previous breaches of academic conduct have been recorded, the Head of School or Faculty Academic Conduct Advisor may determine that no grading penalty should be imposed, but that revision and resubmission of the assessment is permissible; in such instances, academic counselling will be provided by the unit coordinator, and/or referral to other
support services for advice about academic literacy. Resubmitted work will be marked employing the usual scale of assessment in that unit. If the opportunity to revise and resubmit the assessment is not practicable, then the student should be required to undertake a similar assessment for marking purposes.

(ii) In cases where a previous record of a breach of academic conduct has been recorded, marks will be deducted consistent with the level of the breach as indicated in Item 6, Plagiarism. Counselling will be provided by the unit coordinator, and/or referral to other support services for advice about academic literacy.

5.2.2 Level 2, First instance

5.2.2.1 Students in their second 24 points of study within a course at UWA

(i) In cases where no previous record of a breach of academic conduct has been recorded, a deduction of marks consistent with the level of the breach as indicated in Item 6, Plagiarism, will be applied. Counselling will be provided by the unit coordinator, and/or referral to other support services for advice about academic literacy.

(ii) In cases where a previous record of academic conduct breach has been recorded, a mark of zero will usually be awarded for the item of assessment. Counselling will be provided by the Head of School or the Faculty Academic Conduct Advisor, and/or referral to other support services for advice about academic literacy.

5.2.3 Level 2, First instance

5.2.3.1 Students who have completed 48 points of study in a course at UWA, and postgraduate students

A mark of zero will be awarded for the item of assessment. Counselling will be provided by the Head of School or faculty Academic Conduct Advisor, and/or referral to other support services for advice about academic literacy.

5.2.4 Level 2, Second instance

5.2.4.1 All students

For a second instance at Level 2, students will usually be awarded the grade N-Fail for the unit in which the breach has occurred, and will be warned that subsequent Level 2 breaches will be referred to the Dean of the Faculty/Dean of Graduate Research and Postdoctoral Training (as appropriate) and may result in the award of the grade N-Fail for all other units concurrently enrolled within the Faculty. The student should also be advised that receiving an N-Fail may lead to penalties for unsatisfactory progress (see Student Rules: Rule 35).
5.2.5  Level 2, Third instance

5.2.5.1  All students

For a third instance at Level 2, students will usually be awarded the grade N-Fail for the unit, and be referred to the Dean of the Faculty/Dean of Graduate Research and Postdoctoral Training (as appropriate) who will usually award the grade N-Fail for all units in which the student is concurrently enrolled within the Faculty. The student should also be advised that receiving an N-Fail for one or more units may lead to penalties for unsatisfactory progress (see Student Rules: Rule 35).

5.3  Level 3: Major Academic Misconduct

5.3.1  Level 3, First instance

5.3.1.1  All students

For a first instance at Level 3, students will usually be awarded the grade N-Fail for the unit in which the academic misconduct has occurred, and will be warned that further breaches will be referred to the Dean of the Faculty/Dean of Graduate Research and Postdoctoral Training (as appropriate) and may result in the award of the grade N-Fail for all other units concurrently enrolled within the Faculty. The student should also be advised that receiving an N-Fail may lead to penalties for unsatisfactory progress (see Student Rules: Rule 35).

5.3.2  Level 3, Second instance

5.3.2.1  All students

For a second instance at Level 3, students will usually be awarded the grade N-Fail for the unit in which the breach has occurred, and will be referred to the Dean of the Faculty/Dean of Graduate Research and Postdoctoral Training (as appropriate) who will typically apply the grade N-Fail for all other units in which the student is concurrently enrolled within the Faculty. The student should also be advised that receiving an N-Fail for one or more units may lead to penalties for unsatisfactory progress (see Student Rules: Rule 35).

5.3.3  Level 3, Third instance

5.3.3.1  All students

For a third instance at Level 3, students will usually be awarded the grade N-Fail for the unit in which the breach has occurred, and will be referred to the Dean of the Faculty/Dean of Graduate Research and Postdoctoral Training (as appropriate) who will typically apply the grade N-Fail for all other units in which the student is concurrently enrolled within the Faculty. The student should also be advised that receiving an N-Fail in one or more units may lead to penalties for unsatisfactory progress (see Student Rules: Rule 35).
However, in addition, the Dean may under the Regulations for Student Conduct and Discipline recommend to the Senior Deputy Vice-Chancellor that a student be excluded from enrolment in all courses or units offered by the University for a period of up to one academic year or that a student’s current enrolment in any course or unit offered by the University be cancelled. Instances beyond a third breach at Level 3 may result in referral to a Board of Discipline and consequent expulsion from the University or non-conferral of a degree, diploma or other award to which the student would otherwise have been entitled.

5.4 Order of Breaches of Academic Conduct

5.4.1 Subsequent Instances

If a student who has committed a higher level breach then commits a subsequent breach at a lower level, that subsequent breach will not be considered as a first offence. In such cases, the subsequent breach will automatically be treated as at least a second breach for that higher level, and will attract the appropriate penalty. For example, a student who has committed Level 2 plagiarism in their first 48 points of study at UWA and has been afforded the opportunity of rewriting and resubmitting their work without penalty on that occasion, would not then be afforded the same opportunity in relation to a subsequent Level 1 instance. Such a subsequent breach would automatically be classified as at least a Level 2 breach, and would result in a deduction of marks consistent with a subsequent breach at that level.

5.4.2 Concurrent Instances

In cases where students submit items for assessment concurrently in different units, and those items are found to exhibit evidence of breaches of academic conduct, such collective breaches should, for the purposes of a penalty, be treated as a single instance only. Such leniency should only occur if it is clear that the student as a result of a concurrent or near concurrent submission schedule has not been in a position to benefit from remedial counselling, has not previously received counselling for an earlier instance, and is likely to have committed the breaches without intent.

6 Plagiarism

Text matching software is utilised at UWA as an educative tool for students and may be used by staff to confirm suspected or indicate potential breaches related to Plagiarism (See Good Practice Guide on use of text matching software).

6.1 The following scale has been adopted across the University for the purposes of preliminary classification in cases of plagiarism:

- less than 10% Level 1 (minor);
• 10-25% Level 2 (moderate);
• more than 25% Level 3 (major)

This scale has been established on the clear understanding that a final level of breach will be determined after consideration of relevant contextual factors (level of study; previous record of academic misconduct; evidence of intent; other mitigating factors). Faculty policies must state clearly that a Head of School or Dean will consider such factors in finalising judgment about the level of the plagiarism and the penalty applied in the case.

The percentages will relate to the substantive content of the work (i.e. word length excluding properly referenced quotes, and footnotes/endnotes except where plagiarism is contained in the latter). The extent of plagiarism will be calculated to include both unattributed verbatim copying; work in which minor amendments have been made to unattributed source material (through substitution, transposition or exclusion of words); and the close paraphrase of the words and/or specific ideas of another person.

6.2 In relation to forms other than written assessment, such as visual and digital media, computer codes, musical composition and performance, and oral presentations, an estimate of the level of seriousness will be made in relation to the extent to which the plagiarism breaches the intention of the assessment and the guidelines provided for that assessment item (see Plagiarism at http://www.teachingandlearning.uwa.edu.au/401047).

7 Mitigating Circumstances

7.1 In the process of determining the severity (Level) of the breach of academic conduct that has occurred and the appropriate penalty to be applied once a case has been established, Heads of School and Deans may take into account one or more mitigating circumstances that are deemed to bear upon the case.

7.2 Such factors may include, but not be limited to:

(i) differing educational, cultural and/or linguistic backgrounds of students at entry level (defined as students engaged in their first 24 points of study within a course);

(ii) documented medical or personal circumstances of a nature to indicate serious impairment of responsibility at the time the academic misconduct occurred.
8 Principles Relating to the Handling of Alleged Breaches of Academic Conduct

The following principles are to be observed in all cases of alleged breaches:

8.1 Cases of alleged and established breaches of academic conduct must be treated confidentially by staff. Discussion of cases must be limited to those who have a direct line of procedural responsibility in such matters (the relevant unit coordinator, Head of School, Academic Conduct Adviser, Dean and those officers of the University beyond the faculty who are responsible for overseeing procedures relating to breaches of academic conduct).

8.2 Lines of responsibility for investigating cases of a suspected breach must be rigorously adhered to in all faculties and teaching/supervision sections of the University (see Procedural Responsibilities in the Handling of Alleged Academic Misconduct). The only exceptions to the principles of face-to-face interview protocols, timely handling, and lines of responsibility in determining levels and penalties, may occur in the instance of transnational programs where distance factors may demand alternative arrangements. This may include, for example, the delegation of Head of School authority to an appropriately trained senior staff member who co-ordinates and teaches within such programs. Any envisaged variation to these procedures in relation to existing transnational programs must conform as closely as possible to the policy, and those arrangements communicated to students. Variations to procedures in any proposal for future transnational programs must be clearly stated, to be included for consideration as part of the normal approval processes for such programs.

8.3 Unit coordinators must advise students that they are suspected of committing academic misconduct no later than when assessment items are returned to other students. This advice must be confidential and coupled with procedural information so that the student understands what will occur next.

8.4 Established protocols for recording academic misconduct must be adhered to in all faculties and teaching/supervision units of the University.

9 Appeals

In relation to procedures for appeal against findings of academic misconduct, and/or the penalty imposed in such cases, the existing 'Regulations for Student Conduct and Discipline - Section 19: Appeals' (http://www.teachingandlearning.uwa.edu.au/staff/policies/conduct/procedure), details a student's right of appeal against a decision of a staff member via written appeal within ten University working days of notification to the next most senior staff member or body under academic misconduct procedures.
Procedures

1. Recording Procedures in Cases of Academic Misconduct

The following procedures for the generation and keeping of confidential records relating to academic misconduct must be followed centrally, as well as within all faculties and teaching and supervision units at UWA (see ‘Recording Misconduct’ at http://www.teachingandlearning.uwa.edu.au/400067).

1.1 that all faculties, teaching and supervision units at UWA utilise (downloadable) pro forma documents for recording defined instances of academic misconduct at all levels and in all cases, without exception;

1.2 that proformas include ‘Notice of Academic Counselling’ (for use at Level 1 where no penalties are applied) and ‘Academic Misconduct Investigation and Recording’ (at http://www.teachingandlearning.uwa.edu.au/400067);

1.3 that relevant proformas be signed after due deliberation, by the relevant Head of School or Dean as appropriate;

1.4 that a copy of the signed pro forma be provided to the student for their records;

1.5 that all signed proformas be sent to a faculty’s Academic Conduct Adviser, who will enter the relevant notation and information as it appears on the pro forma on a confidential student record, such record not to appear upon a student's academic transcript;

1.6 that the Academic Conduct Adviser send all paper copies of notices to Central Records for confidential safekeeping;

1.7 that access to a student’s confidential record be generally restricted to those University staff members and officers who are nominated under the University's guidelines as being directly responsible for:

   (i) decisions relating to the formulation of appropriate penalties;
   (ii) the oversight of an appeal against an academic misconduct penalty;
   (iii) the re-admission of a student after a period of exclusion;
   (iv) the collation and reporting of de-identified data relating to academic misconduct for the purposes of centralised monitoring and planning;
   (v) external reporting, where necessary.

2. Use of Signed Coversheets/Declarations

2.1 All individual essays and other written work submitted for assessment by students at UWA must be accompanied by a signed coversheet or declaration (proforma to be included at http://www.teachingandlearning.uwa.edu.au/page/59146) stating that the student is aware of extant policy relating to academic misconduct, that the work is their own, that it complies with the guidelines for assessment for that assessment item, and acknowledges that the work may be electronically scanned for detection of plagiarism.

2.2 Further, all group assessments must be accompanied by a coversheet (proforma to be included at http://www.teachingandlearning.uwa.edu.au/page/59146) signed by each group member stating that they are aware of the faculty's extant policy relating to academic misconduct, that their contribution to the group product has been their own work, that they have complied with the guidelines for assessment for that assessment item, and acknowledge that the work may be electronically scanned for detection of plagiarism.
Procedural Responsibilities in the Handling of Alleged Academic Misconduct

It is advisable that the following responsibilities according to role be adhered to within all faculties and teaching/supervision units of the University in the handling of alleged cases of academic misconduct:

3.1 Teaching staff (including sessional staff) other than unit coordinators

3.1.1 Teaching staff including tutors, demonstrators, and other sessional and full-time staff should, in cases of suspected academic misconduct:

(i) Immediately notify the relevant unit coordinator and supply the unit coordinator with details and evidence relating to the matter. In the case of suspected plagiarism, this information should include the relevant work, and reference to the material upon which the work allegedly draws. In other cases of alleged misconduct, staff must furnish unit coordinators with written details of the time, place and circumstances of the alleged misconduct. The matter will then be handled further by the unit coordinator.

3.1.2 Beyond the provision of relevant information to unit coordinators, teaching staff in a unit of study:

(i) Should neither pursue a suspected case of academic misconduct, nor interview a student in relation to it, nor communicate with anyone other than the relevant unit coordinator, Head of School, Dean or other nominated University officer as requested, regarding any alleged case of misconduct.

(ii) Must neither impose independently any penalty for alleged misconduct, nor formulate alternative assessments for the student involved, nor engage in any other procedure outside the existing University and faculty guidelines.

(iii) Must be informed by the relevant unit coordinator at the commencement of each semester of their role and responsibilities in relation to alleged academic misconduct.

3.2 Unit Coordinators

In undergraduate study, the unit coordinator is the official examiner of that unit under University procedures. Therefore:

(i) Unit coordinators may not devolve their responsibilities in relation to academic misconduct to other teaching staff within the unit. In cases where the unit coordinator is unexpectedly ill or otherwise indisposed, the responsibility for initial decisions relating to academic misconduct will be assumed by the Head of School.

(ii) Unit coordinators must brief all relevant staff engaged in teaching and assessment of the unit at the beginning of semester regarding procedures for the handling of academic misconduct within the unit, and particular elements of assessment requirements as they occur in the course of the unit and are notified to students in the unit guide and/or assessment mechanism statement. Particular attention must be given to protocols relating to group work and its assessment, where this element is included for assessment in the unit.

(iii) Unit coordinators will be responsible for advising students that they are suspected of committing academic misconduct no later than when assessment items are returned to other students. This advice must be confidential and coupled with procedural information so that the student understands what will occur next.

(iv) Unit coordinators will report all cases of alleged academic misconduct, except those leading to an advisory ‘Notice of Academic Counselling’ (http://www.teachingandlearning.uwa.edu.au/staff/policies/conduct/procedure), to Heads of School for consideration.

(v) Unit coordinators may issue a ‘Notice of Academic Counselling’ to a student without reference to a Head of School. However, a record of such advice must be forwarded to the Academic Conduct Adviser for central recording purposes, and a signed copy provided to the student.

(vi) Unit coordinators will be responsible for the provision of appropriate academic counselling to students who receive a ‘Notice of Academic Counselling’, which may consist of direct discussion and advice, and/or referral to appropriate support services and materials.

(vii) For instances that unit coordinators believe should lead to deduction of marks for the assessment item, unit coordinators will propose an appropriate deduction of marks, and will forward a ‘Notice of Academic Misconduct’ to the Head of School for confirmation of the proposed deduction.

(viii) Unit coordinators must refer all other higher level instances to Heads of School for handling. In so referring cases, unit coordinators must provide to Heads of Schools the student’s work that is under consideration; supporting details and clear evidence relating to the matter (including copies of relevant material in cases of suspected plagiarism, details of time and circumstances concerning other cases of alleged misconduct, and information provided to students concerning the item of assessment under consideration); and their written advice regarding the level of academic misconduct they believe is evidenced within the work, and, if deemed appropriate, a suggested penalty.
### 3.3 Heads of School
(also Academic Conduct Advisers where Head’s Responsibilities have been Formally Delegated)

3.3.1 The role and responsibilities of Heads of School in relation to academic misconduct may be formally devolved to an appropriately trained Academic Conduct Adviser. For single school faculties where the Head of School and Dean are the same person, it will be necessary for the Dean to appoint a nominee to undertake the role of Head of School as outlined in these Guidelines.

3.3.2 In cases notified to the Head of School for deliberation, the Head of School will review the evidence of academic misconduct and the advice brought before them by the unit coordinator. If a case of misconduct has been established, the Head of School will make further investigation regarding the level of misconduct by accessing a student’s confidential record to assess whether the case is a first or subsequent breach.

3.3.3 The Head of School will then offer an interview to the student concerned, attended by the unit coordinator and the Head, at which the academic misconduct and its level will be discussed as well as evidence of relevant mitigating circumstances. The student may be accompanied by another person.

3.3.4 The Head of School will then make a final determination about the level of academic misconduct where established, and an appropriate penalty for the academic misconduct on the basis of the evidence, the previous record of the student, and any mitigating circumstances relevant to the case.

3.3.5 The Head of School will complete the relevant ‘Notice of Academic Misconduct’, forwarding a signed copy both to the student, and to the Academic Conduct Adviser in the Faculty, within ten working days of determining the outcome of a case.

3.3.6 In any case of academic misconduct that, according to the University guidelines are at a level that may attract penalties exceeding failure within a specific unit of study, namely - the concurrent failure of other units; a period of suspension; exclusion from the faculty; expulsion from the University; and non-conferral of a degree, or that demands referral for warning to the Dean of the Faculty/Dean of Graduate Research and Postdoctoral Training the Head of School will provide full details of the case to the Dean for their consideration. The Head will also provide advice concerning the previous record of the student, the conduct of the matter to date, and the penalty they believe should be applied in the case.

### 3.4 Academic Conduct Advisers (ACAs)

The Academic Conduct Adviser’s role in all faculties would include:

1. **Periodic monitoring of levels of reported academic misconduct within the faculty.**
2. **Liaison with ACAs from other faculties at twice yearly meetings convened by the Dean of Coursework Studies to discuss issues arising from the policy or procedures, to ensure ongoing monitoring of procedures and alterations as required.** It is envisaged that the University Policy on: Academic Conduct be reviewed by this group on a cyclical basis every two years.
3. **Provide relevant information and advice to staff in relation to academic misconduct policy.**

   Heads of School may also choose to devolve some or all of their responsibilities in relation to the handling of academic misconduct to a faculty’s trained ACA. In all such circumstances, the ACA would, in policy terms, exercise the same role as a Head of School, and staff within the School should be informed of the details of any such decision as it may bear on the handling of particular cases.

4. **Where responsibilities with respect to managing aspects of academic conduct have been formally delegated from the Head of School, the ACA’s role would include those of the Head of School listed in 3.3**
3.5 Deans
3.4.1 In cases notified to the Dean for deliberation, the Dean will review the evidence of academic misconduct and the advice brought before them by the Head of School.
3.4.2 The Dean will then offer an interview to the student concerned, attended by the Head of School, at which the academic misconduct and its level will be discussed as well as evidence of relevant mitigating circumstances. The student may be accompanied by another person.
3.4.3 The Dean will then make a final determination about the level of academic misconduct where established, and an appropriate penalty for the academic misconduct on the basis of the evidence, the previous record of the student, and any mitigating circumstances relevant to the case.
3.4.4 The Dean will complete the relevant ‘Notice of Academic Misconduct’, forwarding a signed copy both to the Head of School, the student, and to the Academic Conduct Adviser in the Faculty, within ten working days of determining the outcome of a case.
3.4.5 A proposed penalty for academic misconduct that includes expulsion from the University or non-conferral of a degree, diploma or other award to which the student would otherwise have been entitled must be referred to the Senior Deputy Vice-Chancellor, with appropriate evidence, for referral to a Board of Discipline.

3.5 Beyond the Faculties
The powers and responsibilities of the Senior Deputy Vice-Chancellor and the associated University Board of Discipline as constituted under the ‘Regulations for Student Conduct and Discipline’ (http://www.governance.uwa.edu.au/regulations/student-conduct) will be retained within the new framework.

4. Recording Procedures within Faculties
The following procedures for the generation and keeping of records relating to academic misconduct must be established, and adhered to by all faculties and teaching and supervision units at UWA:

4.1 Level 1, first 48 points of study, first instance
4.1.1 These instances must be recorded by the relevant unit coordinator on a proforma document entitled ‘Notice of Academic Counselling’ (http://www.teachingandlearning.uwa.edu.au/staff/policies/conduct/procedure) to best emphasise the positive educational orientation of UWA’s approach. A copy of the document will be retained by the unit coordinator after discussion with the student. A copy of the document will also be provided to the student who will be asked to acknowledge its receipt.
4.1.2 The ‘Notice of Academic Counselling’ (http://www.teachingandlearning.uwa.edu.au/staff/policies/conduct/procedure) will then be forwarded by the unit coordinator to the Faculty’s Academic Conduct Adviser, who will ensure that the document’s details are entered on a student’s central confidential record.
4.1.3 Such recording is not intended to be punitive: it will, however, provide an efficient basis for academic staff to identify students who continue to engage in academic misconduct. Such records will also, in de-identified aggregate, provide faculty-wide information against which to assess the ongoing effectiveness of educational strategies to diminish minor misconduct.
4.2 All Other levels

4.2.1 Outcomes of cases must be recorded by Heads of School or Deans on the relevant proforma documents pertaining to the level of academic misconduct that has been established (http://www.teachingandlearning.uwa.edu.au/page/59146). Copies of the document will be provided to the student, and to the Faculty's Academic Conduct Adviser to arrange recording of the document's details on a student's confidential electronic record indicating the level and penalty imposed.

5. Appeals

(i) Faculties and other teaching and supervision units must ensure that information relating to appeals cites the correct set of appeal procedures relating to such cases. The relevant appeal regulations are those contained in 'Regulations for Student Conduct and Discipline' section 19: the mechanisms for 'Appeals process in the case where there is dissatisfaction with an assessment result and/or progress status' do not pertain in such cases, and must not be used.

(ii) Any notification of a finding of academic misconduct to a student must include clear information regarding their rights of appeal, the process to be followed and the relevant time limits relating to notification of an appeal if such an option is to be pursued.

(iii) Within the context of an interview with the student by a Head of School, Academic Conduct Adviser or Dean, a student's right of appeal must be reiterated.

(iv) Faculty websites, handbooks and other information relating to academic misconduct provided to students and staff must include information relating to right of appeal.

(v) In the event of a successful appeal leading to dismissal of a finding, a student's confidential electronic record must be amended to remove any reference to the original finding and/or penalty in the case, and relevant paperwork associated with the case and the appeal stored securely in central records. In the event that an appeal results in the modification of a finding and/or a penalty, a student's electronic record must be amended to remove the original finding and to reflect the modified finding and/or penalty only. The relevant paperwork associated with the case and the appeal must be transmitted to central records for secure storage.

6. Specific Faculty Definitions and Use of Levels

6.1 All faculties and teaching/supervision units at UWA must put in context the common definition of academic misconduct, using the Level 1 (Minor)/2 (Moderate)/3 (Major) framework, and emphasise those elements of academic misconduct of particular relevance to teaching and learning in the faculty.

6.2 In particular, faculties must provide to students upon enrolment, via faculty and other relevant websites and printed material, specific information including:

(i) clear definitions that best reflect the principle concerns within any faculty regarding academic misconduct, including local definitions of plagiarism, group work protocols, open book examination protocols and/or appropriate laboratory/research procedures;

(ii) a guide about the quantity of plagiarism within an assessment that will equate to preliminary findings of Level 1 ('minor'), Level 2 ('moderate') and Level 3 ('major') misconduct, set at less than 10%, 10-25%, and more than 25%, respectively; and that close paraphrase and 'cut and paste' techniques are encompassed by the policy;

(iii) advice to students:

(a) regarding the avenues of guidance they may seek to improve their understanding of both academic literacy and academic misconduct (tutors, lecturers, student service advisers, online programs such as those provided by the library);

(b) that they must inform themselves about any more detailed individual assessment item guidelines that will be provided within unit guides and/or Assessment Mechanism Statements (c) directly or via links to other relevant support material to assist them to develop appropriate skills in note-taking, writing and referencing, to meet faculty standards;
(d) concerning the approaches to group work used within the faculty, including assessment and the handling of suspected misconduct within items submitted by a group for assessment;
(e) about the avenues of support within the faculty through which further advice concerning plagiarism and its avoidance may be gained;
(f) about the scope of sources to which plagiarism policy may relate, including visual, digital, musical and other media forms, and computer codes;
(g) about appropriate local referencing conventions;
(h) that they must read and sign an appropriate declaration or coversheet to be attached to each item of assessment within a unit;
(i) concerning procedures in the investigation of academic misconduct;
(j) concerning penalties for established cases of misconduct at different levels;
(k) that qualitative factors will also be used in finalising judgments relating to seriousness of plagiarism;
(l) that all cases of established misconduct will be centrally recorded as part of a confidential record, such record not to appear on a student’s official academic transcript;
(m) concerning their rights and responsibilities in relation to appeal mechanisms in cases of academic misconduct, and the availability of advice in such instances from the Guild Education Office;
(n) about protocols for transnational students, ensuring that principles and practices conform to University policy.

6.3 All Faculty guidelines should be made available in electronic form and facilitate a direct link to the central website regarding academic misconduct, for ease of use by students and staff.

Information in Unit Outlines and Assessment Guides

7.1 Within unit outlines and/or Assessment Mechanism Statements, unit coordinators should direct students to relevant academic misconduct (including plagiarism) policies, associated penalties and appeal information for the faculty in which the unit is offered.

7.2 Information to students relating to any individual item of assessment should be included either in the unit outline, or in detailed assessment instructions, and should include explicit guidelines to clarify:

(i) the extent, if any, of permissible collaboration (group discussion; and/or collaborative research; and/or sharing of notes; and/or collaborative writing);

(ii) in the case of group work where it constitutes part of unit assessment, an instruction for students to retain such items as research notes and a record of their individual input, and any further measures to ensure accountability, that may later be called upon in the investigation of cases of suspected academic misconduct.

Related forms: (Link)

Academic Misconduct Investigation and Recording:
http://www.teachingandlearning.uwa.edu.au/400067

Notice of Academic Counselling
http://www.teachingandlearning.uwa.edu.au/400067
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Use of Turnitin

This assignment required a Turnitin originality report

I used Turnitin for my own purposes to check my work

I submit the Turnitin originality report with this assignment

Academic Integrity is defined in the UWA Policy on Academic Conduct as “acting with the values of honesty, trust, fairness, respect and responsibility in learning, teaching and research”. UWA expects the highest degree of academic conduct from all students. Penalties for academic misconduct vary according to seriousness of the case, and may include the requirement to do further work or repeat work; deduction of marks; the award of zero marks for the assessment; failure of one or more units; suspension from a course of study; exclusion from the University; non-conferment of a degree, diploma or other award to which the student would otherwise have been entitled. For further information on the rules and procedures in respect of appropriate academic conduct you should visit: http://www.teachingandlearning.uwa.edu.au/tla/for_uwa_staff/policies/student_related_policies/academic Conduct

Plagiarism is one example of academic misconduct

1. Plagiarism is taking someone else’s thought, writing or invention and claiming it as your own.
2. All references to other work must be properly cited in the text eg. (Smith 1996) and the article must be fully described in a references section including author’s name, date, title, book/journal, volume/ page numbers.

Late assignments submitted outside office hours will be receipted at 8.30 a.m. the following working day.

No assignment will be accepted unless the following statement is signed and dated.

"I certify that I possess a copy of the attached work submitted".

"I certify that the attached assignment/report is my own work and that all material drawn from other sources has been fully acknowledged”.

“I understand that this work may be checked for originality through the use of Turnitin or other electronic means”

Signed ...................................................... Date ..........................................

A39
Good Practice Guide on use of text matching software (*TurnItIn*)

This guide relates to the use of the text matching software *Turnitin* by staff and students at the University of Western Australia (UWA). It promotes the educative use of the software for students to enhance their academic practices and in the development of an institutional culture of academic integrity. When used as a tool to indicate potential plagiarism in students’ work, this guide should be read in conjunction with the University Policy on Academic Conduct.

**What is Turnitin text-matching software?**

Text-matching software analyses submitted work and identifies sections of text which match electronic sources on the internet, in electronic publications, and in other students’ work. It is a tool to assist in identifying plagiarism as well as one to help students improve their academic writing by increasing their awareness of how effectively they are incorporating external sources and referencing them.

UWA has a license for University staff and students to use the *Turnitin* commercial software. It is available as an activity within an LMS unit and set up by academic staff.

**How Turnitin works**

*Turnitin* matches electronic text publically available on the internet.

*Turnitin* will not match texts from sources such as books that are not digitally available, journals that *Turnitin* does not subscribe to, text that has been converted to an image, material that is password protected on intranets, material that has been electronically translated from a non-English source, or work written by someone else (ghost writing). *Turnitin* will not check specialised text such as graphics, formulae and software coding. Other software products may support these uses for disciplines where such text is integral.

*Turnitin* is neither the only nor a definitive method of identifying plagiarism. It assists in signalling poor academic practice and should be used judiciously by staff in the cases of suspected plagiarism. It is not appropriate for all student assignments.

**Good practice #1:** Academic staff determine whether *Turnitin* is appropriate for each assignment.

**Good practice #2:** Academic staff use other supporting evidence in suspected cases of plagiarism.

*Turnitin* generates an originality report that identifies all areas of the submitted work that are similar or the same as content as sources in the *Turnitin* repository.

**Good practice #3:** For future content-matching effectiveness, staff should set the *TurnItIn* submission activity so that work submitted to *Turnitin* is added to the *Turnitin* world database.

*Turnitin* provides a similarity index for each piece of work, which represents the percentage of the assignment that matches text in other sources. High scores should always be investigated further; for lower scores, the similarity index provides limited information. The figure that might be expected for an assignment can vary greatly depending on

- the nature of the assignment
- the use by students of non-electronic source materials

As at 10 November 2014
• the options chosen when setting up the assignment (e.g. excluding the bibliography or small matches).

Viewing the similarity index with the originality report provides a breakdown of all the areas of content match (with the largest listed first) and highlights the matching text in the student’s work. A high similarity index may have an originality report showing a large number of small matches, each properly cited, whereas an assignment with a lower index may have a significant section plagiarised from a single source.

**Good Practice #4:** Staff do not identify or communicate to students an ideal, minimum or maximum score for the similarity index.

**Good Practice #5:** Originality report and similarity index are viewed together to determine whether plagiarism is suspected.

For detailed support in using Turnitin please refer to the Turnitin section of the LMS Staff Help Site.

**Good practice in using Turnitin at UWA by role and responsibility**

UWA’s approach to the use of Turnitin is one of promoting academic integrity in an educative context.

**Good Practice #6:** Turnitin is used in conjunction with supporting practices and attitudes, such as correct referencing and citation styles, copyright management, and information literacy.

**Overall responsibilities**

Faculties, in conjunction with the central bodies including the Centre for the Advancement of Teaching and Learning (CATL), University Library and Student Services, clearly communicate to staff and students the role of Turnitin as both an educative tool and a means of confirming originality of submitted work. Staff articulate to students the process and procedures related to the use of Turnitin in their courses and units.

**Deans / Heads of School**

Under the guidance of Deans, Associate Deans, and Heads of Schools, Faculties and Schools are responsible for developing policy on the role and use of Turnitin.

**Good Practice #7:** Faculties develop locally-specific policy on the role and use of Turnitin.

**Good Practice #8:** Faculties / Schools communicate the policy to their staff and students in appropriate locations such as School or Faculty websites, handbooks, and other relevant places.

**Course Coordinators**

Developing student knowledge and effective practice in academic integrity is an educative process that requires focus and experience in student learning over time.

**Good Practice #9:** Students engage with Turnitin as often as possible in their first year of study at university.

**Good Practice #10:** Students have the opportunity to learn about Turnitin and learn from those experiences.

**Good Practice #11:** Course coordinators ensure all students have the opportunity to use Turnitin in at least one level one unit. At UWA, with New Courses, this practically would mean that all level one courses use Turnitin to ensure no student misses the opportunity to learn.
Unit Coordinators

Unit coordinators are responsible for ensuring that students learn about how Turnitin works, how to learn from originality reports, how to use it, and its role in plagiarism detection.

**Good Practice #12:** Unit coordinators identify all assignments within their units that are compatible with the functions of Turnitin and use where appropriate.

**Good Practice #13:** Unit coordinators ensure that students are fully aware of the requirements regarding the Turnitin assignment by listing them in the unit outline, on LMS, and other appropriate avenues for the dissemination of unit-based information to students.

Note: Turnitin support for students that is available within the Turnitin topic of the LMS Student Help Site and the STUDYSmarter Turnitin Survival Guide.

**Good Practice #14:** Unit coordinators provide students, particularly in Level 1 units, with the opportunity to check draft assignments using Turnitin, for educative purposes.

**Good Practice #15:** Draft submissions with an educational intent are not set for inclusion in the Turnitin databank – this is to allow students to trial and learn with confidence, and technically as once an assessment item is submitted in the database it will treat the final submission as a near complete copy and interrupt the integrity of the originality report.

**Good Practice #16:** Student final draft submissions are technically enabled so that they are added to the Turnitin world database to support the integrity of the process.

**Good Practice #17:** Unit coordinators communicate to students that submitted work, in particular final submitted versions, will be added to the Turnitin database.

**Good Practice #18:** Unit coordinators ensure that all teaching staff within the unit are informed and trained in the use of Turnitin and are aware of their role and responsibilities in relation to alleged academic misconduct.

**Good Practice #19:** Unit Coordinators who suspect plagiarism in an assignment where there is no accompanying originality report request an electronic copy of the student’s work if submitted in hardcopy or run the student’s work through Turnitin themselves to generate an originality report.

**Good Practice #20:** Unit Coordinators follow the procedure outlined in the University Policy on Academic Conduct, Procedures, Item 3.2 in cases of suspected plagiarism supported by a Turnitin report.

**Good Practice #21:** Unit Coordinators gather other supporting evidence and do not rely solely on text-matching software as the only evidence of potential plagiarism.

**Other teaching staff (including sessional staff, tutors, demonstrators, etc)**

All other staff have a role to inform and educate students, and report on suspected cases of plagiarism as appropriate to the Unit Coordinator. All staff with a teaching oriented role in an LMS unit (lecturer, tutor, non-grading tutor) have access to Turnitin through the LMS.
Good Practice #22: Teaching staff familiarise themselves with the use and limitations of Turnitin particularly in relation to interpretation of text match reports.

Detailed information is available in the Turnitin section of the LMS Staff Help site.

Good Practice #23: Teaching staff ensure that students are aware of the use of Turnitin and where necessary direct them to Turnitin support for students that is available within the Turnitin topic of the LMS Student Help Site and the STUDYSmarter Turnitin Survival Guide.

Academic Conduct Advisers (ACA)

Good Practice #24: Academic Conduct Advisers respond to reports of suspected plagiarism based on a Turnitin report by carefully reviewing the originality report and seeking further supporting evidence outside the Turnitin text matching process.

For further information about Turnitin and support available, staff should refer to the Turnitin section of the LMS Staff Help site.

Support for UWA Staff and Students

STAFF

Self-access information:
- CATL Turnitin Webpage
- LMS Staff Help site

In Person
E: help-elearning@uwa.edu.au, P: 6488 8190
Demonstrations in your School/Faculty or at CATL workshops http://www.catl.uwa.edu.au/e-learning/development

STUDENTS

Self-access information:
- AskUWA
- LMS Student Help Site
- STUDYSmarter Turnitin Survival Guide

In Person:
E: askuwa-is@uwa.edu.au
Via library staff in subject libraries, Unit Co-ordinator, Lecturer or Tutor
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Proposal to Rationalise the Education Committee Structure

Background
In early September 2014, the University Executive considered and noted that the Committees Working Party Report: To Improve the Administrative Efficiency and Effectiveness of Committees (August 2014), had improved the operating principles and administrative practices in the management of committees and that the next phase of work would involve:

- a review within each portfolio, by the portfolio holder, of the governance arrangements in place, with a view to achieving a more effective use of committees in that portfolio; and
- a review at the institutional level, as part of the functional review process, of the committee system as a whole as part of the broader institutional governance function.

The aim of this proposal, as requested by the Deputy Vice-Chancellor (Education) is to clarify the governance arrangements and implement a more effective use of committees within the education portfolio. The proposal has been considered and approved in principle by the Deputy Vice-Chancellor (Education) and the Dean of Coursework Studies.

The Deputy Vice-Chancellor (Education), as Chair of the three key Academic Council Standing Committees (Admissions, Teaching and Learning and Board of Coursework Studies), has requested its referral to the Academic Board for consideration and approval via the University committee system.

Current Committee Structure
The current education-related committee structure is at Appendix A. In summary there are eleven committees that have been included in this review:

- Admissions Committee
- Teaching and Learning Committee
  o Two Standing Committees – Awards and Grants and Schemes
- Board of Coursework Studies
  o Five Standing Boards of Studies
  o Board of Studies – Board of Examiners

The following committees have been considered out of scope for this review:

- Strategic Information Technology and Information Management Committee (SITIMC), an advisory committee to the Vice-Chancellor, chaired by the DVC(E);
- Coursework Scholarships Sub-Committee, a sub-committee of the Scholarships Committee and Board of the Graduate Research School, chaired by the Dean of Coursework Studies; and
- Separately constituted external committees such as UWA Foundation Program – Board of Studies and Management Committee.

Proposed Committee Structure
The proposed committee structure is at Appendix A and comprises three committees:

- Education Committee – as a standing committee of the Academic Council
- Curriculum Committee – as a standing committee of the Education Committee
- Education Futures Strategy Group – as a standing committee of the Education Committee

Key Principles and Issues
This greatly reduced committee structure is based on the following principles:

- Clarity in the delineation between governance and management;
- Appropriate quality assurance;
- Alignment of roles and responsibilities with expertise;
- Appropriate steering to appropriate committees reducing overlap;
- Improved delegations to relevant officers and administrative sections in line with policy.
Some of the key issues that have enabled this realignment include:

- **Timing** – the Boards of Studies were established to manage the major task of introducing and implementing new courses. The first cohort of students will graduate at the end of 2014 and the high level of curriculum related work at the undergraduate level has now greatly reduced. Cycle 2 is still very active.
- **Management Structure** – changes in the management structure over the last couple of years and the new portfolio positions established, including Pro Vice-Chancellor (International), Dean of Coursework Studies, and Pro Vice-Chancellor (Education Innovation) have provided the opportunity for improved delegations and responsibilities.
- **Improved policies** over the last few years enable more efficient decision-making.
- **Improved use of technology and systems** to provide curriculum data (CAIDI) which has streamlined agenda documentation, and provides greater transparency and accountability.

**Supporting documentation**
To achieve the proposed reduction in committees, the following documentation is provided:

**Appendix B**   Flow chart indicating administrative and management responsibilities and the flow on to the committee structure – steering will ensure appropriate governance by the appropriate committee.

**Appendix C**   Mapping of the current roles and responsibilities of the eleven committees to the proposed new three committees and appropriate delegations where possible.

**Appendix D**   Proposed Committee Constitutions indicating role and membership:
  - Education Committee
  - Curriculum Committee
  - Education Futures Strategy Group

Additional work has also been undertaken including mapping of current membership to future membership, which provides a clear picture of ‘released potential’, in particular academic representation on committees; and sample mapping of agenda items (eg Admissions Committee) to indicate that its disestablishment can be accommodated by the new committee structure. A communication and implementation strategy has also been formulated to manage this proposal through appropriate channels. As part of this strategy, key University officers have also been consulted, including Chair of the Academic Board, University Executive, Deans of Faculties, Chairs and Executive Officers of relevant committees.
Proposed – Education Committee Structure

Academic Council

Education Committee
Chair: DVC(E)
(Standing Committee of the Academic Council)

Education Futures Strategy Group
Chair: PVC (EI)
(Standing Committee of the Education Committee)

Curriculum Committee
Chair: Dean of Coursework Studies
(Standing Committee of the Education Committee)

Steered to appropriate committee

Governance

Management

Draft - October 2014
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Committees</th>
<th>Constitutional Role - current</th>
<th>Future</th>
<th>Operationally managed in line with policy or by delegation to relevant officer</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Admissions Committee</td>
<td>The role of the Admissions Committee is to monitor, advise, undertake research and make recommendations to the Academic Council on— (a) undergraduate and postgraduate (by coursework) admissions, including but not limited to the University’s entry requirements including prerequisites and English language competence; (b) the University’s policy on assessment and recognition of overseas qualifications recognition of external onshore or offshore academic programs as entry pathways; and (c) articulation of entry agreements between the University and other educational institutions or local providers; and (d) policy matters relating to the University’s relationships with external stakeholders such as the Department of Education (WA), the School Curriculum Standards Authority, the Tertiary Institutions Service Centre, other universities and all school systems.</td>
<td>Admission requirements as part of course rules - not in line with policy</td>
<td>Dean, Coursework Studies / Pro Vice-Chancellor (International)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(2) In carrying out its functions, the committee must give due consideration to approved University and faculty objectives as set out in Strategic and Operational Priorities Plans.</td>
<td>New and amendments to Policies</td>
<td>Approval based on precedents set - by Dean, Coursework Studies (onshore providers) / Pro Vice-Chancellor (International) Offshore providers</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Board of Coursework Studies</td>
<td>consider and make recommendations to Academic Council on policy matters relating to the structure and content of undergraduate and postgraduate coursework; receive and consider proposals submitted through the appropriate process for the introduction of, and major changes to, coursework units, majors and courses, and make recommendations to Academic Council on these and associated policy matters.</td>
<td>Establishment of academic comparability</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Boards of Studies - BA, Bcom, Bdes, BSc</td>
<td>provide curriculum development advice to faculties and recommendations, as required, to the Board of Coursework Studies on the following: (i) degree-specific majors for the Bachelor of Arts; (ii) embedding the UWA Educational Principles in degree-specific majors; (iii) prerequisites, co-requisites and related matters; (iv) units, including broadening units; (v) articulation agreements; (vi) annual reports, incorporating performance and quality data; and (vii) deal executively with or provide advice on other matters referred to the Board of Studies for the Bachelor of Arts by the Board of Coursework Studies or Academic Council.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Committees</td>
<td>Constitutional Role - current</td>
<td>Future</td>
<td>Operationally managed in line with policy or by delegation to relevant officer</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>----------------------------------</td>
<td>----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>-----------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>--------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Education Committee</td>
<td></td>
<td>Education Committee</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Curriculum Committee</td>
<td></td>
<td>Curriculum Committee</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Education Futures Strategy Group</td>
<td></td>
<td>Education Futures Strategy Group</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Board of Studies - BPhil (Hons)</td>
<td>ensure that the Bachelor of Philosophy (Honours) operates efficiently and effectively, and to make recommendations, as required, to the Board of Coursework Studies on the following matters:</td>
<td>Policy related</td>
<td>Operational - Dean, Coursework Studies</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(i) Selection criteria/procedures for entry</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(ii) annual reports, incorporating performance and quality data</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(b) advise and guide the coordinator of the Bachelor of Philosophy (Honours) on its implementation, including</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(i) arrangements for research-intensive experiences and other appropriate learning opportunities and special requirements; and</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(ii) the residential program</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(c) review, as directed by the Chair of the Board of Coursework Studies, any aspect of the Bachelor of Philosophy (Honours); and</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(b) deal executively with or provide advice on other matters referred to the Board of Studies for the Bachelor of Arts by the Board of Coursework Studies or Academic Council.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Board of Examiners - Board of Examiners</td>
<td>The Board of Examiners of the Boards of Studies (BoE-BoS) is established as a standing committee of the Board of Coursework Studies to deal executively with all related academic matters including, but not limited to, the following extract from University Policy on Boards of Examiners and the Academic Progress Review Sub-Committee - UP13/12</td>
<td>Delegated to Dean, Coursework Studies by the Curriculum Committee</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(a) the award of honours classifications, where these are not routine in nature, or relate to joint-honours classifications for new undergraduate degree courses;</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(b) all exceptional cases relating to academic progress assessment that have been escalated by an Academic Progress Review Sub-Committee [See 3.2(d)] for further deliberation; and</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(c) faculty recommendations on applications for readmission from students who have been excluded from an undergraduate degree course or a diploma course at least 12 months previously.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Teaching and Learning Committee (incorporating its two Standing Committees - Awards, and Grants and Schemes)</td>
<td>(a) advise and make recommendations to the Academic Council and/or other University bodies or officers, as appropriate, on—</td>
<td>Policy related</td>
<td>Deputy Vice-Chancellor (Education)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(i) matters relating to teaching and learning in the University including all aspects of the student learning experience, and the University’s education strategy;</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(ii) the quality of teaching and learning in the institution;</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(iii) means of assessing and improving the quality of teaching and learning;</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(iv) means of encouraging and rewarding high quality teaching and learning;</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(v) the use of technology in teaching and learning;</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(vi) research studies on teaching and learning; and</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(vii) matters arising through liaison with relevant external bodies; and</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(b) allocate its annual budget to support and promote high quality teaching and learning.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
APPENDIX D

Education Committee (constitution)
This committee operates in accordance with the Principles and Rules for the Operation of Committees. Members must act in accordance with the University Committee Members’ Code of Conduct.

Position of the Committee within the University of Western Australia
1. The Education Committee is a standing committee of the Academic Council.

Role
2. The role of the Committee is to—
   (a) advise and make recommendations to the Academic Council and/or other University bodies or officers, as appropriate, on policy and strategic matters relating to:
      (i) the University’s education strategy and vision, including aspects of the student learning experience;
      (ii) the quality of teaching and learning in the institution;
      (iii) undergraduate and postgraduate (coursework) admissions; and
      (iv) the academic structure and framework of undergraduate and postgraduate coursework;
   (b) allocate its annual budget to support and promote the University’s education priorities.

Membership
3.(1) The Committee comprises:
   (a) the Deputy Vice-Chancellor (Education) (as Chair);
   (b) the Chair of the Academic Board;
   (c) the Dean of Coursework Studies;
   (d) the Pro Vice-Chancellor (Education Innovation);
   (e) the Pro Vice-Chancellor (International);
   (f) the Dean of Graduate Research and Postdoctoral Training;
   (g) the Deans of Faculties or nominee;
   (h) the Dean of the School of Indigenous Studies or nominee;
   (i) the Director, Student Services;
   (j) the Director, Academic Policy Services;
   (k) the President of the Guild of Undergraduates;
   (l) the President of the Postgraduate Students’ Association, or nominee;
   (m) up to two co-opted members selected from the academic members of Academic Board.
(2) The Chair may appoint a Deputy Chair from among the members to perform essential duties in the Chair’s absence.
(3) The Chair may invite one or more persons to attend meetings to provide advice on specific areas or agenda items.
(4) Co-opted members are appointed for two years and may be reappointed for a second term only.

Members’ Absence and Nominees
4.(1) In the event that a member is unable to attend a meeting, that member may nominate a person to attend that meeting in their stead.
(2) Nominations must be in writing and received by the Executive Officer prior to the relevant meeting.

Skills and/or qualifications of members and nominees
5. It is desirable that members and nominees have a leadership role within the education portfolio in their respective functional area, or other leadership role related to the student learning experience, and this important role is to be taken into account when nominees are appointed.

Quorum
6. The quorum for the Committee is half the current membership plus one.
Decisions

7. (1) Each member has a vote.
   (2) The Chair has an ordinary vote and a casting vote.
   (3) Decisions are made by a majority of the members present and voting.

Frequency of Meetings

8. The Committee normally meets up to four times each year in the months of February to November but may meet more frequently if required.

Delegation

9. (1) The Committee delegates to the Deputy Vice-Chancellor (Education) responsibility for the annual budget to support education priorities across the education portfolio in line with the University’s strategic plan.
   (2) The Deputy Vice-Chancellor (Education) will provide an annual report to the Education Committee on expenditure and commitments.

Decision-making and communication maps

Local decision-making map – to be formulated
Local communications map – to be formulated

As amended by Teaching and Learning Committee – 5 November 2014
Curriculum Committee (constitution)

This committee operates in accordance with the Principles and Rules for the Operation of Committees. Members must act in accordance with the University Committee Members' Code of Conduct.

Position of the Committee within the University of Western Australia

1. The Curriculum Committee is a standing committee of the Education Committee.

Role

2. The role of the Committee is to—
   (a) consider and make recommendations to the Academic Council on proposals submitted through the appropriate process for the introduction of new curriculum offerings, including articulation agreements and major changes to curriculum;
   (b) advise and make recommendations to the Education Committee on policy and strategic matters relating to the academic structure and framework of coursework courses;
   (c) provide coursework curriculum development advice to faculties, other University bodies or officers as appropriate;
   (d) review, as directed by the Chair of the Education Committee, any aspect of undergraduate and postgraduate coursework.
   (e) formulate and review appropriate schemes, funded from (but not limited to) the Education Committee's annual budget, to support the University's education portfolio.

Membership

3.(1) The Committee comprises:
   (a) the Dean of Coursework Studies (as Chair);
   (b) the Deputy or Associate Chair of the Academic Board;
   (c) the Dean of Graduate Research and Postdoctoral Training;
   (d) the chair of each faculty and School of Indigenous Studies teaching and learning/education committee, or nominee of the Dean;
   (e) the Academic Secretary;
   (f) the Associate Director, Admissions Centre
   (g) the Associate Director (International Admissions), International Centre
   (h) the Academic Coordinator for the Bachelor of Philosophy (Honours);
   (i) the President of the Guild of Undergraduates or nominee;
   (j) a postgraduate coursework student nominated by the President of the Postgraduate Students’ Association
   (k) up to two co-opted members, if required for balance or specific expertise.

   (2) The Chair may appoint a Deputy Chair and an Associate Chair from among the members to perform essential duties under delegated authority.
   (3) The Chair may invite one or more persons to attend meetings to provide advice on specific areas or agenda items.
   (4) Co-opted members are appointed for two years and may be reappointed for a second term only.

Members' Absence and Nominees

4.(1) In the event that a member is unable to attend a meeting, that member may nominate a person to attend that meeting in their stead.
   (2) Nominations must be in writing and received by the Executive Officer prior to the relevant meeting.

Skills and/or qualifications of members and nominees

5. It is desirable that members and nominees have a leadership role within the education portfolio in their respective functional area, or other leadership role related to teaching and learning, and this important role is to be taken into account when nominees are appointed.

Quorum

6. The quorum for the Committee is half the current membership plus one.
Decisions
7. (1) Each member has a vote.
(2) The Chair has an ordinary vote and a casting vote.
(3) Decisions are made by a majority of the members present and voting.

Frequency of Meetings
8. The Committee normally meets up to six times each year in the months of February to November but may meet more frequently if required.

Delegations
9. (1) Where new curriculum proposals and major changes to existing curriculum comply with approved policy, the Chair, Deputy Chair or Associate Chair have delegated authority to steer such proposals direct to the Academic Council for consideration.
(2) The Committee delegates to the Chair or to the Executive Officer, as appropriate, the responsibility to consider and approve minor curriculum changes or administrative changes as part of the annual curriculum change process or the fast-track change process.
(3) The Committee delegates to the Chair the responsibility to consider and determine academic results that are not routine in nature, e.g. the award of joint-honours classifications

Decision-making and communication maps
Local decision-making map – to be formulated
Local communications map – to be formulated

As amended by Teaching and Learning Committee – 5 November 2014
Education Futures Strategy Group (constitution)

This committee operates in accordance with the Principles and Rules for the Operation of Committees. Members must act in accordance with the University Committee Members’ Code of Conduct.

Position of the Committee within the University of Western Australia

1. The Education Futures Strategy Group is a standing committee of the Education Committee.

Role

2. The role of the Education Futures Strategy Group is to—
   (a) advise and make recommendations to the Education Committee on policy and strategic matters relating to the University’s education strategy and vision; and
   (b) make recommendations to other University bodies or officers, as appropriate on teaching and learning including
      (i) the student learning experience;
      (ii) assessing and improving the quality of educational delivery;
      (iii) the use of technology and innovations in teaching and learning;
      (iv) relevant research studies; and
   (c) formulate and review appropriate schemes, funded from (but not limited to) the Education Committee’s annual budget, to support the University’s education portfolio.

Membership

3.(1) The Education Futures Strategy Group comprises:
   (a) the Pro Vice-Chancellor (Education Innovation) (as Chair);
   (b) the Dean of Coursework Studies;
   (c) the Chair of the Academic Board or nominee;
   (d) the Chief Information Officer;
   (e) Associate Deans (Teaching and Learning/Education) in the faculties and the School of Indigenous Studies, or nominee of the dean;
   (f) the Director, Centre for the Advancement of Teaching and Learning;
   (g) the Director, Education Strategies Office;
   (h) the Director, UWA Student Residences;
   (i) the Associate Director, Student Support Services;
   (j) the University Librarian;
   (k) the President of the Guild of Undergraduates or nominee;
   (l) the President of the Postgraduate Students’ Association or nominee;
   (m) up to two co-opted members, if required for balance or specific expertise.

   (2) The Chair may appoint a Deputy Chair from among the members to perform essential duties in the Chair’s absence.
   (3) The Chair may invite one or more persons to attend meetings to provide advice on specific areas or agenda items.
   (4) Co-opted members are appointed for two years and may be reappointed for a second term only.

Members’ Absence and Nominees

4.(1) In the event that a member is unable to attend a meeting, that member may nominate a person to attend that meeting in their stead.
   (2) Nominations must be in writing and received by the Executive Officer prior to the relevant meeting.

Skills and/or qualifications of members and nominees

5. It is desirable that members and nominees have a leadership role within the education portfolio in their respective functional area, or other leadership role related to the student learning experience, and this important role is to be taken into account when nominees are appointed.
Quorum
6. The quorum for the Education Futures Strategy Group is half the current membership plus one.

Decisions
7. (1) Each member has a vote.
   (2) The Chair has an ordinary vote and a casting vote.
   (3) Decisions are made by a majority of the members present and voting.

Frequency of Meetings
8. The Education Futures Strategy Group normally meets up to six times each year in the months of February to November but may meet more frequently if required.

Delegations
9. (1) The Education Futures Strategy Group delegates to established selection groups, as appropriate, oversight of the day-to-day operation of education-related schemes and to make and action decisions that are within the parameters of established guidelines.
   (2) Any changes to existing guidelines for education-related schemes under 2(c) must be forwarded by the relevant selection group to the Education Futures Strategy Group for its approval.

Decision-making and communication maps
Local decision-making map – to be formulated
Local communications map – to be formulated