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TEACHING AND LEARNING COMMITTEE AGENDA BY CIRCULAR
As advised by email on 29th August 2014 the meeting of the Teaching and Learning Committee scheduled for Thursday 4th September 2014 has been cancelled as there is insufficient business to warrant a meeting.

Attached are items for information and consideration by circular. If you do not agree with the recommendations from the Chair in Part 2 or would prefer that the item(s) be referred to the next meeting for discussion, please contact me no later than Tuesday, 9th September. If there are no objections by that date the items in Part 2 will be processed in the normal way and the recommendations will be recorded as resolutions of the Teaching and Learning Committee.

Ms Sue Smurthwaite
Director
Academic Policy Services

Appointment from 1st October 2014
AGENDA

PART 1- ITEMS FOR COMMUNICATION AND NOTING

1. REPORT FROM CATL - TEACHING AND LEARNING WEEK 2014 – FILE REF F60533

Attached (Attachment A) for members’ information is a report on Teaching and Learning Week 2014 from the Director of CATL.

For information and noting.

2. PROGRESS REPORT FROM CATL –PROGRAMS SUPPORTED BY THE TEACHING AND LEARNING COMMITTEE – FILE REF F12090

Attached (Attachment B) for members’ information is a mid-year progress report from CATL on programs supported by the Teaching and Learning Committee.

For information and noting.

3. REPORT FROM DEPUTY VICE-CHANCELLOR (EDUCATION) – EDUCATION PORTFOLIO – FILE REF F62031

Attached (Attachment C) for members’ information is a report to Senate, at its 25th August meeting, from the Deputy Vice-Chancellor (Education) on the Education Portfolio, incorporating the following issues:

- Strategic Alignment
- New Courses
- Education Futures
- Student Surveys
- Student Recruitment
- Deregulation

For information and noting.

PART 2 – ITEMS FOR DECISION

4. 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] has been under review by the Centre for the Advancement of Teaching and Learning and is now referred to the Committee for its consideration.

In undertaking this review, the Director of CATL advises that the changes have been minimal since the policy has 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 has been 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. This also sits well with the present ethos surrounding Education Futures. The role of the Academic Conduct Advisers has also been made explicit in the policy which was previously missing from the document.

The following items are attached:

- University Policy on Academic Conduct – proposed amendments indicating tracked changes (Attachment D1-21)
- University Policy on Academic Conduct – amended version with changes accepted (Attachment D22-38)
- Proposed assignment coversheet (Attachment D 39) – refer clause 2 of the procedures.
The Director of CATL further advises that:

- CATL will update the University’s Academic Conduct website (refer http://www.teachingandlearning.uwa.edu.au/staff/policies/conduct) to align with these proposed changes in due course; and
- the Good Practice Guide on use of text matching software (refer D12) is currently being formulated by CATL and will be available on the website to coincide with the updating this Policy.

The Chair recommends that the Teaching and Learning Committee endorse the proposed amendments to the University Policy on Academic Conduct, as attached to this agenda, and refer the amended policy to the Academic Council for approval.

5. **NEW UNIVERSITY POLICY ON TEACHING PERIODS– FILE REF F40619**

Teaching periods at UWA have increased over time and include standard teaching periods, namely semesters, trimesters or summer session and non-standard teaching periods which fall outside these categories. A number of issues have been raised relating to the overall management of teaching periods resulting in a request to Academic Policy Services and Student Services to formulate a University Policy on Teaching Periods.

For members consideration, a proposed new University Policy on Teaching Periods is attached (Attachment E) 

The Chair recommends that the Teaching and Learning Committee endorse the proposed University Policy on Teaching Periods, as attached to the agenda, and refer the policy to the Academic Council for approval.

6. **NEXT MEETING**

The next meeting of the Teaching and Learning Committee will be held on Thursday, 13th November 2014 at 2.00pm in the Old Senate Room. The cut-off date for submission of items for the Committee’s agenda is Thursday, 30th October 2014. Please refer issues for discussion to the Executive Officer, Ms Sue Smurthwaite (sue.smurthwaite@uwa.edu.au).
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Report on Teaching and Learning Week 2014
Prepared by Clare Peter for the Teaching and Learning Committee.

PURPOSE
Teaching and Learning Week (previously known as Teaching & Learning Month) is an annual event, coordinated by the Centre for the Advancement of Teaching and Learning (CATL) and funded by the UWA Teaching and Learning Committee.

The event has historically taken place over two weeks, however, due to feedback from the Associate Deans (Teaching and Learning) and that UWA was hosting the annual WA Teaching and Learning Forum, it was reduced to one week and incorporated centrally organised events as well as the University’s annual Teaching Awards Ceremony.

Teaching and Learning Week activities are designed to:
• increase the general awareness of the importance that the University places on teaching and learning activities
• celebrate excellence in teaching through the recognition of award winners
• expose UWA staff to different perspectives through presentations by visiting distinguished teachers
• provide opportunities to generate intra-faculty discussion around faculty-specific issues of teaching and learning
• provide opportunities for inter-faculty collaborations and discussions around teaching and learning aspects of common interest and
• provide opportunities for staff and students to participate together in out-of-class activities.

The theme for Teaching and Learning Week 2014 was “Education Futures”, with events scheduled between Monday 2nd June and Friday 6th June, 2014.

EVENTS
The number of events scheduled for Teaching and Learning Week has decreased over the past 4 years as shown in the table below. This is partly in response to the reduced duration of the program, and partly from a reduction of faculty based events. Faculties and divisions have cited the lack of staff and resources as the main reasons for not holding events during the Week. Faculty events continue to be support by CATL throughout the year.

\[
\begin{array}{|c|c|c|c|c|}
\hline
\text{Year} & 2010 & 2011 & 2012 & 2013 & 2014 \\
\hline
\text{Number of scheduled events} & 16 & 12 & 11 & 8 & 4 \\
\hline
\end{array}
\]

Attendance figures at Teaching and Learning Week events in 2014

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Event</th>
<th>No. of Attendees</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>University Teaching Award Ceremony</td>
<td>120</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>First Steps Towards our Vision for Education Futures (invitation only)</td>
<td>24</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>“Who are the learning leaders of today?” Joint CATL/FASE event</td>
<td>42</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>eLearning Expo</td>
<td>55</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CATL Roundtable</td>
<td>16</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**TOTAL APPROXIMATE ATTENDANCE:**

257

Approximate Attendance numbers at Teaching and Learning Month/Week 2010-2013

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>2010</th>
<th>2011</th>
<th>2012</th>
<th>2013</th>
<th>2014</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Approximate attendance</td>
<td>555</td>
<td>444</td>
<td>438</td>
<td>342</td>
<td>257</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
University Teaching Award Ceremony

The most popular event in the program of Teaching and Learning Week continues to be the University Teaching Award Ceremony. The event was well attended, received positive feedback and was a celebration and recognition of the teachers and teaching at the University. As in previous years, the ceremony included the:

- announcement of 2014 Faculty award winners by the Deans of each Faculty (or their nominated representative);
- announcement of the 2014 Teaching Fellows;
- recognition of 2013 AAUT award winners;
- announcement of 2014 AAUT (Australian Awards for University Teaching) nominees; and
- announcement of the 2014 UWA Excellence in Teaching Award winners.

As in 2013, both the ceremony and reception were held at the University Club. The evening was hosted by the Senior Deputy Vice-Chancellor. With the Deputy Vice-Chancellor (Research) providing the opening address.

Feedback about the overall event has been positive, with the community providing ideas for improvements for the future:

“The ceremony was very collegial and has had higher numbers of attendees in recent years. This deserves to be applauded.”

“I really liked the atmosphere at the teaching awards night. The university put on a bit of hospitality and everyone was mixing easily. I had a lovely evening with a couple of colleagues from the physics department whom I had never seen before.”

Other Events

Teaching and Learning Week 2014 featured events which have proven popular over the last number of years, notably the eLearning Expo and a joint CATL/FASE event titled “Who are the learning leaders of today” which featured a panel of experts to engage in the topic. An Education Futures session, facilitated by Winthrop Professor Helen Wildy, Project Director for UWA Futures Vision and Dean of the Faculty of Education was an invitation only event which aimed to identify opportunities within existing routines processes and structures where practice can be tweaked towards Transformative teaching, particularly in large first year classes and post graduate coursework.

The eLearning Expo provided the academics the opportunity to share the ways they engage with blended learning and UWA eLearning tools with students. Mr Michael De Raadt, Development Manager of Moodle, was a special guest speaker at the event. The Expo was well received for the great range of presenters from across the university, and the collegiality and enthusiasm of those present.

“The expo was highly beneficial and informative, and highlighted many positives about our teaching resources and tools being openly accessible to other staff rather than us all creating our own learning objects and reinventing the wheel”
TIMING

Feedback obtained from the faculties and divisions in 2013 suggested that the events should be scheduled, at least in part, during a non-teaching period to enable academics to attend. As a result, the 2014 Teaching and Learning Week was held over one week during the study break, commencing on the Monday 3rd June and finishing on Friday 7th June.

Feedback received after the 2014 event confirmed support for the consolidation of events into one week with 72% of respondents indicating a preference for scheduling during first semester and 28% during the mid-year vacation.

When asked in the survey “When would be the most convenient time for you to attend Teaching and Learning Week events”, 61% of respondents indicated the first semester pre-exam Study Week was preferred. Only 11% indicated they would prefer earlier in semester one, with the remainder indicating the June/July mid-year vacation would be more suitable.

It is important to note that the timing of Teaching and Learning Week is also restricted by the availability of the University executive for the University Teaching Award Ceremony.

CHALLENGES

Now in its ninth year, Teaching and Learning Week has obtained general awareness by the university community yet the pattern of participation indicates that a number of barriers remain to the widespread support of, and engagement in the initiative.

The main challenge continues to be engaging staff and students in the various planned activities. In 2014 the Faculty of Engineering, Computing and Mathematics were the only Faculty to host an event.

The major costs associated with holding Teaching and Learning Week continue to be in hosting the University Teaching Awards Ceremony and the associated reception. It is generally felt that the Awards reception is a highlight of Teaching and Learning Week calendar and is therefore an important way of recognising and rewarding teaching excellence. Although events hosted by CATL during Teaching and Learning Week are reviewed annually as part of the review process (and will continue to be so), it is widely agreed that this event should continue to be held annually as the premier event at UWA to recognise teaching excellence.

Survey respondents were asked to comment on the question “In what ways do you think Teaching and Learning Month could be improved?” 27 comments were received, with the majority focussed on the need for a higher profile in the University; a lack of attendance by key senior staff; and more input by faculties or schools to organise events.

“Needs a higher profile in the Uni and possibly a public event to highlight UWA’s commitment to excellence in teaching & learning”

“Since teaching and learning involves students I would definitely like to hear more of students’ perspective”

“Clear link between what can be learned by attending and tangible opportunities (e.g. research or other funding, promotion opportunities”

“I would like to see more opportunities of cross faculty sharing of resources and ideas”

“It would be great to have a roadshow type of event where some parts of the series of events are presented to Faculties later in the year. I noticed at the event I went to there were not many staff from my School in attendance and I wonder if there would be more involvement if these were offered in at the School (probably not logistically possible)”
OVERALL EFFECTIVENESS

Following the conclusion of the 2014 Teaching and Learning Week a brief survey was distributed to:

- members of the Teaching and Learning mailing list;
- anyone who attended a registered event;
- Deans, Heads of School, and Division Directors distribution lists;
- Any staff who received an invitation to attend an event.

The survey is primarily used to gain feedback for future planning. In 2014 we received 43 responses in total, which is a significant increase on previous years as outlined in the following table.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>2011</th>
<th>2012</th>
<th>2013</th>
<th>2014</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Number of Respondents</td>
<td>79</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>91</td>
<td>43</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

In 2014 of the 43 actual respondents, the aggregated demographics (compared to previous years) is as follows:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>2011</th>
<th>2012</th>
<th>2013</th>
<th>2014</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Academic</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>41</td>
<td>26</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>General / Professional</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sessional</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Student</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Did not answer</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Of 43 respondents, all were aware of Teaching and Learning Week prior to receiving the survey, of which 63% found out about the events as a result of a direct invitation to an event.

Emails and invitations to specific events were the most effective means of advertising the events taking place during Teaching and Learning Month with 83% of respondents identifying this as the main method by which they became aware of events.

The most popular events were the eLearning Expo and the University Teaching Awards Ceremony with 54% and 46% of respondents indicating that they attended the events respectively. This was followed in popularity by the joint FASE/CATL event.

In 2014, respondents answered the question “Overall how would you rate Teaching and Learning Week as a way of promoting excellence in Teaching and Learning at UWA”.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>2014 Total Respondents</th>
<th>%</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Extremely Effective</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Effective</td>
<td>17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Somewhat Effective</td>
<td>13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ineffective</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Extremely Ineffective</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Not applicable</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TOTAL responses</td>
<td>42</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Skipped question</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Survey respondents were asked to provide feedback on “What do you think were the best aspects of Teaching and Learning Month?” In 2014, 86% of respondents answered the question with “collegiality”; “developed a better understanding of Teaching and Learning issues at UWA” and “developed a better understanding of the topics presented” being the most commonly selected.

Some of the comments were:

“I saw examples of innovation and best practice at UWA that I may be able to draw from in my own teaching or to assist others in theirs”

“Seeing examples and interpretations of blended learning by lecturers in their units”

“The eLearning sessions were excellent”

STUDENT INVOLVEMENT

The Student Guild President, Mr Tom Henderson, was invited to give a short address at the University Awards Ceremony. Students who nominated staff members for a University award were invited to attend the Awards Ceremony however the majority of the audience was made up UWA staff members and post graduate students.

Some excellent collaborations have been established between student groups and CATL in the organisation of activities for Teaching and Learning Month over the last number of years. Despite the decrease in formally organised events with student groups in 2013 and 2014, the ongoing relationship between CATL and the various student bodies continues to be important and one that will continue to be pursued by CATL into the future.

COMMUNICATION AND MARKETING

A comprehensive strategy to advertise the series of events is employed, using a communication plan which is regularly reviewed. The most effective method of communicating the events and schedule of activities appeared to be through a paper-based invitation inviting staff to attend an event, with 63% of respondents identifying it as the main means by which they found out about Teaching and Learning Week in 2014. This was a significant change from 2013 which strongly indicated email as the most effective method.

The range of strategies used to communicate information about Teaching and Learning Week include:

- Information regarding the week sent as an All-Staff email via the Office of the Deputy Vice-Chancellor (Education)
- The identification of target audiences for individual events and university distribution lists are used along with other CATL networks to distribute information
- Listing all the events on the University events website and advertising them through the “Events” broadcast distribution emails and the Teaching and Learning mailing list
- Ensuring that information is distributed from the University Teaching and Learning Committee via the Associate Deans
- Ensuring that information is distributed directly to Faculties via the Associate Deans
- Distribution of personalised invitations to identified staff for major events (UWA Teaching Award Ceremony and Vision for Education Futures event)
- Ensuring that the dedicated “Teaching and Learning Week” website is kept up to date with the list of events and information about the events
2015 TEACHING AND LEARNING WEEK PLANNING
The first discussions for the 2015 Teaching and Learning Week will commence during CATL’s planning day on 27th August 2014. At this meeting we will determine the date range during which Teaching and Learning Week can be scheduled for 2015 and then immediately liaise with the Office of the Vice Chancellor to determine his availability.

The event will likely continue in its current shortened format in 2015.
Appendix 1: Income and Expenditure for 2014

Below is both the anticipated and actual expenditure for 2014:

**Income & Expenditure for Teaching & Learning Week 2014**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>2014 Anticipated</th>
<th>2014 Actual</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>MISCELLANEOUS - total</strong></td>
<td>$550</td>
<td>$467</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Print &amp; Design (Flyers &amp; Posters)</td>
<td>$317</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Stationery</td>
<td>$150</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>EDUCATION FUTURES EVENT - total</strong></td>
<td>$1,250</td>
<td>$75</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Catering - Afternoon tea</td>
<td></td>
<td>$75</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>AWARDS CEREMONY - total</strong></td>
<td>$15,400</td>
<td>$9,019</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Catering (including FBT &amp; PRT)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Music/Photography</td>
<td></td>
<td>$175</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>LEARNING LEADERS (CATL/FASE EVENT) - total</strong></td>
<td>$1,200</td>
<td>$843</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Catering - Afternoon tea</td>
<td></td>
<td>$843</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>eLEARNING EXPO</strong></td>
<td>$550</td>
<td>$659</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Catering - Morning tea</td>
<td></td>
<td>$659</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>TOTAL COST BALANCE</strong></td>
<td>$18,950</td>
<td>$11,063</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>T&amp;L Committee Funding</td>
<td></td>
<td>$8,513</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ACTUAL Carry Over from previous year</td>
<td></td>
<td>$14,787</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>TOTAL FUNDING</strong></td>
<td>$23,300</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Potential balance</td>
<td></td>
<td>$12,237</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Comparison of actual costs between 2013 and 2014**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>2013</th>
<th>2014</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>MISCELLANEOUS</td>
<td>$521</td>
<td>$467</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EDUCATION FUTURES EVENT</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>$75</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AWARDS CEREMONY</td>
<td>$11,780</td>
<td>$9,019</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LEARNING LEADERS (CATL/FASE EVENT)</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>$843</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>eLEARNING EXPO</td>
<td>$498</td>
<td>$659</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HYPOThETICAL</td>
<td>$906</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>COLLOQUIUM</td>
<td>$2,912</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DVTF WORKSHOP</td>
<td>$1,876</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AWARD WINNERS NETWORK</td>
<td>$459</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>TOTAL EXPENDITURE</strong></td>
<td>$18,952</td>
<td>$11,063</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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Progress reports on programs supported by the Teaching and Learning Committee

POSTGRADUATE TEACHING INTERNSHIP SCHEME

Eighteen internship places were allocated in 2014. Of these, two withdrew early in the program due to inability to dedicate appropriate time to the program. The current cohort are in the midst of the second semester schedule where they will engage in key activities in curriculum development, reflective teaching, peer observation and will begin developing a teaching portfolio.

INTRODUCTION TO UNIVERSITY TEACHING

A total of 19 postgraduate students participated in the first semester IUT program. Of the 19, more than 50% of participants have completed all components of the program, with the remainder actively working towards the end of year completion date.

Full participants are currently paid $700 in two instalments as a set standard rate for participation in the professional development component of the programme. A maximum of 15 funded positions per semester are available in 2014, with 22 places in total available in the program each semester (remaining seven places are unpaid).

Leading into second semester it had become apparent that many students were only expecting confirmation of teaching/tutoring places in the first week of semester which meant many interested students would miss out on the initial three-day compulsory component of the program. A decision was therefore made to trial moving the program to mid-August to allow those who had received late confirmations to be able to still register their interest. As a result the numbers of participants, compared to past second semesters, has significantly increased.

ENGLISH LANGUAGE SUPPORT FOR TEACHING STAFF

The English Language Support for Teaching Staff program currently funds 14 teaching staff each year to participate in a pronunciation and presentation skills workshop for those whom English is not a first language. The program was initiated by CATL to meet the University’s needs and a diverse workforce has driven demand in recent years. In order to provide qualified ELICOS teachers, the program must be funded so CELT can recover costs.

In 2014 the program attracted nine staff to participate across four consecutive Fridays. Feedback from staff who undertook the program was very positive. An informal review of how CATL can better engage and communicate with Schools to inform this important development information to their staff will likely increase numbers for the 2015 program.

SESSIONAL STAFF DAY

Since its inception in 2010, the purpose of this day is to recognise the important role sessional teachers play in the delivery of a quality student experience and to thank them for their contribution. The day aims to provide tangible advice and guidance in the form of short sessions to induct and support sessional staff in their role as teachers and provide an opportunity to join and develop a supportive community of sessional teachers at UWA.

In 2014, 58 attended the Sessional Staff Day and feedback received by those attending was positive. For the 2015 event, CATL will review timing of the day to ensure sessional staff are able to attend.
EDUCATION REPORT

Strategic alignment

In line with organisational changes announced by the Vice-Chancellor to align organisational units with strategic responsibility, the Education portfolio was expanded as of January 2014, to incorporate the following divisions, under the DVC (Education):

- International, headed by the Pro Vice-Chancellor (International), Iain Watt, and including the International Centre and the Centre for English Language Teaching;
- Coursework Studies, headed by the Dean of Coursework Studies, W/Professor Grady Venville, and including the Albany Centre, and the BPhil course;
- Education Futures, to be headed by the Pro Vice-Chancellor (Education Innovation), W/Professor Gilly Salmon, commencing on 1 October, and including the Centre for the Advancement of Teaching and Learning, the Education Strategies Office, and the Education Futures Project;
- Student Services, headed by the Director, Jon Stubbs, and including Student Admissions, Student Administration, Student Systems, Student Support Services, the Medical Centre, and Childcare;
- Student Accommodations, headed by the Director, Chris Massey, and including University Hall, Crawley Village, and liaison with the affiliated residential colleges;
- IT Services, to be headed by the Chief Information Officer, Assine George, commencing on 1 September;
- University Library, to be headed the University Librarian, currently under advertisement; and
- Executive responsibility for the UWA Sports Association.

As noted above, we have had the opportunity to make some key senior appointments within this new structure.

This new structure provides alignment of all central units directly responsible for education and the student experience, and has resulted in the definition of clear objectives with regard to attracting students of the highest potential, providing an outstanding education and student experience, and achieving the best graduate outcomes. Planning has been undertaken to identify cross-divisional projects to enhance the holistic UWA student experience.
New Courses

2014 represents the completion of the first cohort of students in our new undergraduate degrees (Cycle 1). Consequently, 2015 will be the first year of entry of this cohort of students into the new postgraduate degrees (Cycle 2).

Consequently, there has been much activity in preparation for the new Cycle 2 cohorts. Forty new Cycle 2 courses have been approved this year in preparation for 2015, adding to pre-existing Masters courses, and some new professional postgraduate degrees (in Law, Medicine, Dentistry and Engineering) which had been previously approved. W/Professor Grady Venville has played a major role in overseeing the approval of these new courses.

Marketing and student recruitment plans (further outlined below) have been implemented to attract students, from UWA undergraduates and externally, into the Cycle 2 courses. In addition, a new Postgraduate Admissions Team has been established within the Student Admissions group to process Cycle 2 applications, and this role has been transferred from Faculty Offices to Student Admissions.

We are at a high-level of preparedness, but, given this will be the first year of transition of students from Cycle 1 to Cycle 2, we have no prior experience on which to rely, so will be watching enrolments with very close interest.

Education Futures

The University’s Education Strategy is defined by our Education Futures Vision. This Vision, incorporated in the UWA Strategic Plan and launched earlier this year, describes the aspirational dimensions of the delivery of education at UWA and the UWA student experience in the 2020 timeframe.

Following the leadership of the development of the Vision by W/Professor Helen Wildy, Dean of the Faculty of Education, the implementation of this project will be the responsibility of the incoming Pro Vice-Chancellor (Education Innovation), W/Professor Gilly Salmon.

Prior to Gilly’s arrival, several workshops have been conducted with academic staff, drawn from all Faculties at UWA, and recognised as innovators or leaders in their teaching, to identify projects to progress the realisation of the Education Futures Vision. This is serving to both identify and prioritise initiatives, but also to engage and empower academic staff across UWA as change agents. Key ideas currently being proposed and developed are:

- a UWA academic transitional program for commencing students;
- student academic mentoring;
- Learning and Teaching Index to measure educational quality;
- reducing the emphasis on content delivery in our teaching, to more self-direction and intensive educational experiences for students; and
• changes to our teaching spaces to enable more interactive learning.

Student Surveys

We are very concerned about the relatively poor ratings we receive from our students with regard to their perceptions of teaching quality at UWA, and their overall satisfaction with their student experience. There are several steps in train to address this.

As of this semester, we are now providing to students the results of the SURF (Students’ Unit Reflective Feedback) surveys, which are collected for each unit each semester. We see this as an important step in demonstrating our commitment to address areas of dissatisfaction by, in the first instance, identifying where the issues exist, and stating the steps we will be taking in each unit to respond to concerns. There will also be a clear expectation of direct action from Heads of School and Deans to address the delivery of units with chronic low student ratings.

Secondly, the initiatives in Education Futures are directly aligned with enhancing the student educational experience at UWA. The delivery of Education Futures initiatives, and the communication of these initiatives to students, is intended to improve student sentiment about their UWA education.

Thirdly, compared to other universities, UWA is very passive in its engagement with external surveys, namely the Course Evaluation Questionnaire (CEQ), the University Experience Survey (UES), and the International Student Barometer (ISB). This may be seen locally as UWA not seeking to influence survey results, however, it is common practice at other universities to arrange the completion of surveys at celebratory times (graduations), or communicate directly with students using the terminology used in the surveys to assist in connecting the students understanding of the survey questions with their university experience. As a complement to the above two initiatives, UWA also needs to engage more actively with the external survey process in the future. As part of that engagement, a communication plan for the 2014 UES is currently being implemented.

Student Recruitment

With the situation of the half-cohort of domestic school leaver applicants now immediate, much activity has been undertaken to shore up recruitment within this pool, as well as diversify our intakes by increasing enrolments from other pools of students – particularly cycle 2 and international.

Prospective undergraduate students have been, and will continue to be, targeted by several distinctive campaigns in the market which more clearly identify the benefits of study at UWA. Following a small market research project undertaken last year, the campaign messaging targeting our local undergraduate cohort has been adapted to more directly articulate the career outcomes of our courses in order to overcome perception that degrees from other providers create more job-ready graduates.
following our course restructure. The broadcast campaigns designed to encourage first-preference applications will also be more targeted and make better use of data captured on this stakeholder group; data that was collected during the lead up to our highly successful recent Open Day.

The UWA Schools Liaison Program, with the support of our schools database, has been revised this year, to focus on targeted schools:

- with the potential to send more high achieving students to UWA;
- where we are losing market share to WA and inter-state competitors; and
- where there is potential to attract students from identified equity groups.

Initiatives, to attract high achieving students, including a UWA Excellence Camp, greater promotion of the BPhil, and an inter-state recruitment trip to Sydney, were also incorporated into the undergraduate student recruitment program.

Prospective postgraduate students have also been identified as a critical stakeholder group and much activity has taken place already, with further work to secure enrolments planned for the remaining months of the year. Current UWA students were identified early as the primary target market with the secondary markets identified as students at other universities and professionals looking to up- or re-skill. A comprehensive broadcast campaign, with more investment than previously allocated, will be in market shortly and will run across all media platforms for the remainder of the year. It will have the dual aims of promoting the breadth of benefits to studying one of UWA’s postgraduate courses, as well as a more direct call to action of attending events to be run on campus in September, which are designed to link prospective postgraduate students with their courses of interest and generate applications. This critical priority of increasing enrolments in cycle 2 courses has bought together the marketing and recruitment staff on campus and generated much collective activity towards a common goal.

Prospective international students remain a priority and recruitment activities have been expanded following a $1M growth in annual budget (2014-16) for the International Centre. These funds are being used to increase international recruitment activities in markets to which the university had hitherto devoted only limited resources (primarily South America and Indonesia) and to appoint in-country representatives in the key markets of China, Indonesia, India and Malaysia. There will also be a UWA Open Day event in Singapore in 2015 to build on the success of the inaugural event in 2014. The International Centre are also building an international student recruitment presence in the rest of Australia, which is a very significant source of international students for most Australian universities, but not (to date) for UWA, and addressing shortcomings in IT and other systems in order to improve the level of service provided to students and agents, making the university more competitive.

Pathways into UWA for international students are also being extended. UWA has entered into agreements with a number of top tier Chinese universities (all students will have ATAR equivalents of 95 and above) that will deliver approximately 100
students through articulation agreements in 2015, building to approximately 500 per annum by 2017. The university has also developed new pathways into undergraduate programs including Diplomas in business and science delivered by Taylors College and foundation programs through a number of local and overseas education providers. In addition, agreements with overseas scholarship agencies in China, Indonesia, Vietnam, Brazil, Peru, Chile and Colombia have been, or soon will be, signed and the University has provided incentive targets for leading agents to encourage enrolments in targeted courses.

**Deregulation**

The higher education policy announcements in the Federal budget in May were generally focussed on deregulation of the education functions of universities, and introducing more competition into the sector. This has led to much discussion, internally and externally, and speculation regarding likely pricing strategies of different university groups.

Despite some consideration and modelling of possible approaches, in the absence of clarity about the legislation that will ultimately achieve passage through the Australian Senate, we have not yet determined any firm strategies or proposals in this regard. Our approach, however, will be to ensure a co-ordinated strategy and market positioning with regard to pricing, financial support and entry standards, to ensure that UWA is optimally positioned in its target markets.

This paper has addressed the UWA Education portfolio’s key issues of cycle 2 courses, Education Futures, student surveys, recruitment activities and changes in the Higher Education sector. It remains a top priority of the staff within the portfolio to lead and inspire the development, delivery and support of a world-class student experience throughout UWA and to continue to deliver outcomes that support and progress the UWA Strategic Plan.

Alec Cameron
Deputy Vice-Chancellor (Education)
7 August, 2014
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The University of Western Australia

University Policy on: Academic Conduct: Ethical Scholarship, Academic Literacy and Academic Misconduct Integrity

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). 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. It will help reduce instances of academic misconduct. Whilst this policy’s academic misconduct provisions pertain to postgraduates as well as undergraduates, 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 ). This must be in Normal, Policy style.

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 Exemplary Academic Integrity Project (EAP): 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:

- collusion
- inappropriate collaboration
- plagiarism
- misrepresenting or fabricating data or results or other assessable work
- inappropriate electronic data sourcing/collection
- 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 Conduct

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 Misconduct 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 Misconduct 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
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 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 misconduct 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
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 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
6 Plagiarism

Text matching software is utilised at UWA as an educative tool for students and may be used by staff to confirm suspected 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 the plagiarism and the penalty applied in the case.

Such 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.

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 of 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 breaches of academic misconduct:

8.1 Cases of alleged and established breaches of academic conduct misconduct must be treated confidentially by staff. Discussion of cases should 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 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 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 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 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 (see ‘Group Work’ at http://www.teachingandlearning.uwa.edu.au/page/59146);
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**Related Policies or legislation:**

This policy must be considered within the context of:

- Statute No. 17: Student Discipline
  - [http://www.governance.uwa.edu.au/statutes/statutes/discipline](http://www.governance.uwa.edu.au/statutes/statutes/discipline)

- Regulations for Student Conduct and Discipline

- Student Rules: Rule 35 – Satisfactory or Unsatisfactory Progress in Academic Performance

- Procedures for Dealing with Allegations of Research Misconduct contained in the University Policy on: Code of Conduct for the Responsible Practice of Research

  Guidelines on Research Ethics and Research Conduct
The University of Western Australia

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 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 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.
(b) 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. Provision of relevant information and advice to staff in relation to academic conduct 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 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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**Related Policies or legislation:**

This policy must be considered within the context of:

- Statute No. 17: Student Discipline  

- Regulations for Student Conduct and Discipline  

- Student Rules: Rule 35 – Satisfactory or Unsatisfactory Progress in Academic Performance  

- Procedures for Dealing with Allegations of Research Misconduct contained in the University Policy on: Code of Conduct for the Responsible Practice of Research  
Assignment Cover Sheet

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>FAMILY NAME</th>
<th>FIRST NAME</th>
<th>STUDENT ID. NUMBER</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>UNIT NAME</th>
<th>UNIT CODE</th>
<th>DUE DATE</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>TUTORIAL DAY &amp; TIME (if applicable)</th>
<th>NAME OF TUTOR (if applicable)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>TITLE/TOPIC OF ASSIGNMENT</th>
<th>WORD COUNT</th>
<th>NAME OF LECTURER</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Use of Turnitin**

This assignment required a Turnitin originality report  
Yes □  No □

I used Turnitin for my own purposes to check my work  
Yes □  No □

I submit the Turnitin originality report with this assignment  
Yes □  No □

**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-conferral 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/t4/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  ...........................................
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**Should the drafting of the policy involve consultation? If yes, provide details of proposed consultation.**

- Student Services – Student Systems, Student Administration, Faculties (Administrative Officers, Teaching and Learning Associate Deans)

**Identify the Committees that this Policy needs to be presented for consideration, endorsement or approval**

- Teaching and Learning Committee
- Academic Council

**Proposed time-line for approval process via the Committee system.**

- By October 2014
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All University Policies must be submitted on the University Policies template and instructions are available on the web at:


---

**PART A – for a new policy ONLY**

- **Provide a brief background to the creation of this policy including reference to the particular committee resolution, if relevant, that provides the mandate for its creation**

  At UWA, teaching periods have undoubtedly increased over time. This has raised a number of issues relating to the overall management of teaching periods. These include the difficulty in gathering all relating information on time and in a well-coordinated way, the setting of Census dates, reporting issues and etc. The above issues have created a need to determine the key principles underpinning the creation of and changes to teaching periods.

- **List and/or provide links of relevant papers, or sections therein that provide detailed context for the creation of the new policy**

  - Teaching Periods at UWA – 19/04/2010 authored by Viv James
  - This paper raises issues for discussion on the management of teaching periods at UWA

- **Provide a list of issues that the drafter should consider when developing a first draft of the new policy**

  - Definition of non-standard teaching period;
  - What are the standard teaching periods?
  - Principles underpinning the creation of non-standard teaching period; and
  - Circumstances in which a teaching period may be changed

- **Provide names of at least three senior University staff (reference group) who can answer questions and offer guidance in the development of the new policy**

  - Ms Mary Carroll (Associate Director, Student Services, Student Systems)
  - Academic Secretary

**Date first draft required**

- November 2013
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**PART B – for a revision of an existing policy ONLY**

- **State title of the existing policy and provide the appropriate web-link and policy number (as allocated on the University’s Policies website)**

- **Provide a brief background and the particular committee resolution, where relevant, that provides the mandate for its revision.**

- **List and/or provide links of relevant papers, or sections therein that provide detailed context for the revision**

- **Provide a list of issues that the drafter should consider when developing a first draft of the new policy**

- **Provide names of at least three senior University staff (reference group) who can answer questions and offer guidance in the development of the new policy**

**Date first draft required**

---

**PART C – for a policy that is replacing an existing rule ONLY**

- **State rule number(s)**

- **Date first draft required**
PART D – for an approved policy that has been reformatted into the required University Policies template ONLY

Note 1: The approved policy must be formally approved and be available on the University Policies website.

Note 2: The reformating includes changes only to title, layout, introductory purpose statement, BUT NO CHANGE TO CONTENT OF POLICY.

Note 3: Once reformatted, the policy will need to be reloaded onto the University Policies website (http://www.universitypolicies.uwa.edu.au/page/117111) with the existing policy number.

Note 4: Please complete the table below and forward the following documents electronically to Ms Lidia Cuoco, Administrative Officer, Academic Policy Services – Email: lidia.cuoco@uwa.edu.au:

- Completed University Policy cover sheet
- Copy of the reformatted University Policy on the University Policies template

Academic Policy Services will, as part of the New Courses 2012 Policies Project, upload reformatted academic policies as an interim measure. With effect from 2012, reformatted policies will, as is normally the case, need to be uploaded by the administrative division responsible for the policy.

State
- title of existing policy / guidelines;
- University Policy Number; and
- web-link

Date reformating finalised and sent to Academic Policy Services
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The University of Western Australia

University Policy on: Teaching Periods

Purpose of the policy and summary of issues it addresses:
This policy defines teaching periods and deals with the creation of non-standard teaching periods.

Definitions:
For the purposes of this policy and any related procedures, the University means The University of Western Australia.
end date for a teaching period is the date on which the relevant assessment period finishes and in the case of units with final examination it does not include the deferred examination period.
teaching period is a scheduled duration, normally within an academic year, which, for a standard six point unit, provides for a student workload of 150 hours, including student contact hours, personal study time and examinations, and for a unit that is a multiple of six points, provides for a proportionately greater student workload.
census date refers to the last date by which the study load for the teaching period is finalised.
relevant board(s) means a Board of the University relevant to the case in point. The relevant board(s) may include a position or a body of people with authority to carry out the function concerned.
start date of a teaching period means the date on which teaching in a unit commences and may be the date on which students are provided with preparatory reading material and/or details of their first assignment for the unit.
non-standard teaching period means a teaching period of which the start and end dates do not coincide with the University's standard semesters or trimesters or with the summer session.

Policy statement:

1 Teaching periods

1.1 The University determines teaching periods during which a unit is taught and assessed.

1.2 A teaching period is either standard or non-standard.

1.3 A teaching period must not span more than one academic year unless in exceptional circumstances where there are persuasive justifications.

1.4 Teaching periods must be determined:
• taking due account of students’ potential concurrent enrolment in other units as part of a course; and
• with a view to enabling students to complete award courses within the specified time-frame with maximum efficiency.

1.5 New teaching periods are only created where there are persuasive justifications.

2 Standard teaching periods

2.1 The University's standard teaching periods:
• for units taught in undergraduate courses are: Semester One; Semester Two; and Summer Session
• for units taught in postgraduate courses are: Semester One, Semester Two, Trimester One, Trimester Two, Trimester Three and Summer Session.

2.2 The start and end dates for semester one and semester two are determined by the Academic Year Planning Committee in accordance with the University Policy on Structure of the Academic Year.
3 Summer session

3.1 Faculties may offer units in the summer session in accordance with the University Policy on Summer Session.

3.2 The summer session is a period of eight weeks during January and February the dates of which are set in accordance with the University Policy on Summer Session.

4 Creation of a non-standard teaching period

4.1 A non-standard teaching period is a period for which the start and end dates do not coincide with the start and end dates of a standard teaching period.

4.2 Non-standard teaching periods enable:

(a) schools to take advantage of the availability of expert external teaching staff whose availability does not coincide with the University's standard teaching periods;
(b) units to be taught offshore or in facilities external to the campus, such as hospitals, where the availability of resources and staff do not coincide with the University's standard teaching periods;
(c) practicums, internships and intensive study programs to be undertaken;
(d) teaching to be linked to specific events/circumstances (e.g. relating to climate, animal behaviour, requirements of offshore campuses); and
(e) better use of the University's facilities.

4.3 A school proposing a non-standard teaching period must provide a persuasive justification and ensure:

(a) that there is no potential impact on students in relation to such issues as:
   • ability to graduate that year;
   • receiving results;
   • assessment of academic progress for the year;
   • management of several different census dates;
   • allocation of load in the case of international students and students on Centrelink payments,
   or
(b) where there is potential impact on students, it is minimal and can be addressed without disadvantaging those students.

4.4 A proposal to offer a unit in a non-standard teaching period requires approval by the relevant board which must be satisfied that:

(a) the proposed teaching period meets academic standards comparable to those for units taught in a standard teaching period;
(b) the proposed teaching period meets the standard student workload requirement of 150 hours per six credit points including contact hours, personal study time and examinations; and
(c) a non-standard teaching period for a unit is no longer than the standard duration of a semester, unless approved otherwise by the relevant board on the basis of sound reason.
5 Changing a teaching period

5.1 A change to teaching period must occur in accordance with the University Policy on Changes to units.

5.2 The teaching period must not be amended after students have enrolled, unless the Chair of Academic Board approves a request from the dean of a faculty in exceptional circumstances which include but are not limited to:

(a) an illness, injury to, or the unavoidable absence of, the staff member teaching the unit and where no other staff member is able to teach the unit;
(b) significant damage to facilities or equipment which prevents the unit from being taught; or
(c) other unforeseen circumstances.

5.3 The relevant faculty has responsibility to advise all affected students if a teaching period is amended after enrolments have commenced.

5.4 The relevant faculty must take any appropriate action to minimise any disadvantage experienced by a student as the result of a change to a teaching period which occurs after the student has enrolled in the unit.

6 Release of examination results for a non-standard teaching period

6.1 Unless there is good reason otherwise, the date of release of final results for units offered in a non-standard teaching period must coincide with the date of release of final results for units taught in the closest standard teaching period.

7 Census date

7.1 A teaching period must have only one census date which must be calculated in accordance with the Higher Education Support Act.

Related forms: (Link)
- University Policy on Changes to Units (UP11/46)
- University Policy on Structure of the Academic Year (UP14/4)
- University Policy on Summer Session (UP 07/133)
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Teaching Periods: Creation and approval of a new non-standard teaching period (NSTP)

NOTE:
Curriculum Approval Information
Database online (CAIDi)

New unit or new special unit
- Faculty
  - CAIDi new unit proposal form
    (Add new NSTP and provide required information in proposal form)
- Unit approval process
- Student Systems
  - CAIDi report on approved units with NSTPs
- Update CAIDi

Existing unit with no previous NSTP
- Faculty
  - CAIDi Annual change form
    (Add new NSTP and provide required information)
- Faculty
  - CAIDi Late change (fast track) form or as 'Exceptional Circumstances'
    (Add new NSTP and provide required information)
- Students Systems
  - Negotiate date with faculty (if necessary) to confirm teaching period
- NSTP published
Teaching Periods: Submission and approval of changes to a non-standard teaching period (NSTP)

**NOTE:**
Curriculum Approval Information
Database online (CAIDi)

- **Faculty**
  - CAIDi Annual change form
    - (Remove NSTP and provide justification)
  - CAIDi Late change (fast track) form or ‘Exceptional Circumstance’
    - (Remove NSTP and provide justification)

- **Unit change process**

- **Student Systems**
  - CAIDi report on units with NSTPs removed

- **Faculty**
  - CAIDi Annual change form
    - (Make change and provide justification)
  - CAIDi Late change (fast track) form or ‘Exceptional Circumstance’
    - (Make change and provide justification)

- **Unit change process**

- **Student Systems**
  - CAIDi report on units with change to NSTP

- **Faculty**
  - Negotiate date with faculty (if necessary) to confirm teaching period

- **NSTP details published**

**Faculty Responsibility**
- Advise students if amended after enrolments have commenced
- Ensure students un-enrol / re-enrol as relevant