

Student Academic Integrity Guidelines

Purpose

These guidelines outline:

- general guidelines for investigating academic misconduct
- structure and responsibilities of Academic Integrity Committees (AIC)
- the AIC meeting process
- standards of evidence and decision-making criteria
- academic misconduct detection criteria
- possible outcomes and penalty levels

Scope

These guidelines apply to all Monash College (the College) pathways programs staff involved with the academic integrity investigation process and/or Academic Integrity Committees.

These guidelines also apply to International Partners who are required to comply with the College policies per the Third-Party Arrangement contracts between the College and Partners.

These guidelines do not apply to Vocational Education and Training, Professional Year or Non-accredited training programs.

Guidelines

1. General guidelines

- 1.1 An AIC is convened to consider whether or not academic misconduct has occurred.
- 1.2 Whilst the Academic Integrity Committee (AIC, the Committee) is to be guided by the detail presented in this document, it does not remove the option for Committees to respond to situations where a student may become distressed by the Committee process and the Chair may determine to adjourn the meeting or seek support from College welfare teams. The Committee has a duty of care for all students involved in Committee meetings.
- 1.3 Wherever possible, the welfare of students should be at the forefront of the process, and checks should be made as to whether the student requires a break in the process, or may need to seek support from internal or external support processes.
- 1.4 In determining if academic misconduct has occurred and for application of penalty levels, the burden of proof is the balance of probabilities. The decision maker/s responsible for investigating the conduct will use the evidence along with their academic and professional judgement.

2. Academic Integrity Committee membership and responsibilities

- 2.1. An AIC consists of two or three members of College staff. The Committee requires two staff for the quorum, with one member serving as the Chair of the Committee.
- 2.2. Membership consists of Program Leaders, Discipline Leaders, Team Leaders, Unit Leaders or delegates from the English language, Foundation or Diploma programs (for further detail, please see the Student Academic Integrity Procedure).
- 2.3. Members may appoint delegates if authorised by the relevant Program Leader, Discipline Leader, or Team Leader. These delegates may be teaching staff from other pathway programs or professional staff with extensive knowledge and expertise in the area of academic integrity. Training will be provided where required.
- 2.4. All Committee members must maintain fairness whilst considering the evidence presented for the suspected academic misconduct investigation.
- 2.5. Members are responsible for coming to a decision that takes into account all evidence submitted. Committees are responsible for ensuring procedural fairness during the course of the Committee meeting.
- 2.6. If additional evidence is required or made available before the AIC meeting, the Committee may determine to postpone the meeting and/or dismiss the case.
- 2.7. Committee members are responsible for declaring any conflict of interests in advance of the meeting so an alternate panel member can be found.

3. Academic Integrity Committee meeting process

Please note, full detail of this process is found in the Academic Integrity Committee Meeting Guide.

- 3.1. For cases involving multiple students, individual AIC meetings must be scheduled to ensure fair and thorough investigation of each case.
- 3.2. At the commencement of the meeting, the Chair will explain the process to the student to ensure they understand the purpose of the meeting, and confirm that all persons present have received information on the suspected academic misconduct and associated evidence.

Role of a Support Person

- 3.3. The student may be accompanied by one support person at the AIC meeting. The support person can be a Monash College student, staff member, close family member, or friend. However, they cannot represent or advocate for the student, as their role is strictly to act as an observer.
- 3.4. The support person must:
 - remain silent during the meeting,
 - not communicate with the student, and

- not participate in the discussion.
- 3.5. If the support person engages in any activity beyond their role as a passive observer, the Committee has the authority to:
- ask the support person to leave the meeting, or
 - close the meeting and reschedule it for another day.
- 3.6. If the support person is a Monash College student, their details must be provided to the Academic Processes and Policy team. Students under investigation for academic misconduct in the same unit cannot serve as support persons.

Before the meeting

- 3.7. When a student is unable to attend the meeting, they can provide a written supporting statement before their scheduled meeting to the Academic Processes and Policy (APP) team. APP will provide this to the AIC, who will review it to make their determination.
- 3.8. A meeting can only be rescheduled where the student has supplied evidence of compassionate and/or compelling circumstances.
- 3.9. Teachers can allow the student to miss a class to attend the scheduled AIC meeting without any disadvantage. When this cannot be accommodated, the student must contact the APP team to have the meeting rescheduled.
- 3.10. When a student does not respond to the communication, provide supporting evidence, or attend the meeting, the AIC will determine the outcome based on the information available at the time of the meeting. It should be noted that students are required to check their Monash College student email account, and therefore, cases can proceed in lieu of any response from the student.

During the meeting

- 3.11. The student's identity must be verified before the meeting commences by requesting their student ID card.
- 3.12. The Committee will discuss the presented evidence with the student regarding the suspected academic misconduct. This may include detailed evidence to expand upon previously summarised rationales sent to the student explaining the suspected academic misconduct.
- 3.13. The student/s will be given an opportunity to present their response to the suspected academic misconduct.
- 3.14. If the student provides a pre-prepared written statement to support their case, it can be provided to the committee at the end of the meeting for consideration.
- 3.15. The Chair may allow the student to write down their responses to the questions if they are nervous and/or unable to convey their message well.

- 3.16. Once all evidence and responses have been gathered and heard, the Chair of the AIC will ask the student to leave the meeting whilst the Committee considers the evidence presented. The student will be informed that the outcome will be provided to them in writing at a later date.

Decision-making process

- 3.17. During deliberation, the AIC will consider all available and presented evidence in line with the decision-making criteria and evidentiary standards (set out in section 4 below).
- 3.18. The Committee will come to a determination as to whether academic misconduct was found or not found.
- 3.19. If the AIC determines that academic misconduct was found, the APP team will inform the Committee of any prior history of academic misconduct by the student (including at any international partners). Prior suspected academic misconduct cases that were dismissed are not to be counted as a history of misconduct.
- 3.20. Outcomes will then be determined based on the criteria set out below (Section 5).
- 3.21. The Committee must complete the AIC meeting form and return this to APP to maintain a record of the meeting and its determination. The form includes a summary of the meeting, the student's response, any additional written statements provided by the student during the meeting, and any supporting evidence used to determine the final outcome, in addition to the initial assessment mark, penalty applied and final assessment mark.
- 3.22. Academic Processes and Policy are responsible for notifying all students of the outcome of the Committee meeting, as well as relevant teams, in a timely manner.

4. Standards of evidence and decision-making criteria

Standards of evidence

- 4.1. Suspected academic misconduct may be detected through various methods and means, including by staff members, systems or tools, or reported by other persons (including staff, students, or persons external to Monash College). Any form of evidence can be considered in the course of the formal investigation by the AIC.
- 4.2. Suspected academic misconduct may be detected and/or reported from more than one method for a single student investigation.
- 4.3. Committee members should consider the viability and quality of all evidence presented in order to determine whether on the balance of probabilities, that the evidence demonstrates that academic misconduct occurred.
- 4.4. Evidence submitted may also include information presented by the student whose work is under investigation, to allow them the fair chance to respond to the allegation.

- 4.5. Table 1 outlines potential indicators of academic misconduct that may warrant investigation. Before initiating a formal investigation, teachers must:
- review the cases and may conduct informal discussions with students;
 - consider their knowledge of the student's performance and classroom engagement;
 - evaluate potential indicators of academic misconduct and ensure proper documentation of evidence; and
 - apply *academic judgement* to determine whether there is evidence of academic integrity breach, rather than relying solely on those potential indicators.

Table 1: Potential Indicators of Academic Misconduct

Category	Potential Indicators and supporting evidence, including but not limited to:
Plagiarism	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ● Originality reports generated by text-matching or similarity-detection software or systems (e.g., Turnitin or equivalent). ● Data matching software for coding assignments (e.g., MOSS). ● Analysis of the similarity report. ● Evidence of inconsistencies in writing styles
Cheating in examinations or other assessment tasks	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ● Reports with timestamps from supervisors, invigilator reports, or invigilation systems, including but not limited to: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ Items and materials that are allowed or prohibited in exam spaces. ○ Proof of identity required before the student is allowed to commence the assessment. ○ Access to software applications and digital media that are not allowed or prohibited on student devices. ○ Directions for how students are expected to engage with the invigilation process. ● Allegations or reports of suspected academic misconduct received from other students, staff, or external parties. ● In-class assessment photographs. ● Full-screen, uncropped screenshots with timestamps showing suspected academic misconduct occurred during assessments. ● Evidence of unauthorised materials, electronic devices, or technologies used during assessments. ● Screen capture of metadata: Unusual information in the file metadata, such as unexpected author names or very short time periods between file creation and completion.
Non-compliance with assessment conditions	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ● Documented evidence of unauthorised materials, electronic devices, or technologies used during assessments. ● Allegations or reports of suspected academic misconduct received from other students, staff, or external parties. ● In-class assessment photographs ● Full-screen, uncropped screenshots with timestamps showing suspected academic misconduct occurred during an assessment.

Category	Potential Indicators and supporting evidence, including but not limited to:
Collusion	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ● Similar structure or reference lists in individual written assignments (or individual written components of group assignment). ● Data based assignments with the same or similar mistakes or unusual answers ● Comparing work between students, for example, answers are identically wrong. ● Identical solutions to a problem. ● Originality reports generated by text-matching or similarity-detection software or systems (e.g., Turnitin or equivalent). ● Data matching software for coding assignments (e.g., MOSS). ● Extracts showing similarity of structure, references, answers. ● Allegations or reports of suspected academic misconduct received from other students, staff, or external parties.
Resubmission of previous work (previously known as Recycling)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ● Originality reports generated by text-matching or similarity-detection software or systems (e.g., Turnitin or equivalent). ● Data matching software for coding assignments (e.g., MOSS). ● Copies of documents matching a student's work including previous submissions or online sources.
Contract cheating	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ● The referencing formatting uses software that is not available or known to the student. ● Originality reports generated by text-matching or similarity-detection software or systems (e.g., Turnitin or equivalent). ● Data matching software for coding assignments (e.g., MOSS). ● Internet search on student's name (e.g. student's name appears on contract cheating or file sharing website, student tagged in a photo at an event at the same time assessment was submitted) ● Correspondence, including emails and documents with students, staff, or external parties. ● Screen capture of metadata: Unusual information in the file metadata, such as unexpected author names or very short time periods between file creation and completion. ● Multiple IP addresses, and/or other technical indicators. ● Login logs of Monash accounts, including Multi Factor Authentication (MFA). ● Copies of documents which match a student's work including previous submissions or online sources.
Fraud	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ● Reports from whistleblowers or third parties verifying fraudulent documents. ● Screenshots and descriptions with timestamps indicating fraud occurred. ● Allegations or reports of suspected academic misconduct received from other students, staff, or external parties.
Unauthorised distribution of course-related materials including	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ● Reports from whistleblowers ● Allegations or reports of suspected academic misconduct received from other students, staff, or external parties. ● Screenshots and descriptions with timestamps indicating academic misconduct

Category	Potential Indicators and supporting evidence, including but not limited to:
assessment-related material	occurred.
Bribery	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Evidence of students offering money, items, or services to staff or others to gain academic advantage for the student or another person.
Other indicators	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Comparative assessment results, including variations in quality, language, or other aspects indicative of authorship or inappropriate content for the program level. The student being unable to discuss the content of their work or the process that was undertaken to produce it. Student notes and drafts inconsistent with submitted work. Records of Informal or formal meetings with students to explain their understanding of their work. Allegations or reports of suspected academic misconduct received from other students, staff, or external parties. Handwriting styles.

- 4.6. For suspected academic misconduct in eAssessments detected by invigilators, supervisors, or invigilation systems, cases will be referred to the Program Leader, Discipline Leader, or Team Leader (or equivalent), or delegate. These leaders will assess the evidence to determine whether:
- the student gained an unfair or unjustified academic advantage.
 - the case should be referred to the Academic Integrity Committee (AIC).
- 4.7. While statistical variance in student submissions across the unit or Monash English program can trigger an investigation, it should not be considered conclusive evidence on its own. To ensure consistency, each discipline area must maintain a uniform approach to the use of the statistical detection tools, which assist in investigations and are used as possible indicators of academic misconduct. These guidelines will be made available on the [staff intranet](#).

Decision-making criteria

- 4.8. Academic Integrity Committees must consider the following when determining the outcome for a formal investigation:
- identify how the allegation could constitute academic misconduct
 - consider any evidence, including information submitted by the student in writing and/or in person, and the student's academic misconduct history to-date (including their time at the College and the breach history from the enrolled/completed Monash College program at an International Partner institution)
 - consider the degree of severity and recurrence of the misconduct
 - consider the intent of the behaviour
 - consider the current stage of the program in which the student is enrolled.

- 4.9. When required, committees may use appropriate internal or external resources available to assist in investigations to enable them to come to a decision on the case.
- 4.10. In determining if academic misconduct has occurred, the burden of proof is on the *balance of probabilities*. The decision maker responsible for investigating the case will use available evidence in combination with their academic and professional judgement.
- 4.11. Where breaches of academic integrity occur concurrently (either in one unit or across multiple units), and the student has not had the opportunity to learn from educative measures and feedback, the AIC may take this into consideration.

5. Outcomes and applications of penalties

Outcomes

- 5.1. Committees have a responsibility to determine an outcome for each case being investigated unless it requires an adjournment (for student welfare concerns, or to gather further information), or where the student discontinues during the Committee meeting.
- 5.2. In all cases, the AIC should detail the reasons behind their determination, which should be provided to the student.
- 5.3. Available outcomes:
 - Dismissed
 - Academic misconduct not found
 - Academic misconduct not found, academic integrity intervention issued
 - Academic misconduct found
- 5.4. The Committee may opt to issue a warning to a student in cases where no academic misconduct was found.
- 5.5. In any instances where academic misconduct was found, the AIC needs to determine which type/s of breach were evidenced and the severity of the academic misconduct.
- 5.6. When academic misconduct was found, after determining types and severity, the Committee must determine a suitable penalty level (1-5). The AIC can apply one of the following levels of outcome to determined academic misconduct cases, in accordance with Appendices A and B below:
 - Warning
 - Partial penalty
 - Zero mark for the assessment task
 - Zero mark for the unit
 - Suspension
 - Exclusion
- 5.7. The AIC will take into account the student's academic misconduct history including any enrolled/completed Monash College program/s at an International Partner institution, when determining suitable outcomes.

- 5.8. Where lower-level misconduct recurs, this may constitute a higher-level case, whether it is unintentional or intentional. The AIC may, at their discretion, consider applying Penalty Level 3 as a minimum in those instances.
- 5.9. Depending on the type/s of academic misconduct and degree of severity, penalty levels may range from Level 1 to Level 5 (refer to Appendices B and C). Note that where a partial penalty applies to the student's awarded mark, the percentage of the attributed content where breaches occur must be considered. The partial penalty cannot be applied unless academic misconduct is found.
- 5.10. The penalty levels in Appendices A and B apply to students currently enrolled in the unit in question. However, for students enrolled at the College but not in the unit in question, the AIC can apply the following penalties when academic misconduct is determined:
- Level 0: A warning letter (academic misconduct not found)
 - Level 1: A warning letter (academic misconduct found)
 - Level 2: Temporary suspension of up to two weeks (academic misconduct found)
 - Level 3: Suspension of one teaching period (academic misconduct found)
For Levels 2 and 3 suspensions, the AIC may consider assessment task submission deadlines when determining the suspension timing.
- 5.11. Penalty levels have varied outcomes within them. Depending on the severity of the breach or the current stage of the program in which the student is enrolled (e.g., last study period of their program), the AIC may, at their discretion, consider applying a higher penalty level.
- 5.12. The final penalty outcome may vary to the minimum outcome in that penalty level as outlined in Appendix A, based on one or more of the following:
- When academic misconduct has occurred more than three times (regardless of whether it is of the same type of breach), the AIC may, at their discretion, consider applying Penalty Level 4 or 5 depending on the severity of the breach.
 - Where a student has committed two or more types of misconduct in the same assessment task, the higher penalty level will apply.
- 5.13. When the AIC decides to suspend a student from their program or exclude the student from the College, the decision must be made with the approval of the relevant Program Director (or equivalent) or delegate and in consultation with the Academic Processes and Policy team where relevant.
- 5.14. For all misconduct found in Foundation Year examinations, the AIC can only make a recommendation to suspend or exclude a student. The recommendation is made to the Academic Progress Panel who determines whether the outcome is to be applied and seeks subsequent approval from the Executive Director, Education.
- 5.15. In the case of suspension or exclusion, this can be:
- suspension from the program for one study period
 - exclusion from the College for a minimum of 12 months.

- 5.16. The Committee may determine that the suspension or exclusion should take effect immediately, and recommend such to the Executive Director, Education.
- 5.17. The Executive Director, Education has the discretion to amend any decisions regarding the application of penalties to ensure procedural fairness.
- 5.18. Any breach that is considered a criminal offence may be subject to legal action.
- 5.19. In cases of significant academic misconduct being determined after the student has graduated from the program or the College and the outcome leads to failure of a unit, the AIC may recommend to the Monash College Academic Board or delegate that the student's award be rescinded (see section 3 of the [Issuance Policy](#) and sections 4 and 5 of the [Issuance Procedure](#)).

Definitions

Academic judgment	Academic judgment is intended to encompass judgments that rely on the opinion of an academic. This includes, for example, decisions about the academic merit of awarded grades, the content of a curriculum, and teaching and assessment methods.
Academic Integrity	This is the moral code of academia. It involves using, generating and communicating information and behaviours in an honest, ethical, fair, respectful and responsible manner. This means that all academic work is the individual's own and credit is given to other people's ideas.
Academic integrity concern	A concern with a student's work that shows poor scholarship and requires improvement in relation to academic skills, as well as developing student's knowledge of academic integrity conventions.
Academic integrity intervention	An educative intervention where poor scholarship is found, and if not addressed could develop into academic misconduct, and is designed to increase student's knowledge of expected academic conventions and principles of academic integrity.
Academic Misconduct	Conduct or behaviour by which a student seeks to gain an unfair or unjustified academic advantage in a course or unit of study. Academic misconduct may be intentional or reckless.
Balance of probabilities	The determination of proof as to whether or not academic misconduct has occurred. This is based on the probability, rather than certainty, that in consideration of the evidence available at the time of the decision, academic misconduct occurred.

Bribery	Offering or giving money, items, or services to College staff members or others to gain academic advantage for oneself or another person.
Cheating in examinations	<p>Cheating in an examination is the act of seeking to obtain an unfair advantage in examination (written, oral or practical). This includes:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ● obtaining, accepting, receiving or using any kind of unauthorised materials, information or technologies to undertake the examination ● being in possession of unauthorised material/notes in examinations and including notes written on the student's body or personal items.
Collusion	<p>Collusion is unauthorised collaboration with another person, where students work together on an assessment task which is then presented as a student's own individual work. Collusion occurs when students collaborate without the permission of the teacher to:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ● work with one or more people to prepare and produce work ● allow others to copy their work or share their answer to an assessment task ● copy the work or notes of others, with or without changes, for the purposes of an assessment task ● allow someone else to write or edit their work ● write or edit an assessment for another student. <p>Proofreading is the process of identifying errors and suggesting corrections to spelling and grammar. In a unit or program where proofreading is permitted, it does not allow for the following:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ● rewriting passages of text in order to clarify meaning ● changing the words used by the submitting student ● rearranging or reformatting text, code or other material ● adding material or references to the original work ● checking calculations or formulas.
Contract cheating	<p>Contract cheating is the act of engaging, or acting as, a third party to produce or complete all or part of an assessment task and submitting that work as the student's own work, regardless of whether they are paid or unpaid. Contract cheating includes instances when a student either receives or offers a contract cheating service, such as when they:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ● engage a third party to produce all or part of the work, including family members, friends, students or staff members ● have another person sit a final examination or take their place in assessable work (e.g., placement, in-class assessment, final examinations)

	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ● offer to complete an assessment for other students ● take the place of, or produce the work for, another student in assessable work.
First study period at the College	Refers to a student's first enrolled study period at the College. Students are not considered as being at the College for the first time if they are re-admitted or come back from intermission, or enrol in/internal transfer to a different Monash College pathway program, or transfer from the program that is delivered in the partner locations.
Fraud	<p>Fraud is a form of cheating where a student submits false information to the College. This may be related to an assessment task, admission, or for another academic related process such as special consideration. Fraud may be a criminal offence and may be subject to legal action. Types of fraud may include but are not limited to:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ● submission of a falsified testamur or academic record to gain admission to a course at the College ● creation of false references in an assessment ● use of falsified data for an assessment, including creating additional data to supplement actual data, modifying data, or <i>falsifying</i> data sets; ● use of forged signatures ● submission of any fraudulent documents including a medical certificate to gain an advantage in admission, assessment (including special consideration) or student academic progress or any other academic related processes.
Generative artificial intelligence	A set of technologies that can perform tasks normally requiring human intelligence - specifically the ability to create new outputs such as text, images, audio, code and video, after human-inputted prompts.
Non-compliance with assessment conditions	<p>Non-compliance may include any of the following behaviours:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ● not following instructions related to the conditions under which the assessment is to be completed, including in an invigilated or supervised assessment ● unauthorised use of technologies (including generative artificial intelligence), to complete part or all of an assessment task ● obtaining, accepting or receiving any unauthorised materials for the completion of an assessment task where not otherwise deemed to be any other type of academic misconduct.
Plagiarism	Plagiarism is the act of using another person's ideas, designs, words or other content and passing them off as one's own without giving appropriate

	<p>acknowledgement. See also 'Resubmission of previous work', which may also constitute plagiarism. Plagiarism may include, but is not limited to, cases where a student:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • paraphrases other people's work and/or ideas without referencing the source • provides reference to the source but inappropriately paraphrases other people's work and/or ideas by not expressing them in the student's own words • uses phrases, passages, layout or structure without quotation marks and/or without a reference to the author(s) or web page(s) • reproduces lecture notes without proper acknowledgement • copies work verbatim, either in whole or in part • presents other's designs, code, images or other material as one's own work • uses any form of information generated by artificial intelligence tools to produce some or all of an assignment when the work submitted should be the student's own.
Resubmission of previous work (previously known as Recycling)	Resubmitting in whole or part of their own work for another assessment item, or past attempt at same assessment item in current or previous enrolment in the subject or any other subject, at any education institution.
Substantial scale	Refers to the magnitude or extent of a breach. This means the act of academic misconduct is significant in terms of its impact, scope and/or frequency.
Unauthorised distribution of course-related materials	<p>Unauthorised distribution of course-related materials is where a student shares, sells or passes on College course materials to another person or entity (including file-sharing sites). This includes:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • any course material produced by the College, such as lecture slides, lecture recordings, class handouts, assessment requirements and questions. Such conduct may also be a breach of the Copyright Compliance Policy and constitute a copyright law infringement subject to legal action • any assessment-related material produced by students themselves or other students (such as notes, past assignments), nor to receive such material without the permission.

Appendices

Appendix A: Penalty levels and outcomes

All penalty level outcomes (other than exclusion) will be combined with an educative response which will provide recommendations to increase learning and academic skills, and may include:

- Helping the student to identify gaps in their skills or knowledge that led to the misconduct
- Counselling the student in appropriate academic practice
- Referring students to the relevant academic skill support services including reviewing educative materials and recompletion of the Academic Integrity Module (in the current or next study period, or upon re-enrolment for suspended students)

The outcomes presented below provide a range of options available to the Committee. The AIC must use its discretion, academic and professional judgement to determine whether the type and severity of the academic misconduct warrants a higher or lower outcome within that penalty level. This may include taking into account a student’s history of academic misconduct and considering what previous outcomes were provided, and whether or not the student has demonstrated any improvement or learning from prior mistakes.

Penalty level	Outcome options
0	A warning letter (academic misconduct not found)
1	A warning letter (academic misconduct found)
2	An outcome letter with partial penalty including: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ● Academic misconduct found; and ● Penalties applied to awarded marks may include: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ Sections containing academic misconduct will not be marked; or ○ A mark reduction proportionate to the unattributed content <p>Note: In some units or Monash English modules, partial penalties may be included in the established rubric where academic misconduct is found. The penalties cannot be applied unless academic misconduct is determined.</p>
3	An outcome letter with penalty including: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ● Academic misconduct found; and ● Penalties may include: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ Zero mark for the assessment task; or ○ Zero mark for the unit
4	An outcome letter with penalties including: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ● Academic misconduct found; and ● Penalties may include: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ● Zero mark for the assessment task; or ● Zero mark for the unit; and/or ● Suspension; and/or ● Suspension with conditions focused on cause of conduct
5	An outcome letter with penalties including: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ● Academic misconduct found; and ● Penalties may include: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ Zero mark for the unit; and/or

- Suspension; or
- Exclusion

Appendix B: Penalty levels by misconduct type and breach history

The AIC must determine a suitable outcome according to the severity and type of academic misconduct. The following table presents descriptions of types of academic misconduct, by severity, to guide the Committee on suitable outcomes to address the misconduct.

Committees can use their discrepancy and if a second breach occurs on a lesser or minor scale, the AIC may opt to give the student a penalty at the same level as the first breach. Equally, if a student has previously received a lesser penalty at one level, a higher penalty in the same level may be given for a subsequent breach. In cases where there has been a significant demonstration of intent or of evading and purposefully attempting to bypass integrity expectations, the AIC may opt to give a higher penalty.

Type of academic misconduct	Description	Penalty levels		
		First breach	Second breach	Third breach
Plagiarism	Minor copying of material, such as copying up to a few sentences or a paragraph. Paraphrasing too closely to the original source Use of several sources without reference (in any format, text, image, video etc). For very minor instances which could instead be considered as poor scholarship (academic integrity concern - such as inadequate, incorrect, inconsistent or missing citation and/or referencing of sources), cases may be dismissed and referred back to an academic integrity intervention.	Level 1	Level 2	Level 3
	Extensive direct quotes, paraphrasing, using information without acknowledging the source. Copying of material verbatim, which constitutes a majority proportion of their assignment, such as several paragraphs. Fabricating citations.	Level 2	Level 3	Level 4

Type of academic misconduct	Description	Penalty levels		
		First breach	Second breach	Third breach
	Where plagiarism appears to have occurred extensively throughout their assignment and/or the student is not in their first study period at the College, a higher penalty level may be considered by the AIC.			
Cheating in examinations or in other assessment tasks	<p><i>This category refers to deliberate actions aimed at gaining an unfair advantage during examinations or other assessment tasks.</i></p> <p>Accessing or using unapproved external sources (e.g., mobile phones, smart watches, notes, software) during an examination or assessment task.</p> <p>Copying from unauthorised materials or other students.</p> <p>Using cheat aids or technologies, including generative artificial intelligence, to seek answers and gain an unfair advantage during an examination.</p> <p>Possess unauthorised materials during an examination, even if they were not used to gain an advantage.</p> <p><i>Where cheating in an examination or in other assessment tasks appears to have occurred extensively, a higher penalty level may be considered by the AIC.</i></p>	Level 2	Level 3	Level 4
Non-compliance with assessment conditions	<p><i>This category involves failure to adhere to the specified conditions of an assessment, which may or may not involve intent to gain an unfair advantage.</i></p> <p>Failing to follow instructions related to the conditions under which the assessment is to be completed, including in an invigilated or supervised assessment. This may have been a</p>	Level 1	Level 2	Level 3

Type of academic misconduct	Description	Penalty levels		
		First breach	Second breach	Third breach
	<p>lack of understanding, rather than a deliberate attempt to gain an unfair advantage.</p> <p>Using unauthorised technologies, including generative artificial intelligence, when explicitly prohibited under the assessment conditions, to complete part or all of an assessment.</p>			
	<p>Obtaining, accepting or receiving any unauthorised materials for completing an assessment task, even if the action does not fall under other types of academic misconduct.</p> <p>Repeated non-compliance with assessment rules, or deliberate attempts to avoid assessment conditions to gain an unfair academic advantage.</p> <p>Extensive use of generative artificial intelligence to complete an assessment task, when such use is prohibited under the assessment conditions.</p> <p><i>Where non-compliance with assessment conditions appears to have occurred extensively, a higher penalty level may be considered by the AIC.</i></p>	Level 2	Level 3	Level 4
Collusion	<p>Working with another student on an assignment that is designed to be individual work. This may be helping with ideas or a small part of an assignment.</p> <p>Showing a lack of understanding between appropriate collaboration and collusion.</p>	Level 1	Level 2	Level 3
	<p>Copying from or providing to another student(s) an answer(s) to any assessment task.</p> <p>Working on an entire assignment with another student and submitting individual assignments</p>	Level 2	Level 3	Level 4

Type of academic misconduct	Description	Penalty levels		
		First breach	Second breach	Third breach
	that have been completed as more than one student.			
Resubmission of previous work (previously known as Recycling)	Resubmitting whole, or parts of, prior assessment items or past attempts, for current or previous enrolment in the unit or any other unit, at any education institution.	Level 2	Level 3	Level 4
Contract cheating	<p>Having another person or entity complete an assessment or examination, or completing an assessment task for another person (i.e., taking the place of, or producing the work for, another student in assessable work).</p> <p>Obtaining (whether or not for money) an assignment or assessment materials (in any format and for any assessment type) - including an examination or test questions, or answers to any assessment task.</p>	Level 3	Level 4	Level 5
Fraud	Misrepresenting work, or attempting to avoid detection, including falsification of data, information or sources.	Level 3	Level 4	Level 5
	<p>Creating or providing fraudulent documents to support a special consideration application (e.g., forged medical certificates).</p> <p>Creating or providing fraudulent documentation in relation to any of the following:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Admission to the College including providing false academic records • Assessment outcomes • Forged Monash College academic records • Academic progress • Other academic related processes 	Level 4	Level 5	Level 5 (higher level outcome)
Unauthorised distribution of course-related	Selling an assignment or assessment materials - including essays, examination or test	Level 3	Level 4	Level 5

Type of academic misconduct	Description	Penalty levels		
		First breach	Second breach	Third breach
materials including assessment-related material	<p>questions or answers to any assessment task or any person or organisation.</p> <p>Uploading assignment/s or assessment materials (including essays, examinations, test questions or answers to any assessment task) to an online platform.</p> <p>Sharing assignment or assessment materials (including essays, examinations, test questions) or answers to any assessment task with a student who is currently enrolled in the unit in question.</p> <p>Distributing material outlining advice or techniques to breach academic integrity.</p> <p>If a student receives or uses the shared assignment or assessment materials as specified above for a submitted assessment task, the same penalty level may be considered by the AIC.</p>			
Bribery	Offering or giving money, items, or services to College staff members or others to gain academic advantage for oneself or another person.	Level 3	Level 4	Level 5

Related Documents

Parent Policy	Student Academic Integrity Policy
Legislation and Standards	Education Services for Overseas Students Act 2000 (Cth) ELICOS Standards 2018 Foundation Program Standards 2021 Higher Education Standards Framework (Threshold Standards) 2021 National Code of Practice for Providers of Education and Training to Overseas Students 2018 Privacy Act 1988
Reference Policies, Procedures and	Student Academic Integrity Procedure

Supporting Documentation	Assessment Policy
--------------------------	-----------------------------------

Version control and accountability table

Accountable Area	Education				
Responsible Officer	Executive Director, Education				
Review Date	January 2027				
Approved by					
Executive Director, Education 4 December 2023					
Endorsed by					
Education Leaders Meeting 4 December 2023					
Version	Authored by	Brief Description of the changes	Approved by	Date Approved	Effective Date
2.2	Senior Consultant - Education Policy and Procedures	Clarified the AIC membership to include cross-program representation as outlined in clause 2.3.	Executive Director, Education	22/01/2026	22/01/2026
2.1	Senior Consultant - Education Policy and Procedures	Updated guidelines to provide clarification on: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Academic Integrity Committee membership and meeting procedures Standards of evidence requirements Types of academic misconduct Penalty levels, including those for College students who are not enrolled in the unit Responsibilities of Executive Director, Education Definition and application of 	Executive Director, Education	18/02/2025	18/02/2025

		'academic judgment'			
2.0	Senior Consultant - Policy and Procedures	Revised guidelines to incorporate penalties into a new document for Academic Integrity Committee Guidelines.	Executive Director, Education	04/12/2023	08/01/2024
1.0	Academic Integrity Officer	Consolidation of pathway procedures	Learning and Teaching Committee	16/06/2021	16/06/2021