

## Student Academic Misconduct Sanction Guidelines 2019

NB: These guidelines are an attempt to organise some of the factors that should be weighed when considering sanctions (see clause 81 of the rule <https://policy.csu.edu.au/document/view-current.php?id=501&version=1>). The aim is to provide guidance for investigators and decision makers in order to approach consistency across the Faculties. However, it is important to note that each case should be decided on its own merits and that no two cases are equal in every respect. Thus, investigators and appointed officers are free to make decisions outside these guidelines, where appropriate circumstances apply.

Type of Academic Misconduct	First Breach	Second Breach	Third Breach
<b>Plagiarism</b>	<i>Higher severity:</i> Fail subject; or Zero marks for assessment;	Fail subject; or Zero marks for assessment	Suspension of enrolment (pass to category 2)
	<i>Lower severity:</i> Reduction in Marks <sup>1</sup> ; or Resubmission (consider whether Poor Academic Practice)		
<b>Collusion</b>	<i>Higher severity:</i> Suspension of enrolment (pass to category 2); or Fail subject; or Zero marks for assessment;	Fail subject; or Suspension of enrolment (pass to category 2)	Suspension of enrolment (pass to category 2)
	<i>Lower severity:</i> Reduction in Marks; or Reprimand		
<b>Exam Cheating</b>	<i>Higher severity:</i> Suspension of enrolment (pass to category 2); or Fail Subject;	Fail subject; or Suspension of enrolment (pass to category 2)	Suspension of enrolment (pass to category 2)
	<i>Lower severity:</i> Zero marks for exam; or Reduction of Marks; or Reprimand		
<b>Contract Cheating</b>	<i>Higher severity:</i> Suspension of enrolment (pass to category 2)	Suspension of enrolment; (pass to category 2)	Suspension of enrolment (pass to category 2); or Exclusion; or Expulsion (pass to category 2)
	<i>Lower severity:</i> Fail subject		
<b>Workplace Learning</b>	<i>Higher severity:</i> Suspension of enrolment; or Expulsion (pass to category 2)	Suspension of enrolment; or Exclusion; or Expulsion (pass to category 2)	
	<i>Lower severity:</i> Fail Subject; or Reprimand		

NB: It is assumed that all higher sanctions will include lower sanctions where appropriate. I.e.:

- Zero marks will be accompanied by a reprimand
- Reduced marks will be accompanied by a reprimand
- Fail subject will be accompanied by a reprimand

<sup>1</sup> Reduction in Marks will normally be either i) zero marks for part of assessment, ii) reduction to 50% for the whole assessment task, iii) reduction of marks by 50% for the whole assessment task.

- Suspension will be accompanied by fail subject and a reprimand, etc.

### How might we think about severity?

*The following questions might be helpful when considering the severity of misconduct:*

#### Plagiarism:

What is the qualitative type of plagiarism? (A, B, or C: see Appendix 1 Plagiarism Class Key)

What is the quantitative amount of plagiarism?

- Percentage of unauthorised similarity. *High*: more than 250 words/ 25 lines/ 25% of assessment, *Low*: more than 50 words/ 5 lines / 5% of assessment.
- Number of instances of plagiarism: *High*: more than 2 instances. *Low*: 1-2 instances)

What is the weight of the assessment in the subject (e.g. 30% of total marks, 70% of total marks)? Are there other deceptive devices in the assessment (false references, hidden text, text as pictures, paraphrasing tools, etc.)?

#### Collusion:

*Higher severity*: Is the 'unauthorised collaboration' premeditated and planned to circumvent the integrity of the task? Does it involve acts that indicate deliberate deception and/or resemble fraud? [e.g. someone selling a previously submitted assessment; someone running an organised assessment sharing ring; multiple people submitting substantially the same assessment]

*Lower severity*: Is the 'unauthorised collaboration' the result of carelessness or a lack of knowledge on the part of a student? [e.g. a person gives their assessment to someone else without knowledge that they might plagiarise from it; misunderstandings about requirements for individually written sections in group work assessments]

#### Exam cheating:

*Higher Severity*: Was this a deliberate and blatant attempt to gain an unfair advantage? Did the behaviour substantially disadvantage other students? Did the behaviour require planning and premeditation? Did the behaviour resemble fraud or theft [e.g. planned hidden notes; planned cheating mechanisms; systems for communicating answers during an examination, major disruption of examination; stealing examination papers]

*Lower Severity*: Did the student breach an exam condition in a way that did not provide an unfair advantage? Did the student breach an exam condition without disadvantaging other students? Did the behaviour breach exam conditions that are unclear or difficult to determine? [e.g. giggling during an examination; inadvertently bringing in a prohibited object that has no effect on exam performance]

#### Contract Cheating:

*Higher Severity*: Are there a large number of assessments (i.e. more than two) that show evidence of contract cheating? Did the student engage a service knowing that it was wrong?

*Lower Severity*: Are there 1-2 assessments that show evidence of contract cheating? Did the student get fooled by what they thought was a legitimate academic service?

#### Workplace Learning (NB: some workplace learning misconduct could be general misconduct):

*Higher Severity*: Does this behaviour involve deception or fraud-like behaviour directed toward a party outside the University (such as a professional body or accreditation partner)? Does this behaviour pose a risk to the public? Does this behaviour pose a risk to the University's reputation or professional relationships?

*Lower Severity*: Is this behaviour due to a lack of knowledge about specific rules or processes that may have been difficult to determine or apprehend? Does the behaviour involve a low degree of impact on the workplace, the public, or any party outside the University? Does the behaviour have little impact on the University's reputation or relationships?

## How do we take into account Student Experience and Circumstances?

**Student Experience:** This should be considered in assessing whether a behaviour is of higher or lower severity.

*The following questions may be helpful when considering experience:*

Has the student completed the Academic Integrity Module? Is the student within their first four subjects of study at CSU? Has the student completed subjects on ethics or professional practice/standards? How many subjects has the student completed successfully at CSU?

**Student Circumstances:** These will differ from student to student and each circumstance should be assessed on whether it is relevant to the misconduct at issue. Factors may include whether a student has admitted misconduct, whether they have been open and honest in dealing with investigators, or whether they have indicated future steps for changed behaviour. Factors may also include any circumstances that would impinge upon decision making abilities or a student's ability to exercise proper ethical judgments.

### Notes:

- 1) Under the rule, the finding of Poor Academic Practice is also available. This is not dealt with in these guidelines, which are for cases where the finding is that Academic Misconduct has occurred.
- 2) Under the rule, the following penalties are not available as sanctions for any finding of Student Academic Misconduct (though some are available for Poor Academic Practice Findings):
  - a. Resubmission for a maximum of 50%
  - b. Counselling the student
  - c. Cautioning the student
  - d. Requiring the student to complete a remedial exercise (e.g. the Academic Integrity Module)... however we can 'invite' the student to complete a remedial exercises (or direct them as part of a suspended sanction).

### How these guidelines were developed

These guidelines were developed in consultation with the Deputy Deans and Academic Misconduct Officers from the Faculty of Arts and Education, the Faculty of Business, Justice Studies, and Behavioural Sciences, and the Faculty of Science in March 2019. The development process took into account the SAM Penalty Guidelines which were put in place as part of the Three Faculty Common Support Model (July 2016). This process has also examined the requirements of the new Student Misconduct Rule (which came into effect on 4 March 2019).

### Appendix 1

Plagiarism Class Key	
<b>A</b>	The extract is neither in quotation marks nor indented. A reference to the source is not located next to the extract. A reference to the source is not located elsewhere in the student's work.
<b>B</b>	The extract is neither in quotation marks nor indented. A reference to the source is not located next to the extract. A reference to the source <b>IS</b> located elsewhere in the student's work.
<b>C</b>	The extract is neither in quotation marks nor indented. A reference to the source <b>IS</b> located next to the extract.

*Dr Lachlan Brown, Academic Misconduct Officer, Faculty of Arts and Education, 2 April March 2019*