

ACADEMIC INTEGRITY PROCEDURE



Initial Approval by Academic Board: 3 Jun 2025

Subsequent Approval by Vice-Chancellor:

Procedure Steward:

Dean of Academic Programs

Related documents

Education Services for Overseas Students Legislative Framework (ESOS)

Higher Education Standards Framework (Threshold Standards) 2021 Part A section 5.2
Academic and Research Integrity

TEQSA Academic Integrity Toolkit (2020)

TEQSA Good Practice Note: Addressing contract cheating to safeguard academic
integrity (2017)

TEQSA Guidance Note on Academic Integrity (2019)

Regulation 8 Members of the University

Regulation 9 Code of Conduct

Academic Staff Policy

Academic Integrity Policy

Assessment Policy and Assessment Procedure

Appeals Policy

Enrolment Policy

Unit Development and Review Policy and Unit Development and Review Procedure

Privacy Policy

Support for Students Policy

1. Rationale and Objectives

1.1 This Procedure document facilitates the implementation of the Academic Integrity Policy at the University of Divinity.

1.2 The University of Divinity's approach to building and maintaining a culture of Academic Integrity is educative, systemic and responsive.

1.3 The University of Divinity's confidential approach to monitoring, managing and reporting academic integrity is at two levels. The first is at the College or School level and the second is at the University level.

2. Scope

- 2.1 This Procedure applies to all members of the University as defined in Regulation 8 Members of the University.

3. Definitions

- 3.1 **Academic integrity** is a moral code guiding academic endeavour and engagement. It involves the generation and communication of information in an ethical, honest, fair, respectful and responsible manner.

- 3.2 **Breaches of Academic Integrity Standards and Generative Artificial Intelligence** definitions can be found in the Academic Integrity Policy.

- 3.3 **Academic Integrity Breaches Classification** fall into three categories.

- a) *Poor Academic Practice (PAP)* is an observed behaviour by a coursework person under consideration that breaches the standards of academic integrity that does not meet the threshold for academic misconduct. It is identified when the student has **unintentionally, inadvertently, or carelessly** failed to follow the academic integrity standards in a submitted work.

PAP only applies when:

- i. The observed behaviour is a result of:
 1. Inadequate attribution of sources, or
 2. Poor quoting or paraphrasing, or
 3. Using GenAI outside of assessment guidelines, or
 4. Misinterpreted assessment instructions.
 - ii. Any advantage to the student would not have been significant.
 - iii. The student has not repeatedly made the same subsection (i) error.
 - iv. The student has not completed a prior award at the University of Divinity within the last 2 years.
- b) *Concerning Misconduct* – An observed behaviour is classified as Concerning Misconduct when a breach of academic integrity standards is due to:
- i. **negligence or recklessness, and/or**
 - ii. where the issue should have been foreseen; and/or
 - iii. where there is an intent to gain advantage.
- c) *Serious Misconduct* – An observed behaviour is classified as Serious Misconduct when a breach of academic integrity standards is:
- i. **deliberate or planned, and/or**
 - ii. An attempt to gain marks or advantage where marks would not otherwise have been awarded, and/or

- iii. A breach under Section 6.1 (g) or (h) of the associated Policy, and/or
- iv. Is of a criminal nature, and/or
- v. Intends to discredit or defraud the University, and/or
- vi. Enables the carriage of breaches of academic integrity.

3.4 Person Under Consideration is the member(s) of the University responsible for work for which concerns were raised regarding a possible Breach of Academic Integrity Standards.

4. Supports for Academic Integrity

- 4.1 Students will be provided with academic integrity training modules.
- 4.2 Students will have access to online academic study skills modules to support them in their academic writing.
- 4.3 Staff at the University will be provided professional development opportunities for teaching and assessing academic integrity including emerging threats to integrity in Higher Education.
- 4.4 Students will be provided with academic skills support by their home college. This should include guidance on:
 - academic integrity principles,
 - appropriate referencing as per the Style Guide,
 - appropriate quoting and paraphrasing.

5. Guidelines for the Use of Generative Artificial Intelligence (GenAI) in Assessments

- 5.1 The use of GenAI in assessment must be undertaken in accordance with the Assessment Procedure to ensure that all work submitted for assessment is able to measure the ability of the student to meet the learning outcomes being assessed.
- 5.2 Submitted assessment tasks may contain the use of GenAI tools in accordance with assessment guidelines in the unit guides. The extent to which GenAI is to be used in preparation of an assessment task must be clearly indicated to the student in the Unit Guide on or before the start date of the unit.
- 5.3 Students may be required to provide process evidence which may include:
 - writing drafts, and/or
 - prompts and responses from GenAI tools, and/or
 - other materials used in the generation of the submitted assessment.
- 5.4 Students must be notified in the Unit Guide and the Submission Declaration (Schedules A & B) that submitted work will be processed through AI detection software and that they may be asked to explain any detected use of GenAI in their submitted work.

- 5.5 Colleges are responsible for ensuring academic staff are aware of the availability of and the prevalence of GenAI tools and their risks to assessment validity.
- 5.6 Colleges are responsible for ensuring academic staff are aware of the risks of GenAI detectors, particularly the likelihood of false positives, and ensuring that any detected use of GenAI is handled in a fair manner. Academic staff must be made aware that commonly used grammar improvement software will be detected by the GenAI detection software as GenAI modified or generated text.
- 5.7 Academic staff are responsible for educating students on the use of GenAI aided grammar software and the implications for detection.
- 5.8 Student-submitted work must only be processed through the University's approved GenAI detection software.
- 5.9 Under no circumstances should students' submitted work be uploaded to unauthorised GenAI tools or GenAI detectors without explicit consent of the student. Unauthorised upload of student work to GenAI tools or detectors by academic staff must be notified to the Dean of Academic Programs, University Secretary or both.

6. Procedure for Reporting and Investigating Breaches of Academic Integrity

6.1 Overview of the Process

- 6.1.1 The University of Divinity's process of monitoring, managing and reporting academic integrity aims to ensure that the process of investigating and classifying behaviour is performed prior to any determination of outcomes or mitigating factors.
- 6.1.2 The process ensures that the education and welfare of person under considerations is managed by a person under consideration's home college or school and records are kept at a college or school unless a Concerning Misconduct or Serious Misconduct classification is made.
- 6.1.3 The investigation process should focus on a educative, systemic and responsive approach to academic integrity to ensure focus remains on assurance of learning and responsible research.
- 6.1.4 The process for investigating a concern about academic integrity behaviour follows the following six stages in this sequence:
 - a) **A Trigger** (as outlined in 6.3) is an event that raises concern about behaviour or evidence of behaviour which may meet the definition of a breach of Academic Integrity in the Academic Integrity Policy
 - b) **A Report Requesting Intervention** is submitted by a member of the University providing evidence and context
 - c) **An Investigation** will determine the type of Academic Integrity breach and the nature of conduct
 - d) **A Classification** of the Academic Integrity behaviour of concern is made based on the type of breach and nature of conduct
 - e) **A Determination** of outcomes will be made in accordance with this procedure

- f) **Follow-up** actions to ensure education, support and restoration are managed by the person under consideration's home College or School

6.2 ***Responsibilities of Parties to Report***

- 6.2.1 A member of the University who considers that another member of the University may have breached academic integrity or committed academic misconduct as described in this Procedure, even if inadvertently, is required to report the issue immediately to the relevant Academic Integrity Officer.
- 6.2.2 An Academic Integrity Officer is an Authorised Officer appointed by the Vice Chancellor to monitor, investigate and make determinations regarding instances of Academic Integrity breaches.
- 6.2.3 At every College and School of the University, there will be at least two Academic Integrity Officers, one of them will be the Academic Dean of the College or School.
- 6.2.4 Authorised officers will include other Academic Integrity Officers as in the table below:

<i>Domain</i>	<i>Academic Integrity Officer</i>	<i>Alternate</i>
Unit of study or assessment task	Academic Dean of College or School delivering the unit	Another Academic Integrity Officer or Academic Dean of another College
Higher degree by research	Dean of the School of Graduate Research	Dean of Academic Programs or Dean of Research Strategy
Academic staff – concerning breach	Principal of the staff member's College	Principal of another College
Academic staff – serious breach	Chair of the Academic Board	Deputy Chair of the Academic Board
Research involving human subjects	Chair of the Human Research Ethics Committee	Deputy Chair of the Human Research Ethics Committee
Any other matter	University Secretary, for referral to an Authorised Officer appointed by the Vice-Chancellor for the matter at hand	

- 6.2.5 A person who is external to the University who considers that a member of the University may have breached academic integrity as described in this Policy may report the issue to the relevant Academic Integrity Officer.
- 6.2.6 If a student has reason to believe that their work has been plagiarised, copied, or otherwise used for academic misconduct, the student must report the matter immediately to their lecturer or Academic Dean.

6.2.7 A potential breach of academic integrity is reported confidentially to an Academic Integrity Officer in accordance with Regulation 9.3.3 and as set out in the table below. Where the Academic Integrity Officer has a conflict of interest which cannot be resolved, the Academic Integrity Officer must refer the matter to the Alternate Academic Integrity Officer in the table in 6.2.3 or request the Vice-Chancellor to appoint another Academic Integrity Officer.

6.3 ***Triggers that may Raise Concerns of an Academic Integrity Breach***

6.3.1 A concern or suspicion of breach of academic integrity standards may occur due to:

- a) A high percentage Similarity Report of student assessment submission
- b) Similarities between submissions from two or more students
- c) A report detecting possible use of GenAI in a submitted work where the use of GenAI was not expected
- d) A confidential report from a member of the University about a student or staff member's submitted work
- e) An observed change in the writing style of a student
- f) A lack of footnotes, unexpected sources, or inappropriate use of quotation marks
- g) Or other observed behaviour

6.4 ***Initial Report at College or School Level***

6.4.1 Where a potential need for support or intervention is observed due to a possible breach of academic integrity standards, a report should be made to an Academic Integrity Officer via the Academic Integrity Registry System.

6.4.2 A report is confidentially held by the Academic Integrity Officer at a ***College or School until a classification of Concerning or Serious Misconduct is submitted to the University Secretary.***

6.4.3 The report should include, as applicable:

- Unit of study (code and name)
- Assessment Task
- Name and student number of Person Under Consideration
- Evidence of the area of concern
- Trigger for concern
- Description of conduct

6.5 ***Investigation of Potential Breach at the College or School level***

6.5.1 The investigation is performed by the Academic Integrity Officer as per section 6.2.3 of this Procedure.

- 6.5.2 Throughout the reporting, investigation and determination process, the care and wellbeing of the person under consideration is vital. The Academic Integrity Officer may consult with an appropriate colleague to ensure the welfare of that person is supported, while maintaining confidentiality.
- 6.5.3 Where the Academic Integrity Officer is the lecturer or examiner of the person under consideration, then the investigation must be conducted by another Academic Integrity Officer.
- 6.5.4 The Academic Integrity Officer will need to consider:
- **Type of Breach:** What does the evidence show has happened?
 - **Nature of Conduct:** Why has the person under consideration acted in the way they did?
- 6.5.5 The Academic Integrity Officer should determine the Type of Breach of Academic Integrity Standards as defined in Section 6 of the Academic Integrity Policy.
- 6.5.6 If the evidence does not suggest a Breach of Academic Integrity Standards, and there is no reason to investigate further, the Academic Integrity Officer should close the investigation and where appropriate notify the reporting member of the University.
- 6.5.7 After determining the Type of Breach, the Academic Integrity Officer will meet with the person under consideration. The purpose of the meeting is to hear the perspective of the person under consideration and provide an educative response as soon as possible.
- i. The person under consideration may bring a support person to the meeting. The support person must not be a legal representative.
 - ii. The person under consideration has the right to seek advice from support services.
 - iii. The meeting should aim to discover:
 - a) To what degree was the person under consideration aware of the University's Academic Integrity Policy and Procedure?
 - b) To what degree was the person under consideration aware of the expectations of academic integrity and work required for this assessment task, including the use of GenAI?
 - c) What were the reasons or circumstances that made the person under consideration act in a way that has caused concern?
 - d) What mitigating circumstances may be at play in this suspected need for intervention? Mitigating circumstances may include:
 - Unclear guidance from teaching staff
 - External stresses or pressure that could have been mitigated by an extension, support or intervention plan

- 6.5.8 If the meeting with person under concern points to a knowledge or skill gap, the Academic Integrity Officer should take the opportunity for timely instruction on the practices of Academic Integrity.
- 6.5.9 The Academic Integrity Officer needs to determine the Nature of Conduct . Nature of conduct may be of the following forms:
- Unintentional, inadvertent, or careless
 - Reckless and negligent
 - Intentional and deliberate
- 6.5.10 History of conduct by the person under consideration is not to be a factor in the investigation or classification steps of the procedure.
- 6.5.11 The Academic Integrity Officer must upload their finding to the Academic Integrity Register System once the confidential investigation has been completed.
- 6.6 ***Classification of Breach at the College or School Level***
- 6.6.1 The Type of Breach and Nature of Conduct will determine the Classification of the Breach in accordance with the table in Schedule C. This should happen automatically through the Academic Integrity Register System.
- 6.6.2 The College or School Academic Integrity Officer may request the Dean of Academic Programs downgrade or upgrade the classification.
- 6.6.3 In considering a request to modify the classification the Dean of Academic Programs should give consideration to the following:
- a. Risks to quality of education at the University
 - b. Mitigating circumstances
 - c. Lack of clarity in definitions of breaches or nature of conduct
 - d. Gaps in University, College or School resourcing around Academic Integrity Standards
- 6.7 ***Determination of Outcomes***
- 6.7.1 The determination of outcomes is based on the classification made in Section 6.6 and prior history of conduct by the person under consideration.
- 6.7.2 Before determining outcomes, the breach of academic integrity must be evaluated by considering each of the following:
- a) Academic level of person under consideration (e.g. first year undergraduate, postgraduate student, experienced scholar)
 - b) Volume of work affected by the breach of academic integrity
 - c) Extent to which the breach of academic integrity standards would provide unfair advantage

- d) Risks to the University or partner institution's reputation
 - e) Mitigating circumstances
 - f) History of academic integrity incidents by the person under consideration
- 6.7.3 If the person under consideration has a history of breaches of the academic integrity standard that gives the Academic Integrity Officer cause to change the Nature of Conduct, they may ask the Dean of Academic Programs to upgrade the classification in accordance with 6.6.3.
- 6.7.4 An outcome should be determined based on the Outcomes Matrix in Schedule D. A classification of outcomes for Serious Misconduct will be referred to a University Authorised Officer as per section 6.7.13.3.
- 6.7.5 If the classification was PAP and the meeting with the person under consideration was able to provide sufficient educative follow up, the above outcomes may be considered complete.
- 6.7.6 A record of the decision is kept in the Registry System.
- 6.7.7 Records of Poor Academic Practice are only accessible to the student's home College or School and is not used for disciplinary purposes.
- 6.7.8 The Academic Integrity Officer should meet with the person under consideration to inform them of the determination and required outcomes.
- 6.7.9 A written summary of the determination and outcomes taken or required should be sent to the person under consideration within 2 business days. If outcomes are outstanding the person under consideration will be given a deadline of no less than 3 days and no greater than 30 days to complete the outcomes.
- 6.7.10 The Academic Integrity Register System will notify:
- The Academic Dean of the Provider and Home College (if different from Provider) with a summary of findings and recommended actions
 - The Dean of Academic Programs (Coursework) or Dean of Graduate Studies (HDR) with a summary of findings and recommended actions
- 6.7.11 The person under consideration will be informed of additional support mechanisms to help them achieve their learning objectives.
- 6.7.12 The person under consideration should be informed of their right of appeal as per the University's Appeals Policy.
- 6.7.13 *Serious Academic Misconduct Panel*
- 6.7.13.1 For classifications of Serious Academic Misconduct the incident will be referred to a University Authorised Officer:
- a) the Dean of Academic Programs (for coursework students), or
 - b) the Dean of the School of Graduate Research (for HDR), or

c) the Vice-Chancellor (for University staff), or

d) Chancellor (if involving the Vice-Chancellor)

6.7.13.2 The University Authorised Officer will review investigation materials to ensure correct classification of the Breach of the Academic Integrity Standards.

6.7.13.3 The University Secretary and Vice-Chancellor will be asked to convene a Panel comprising of:

a) For coursework students:

i. The Chair of the Academic Board (or Deputy Chair)

ii. An Authorised Officer of the University not at the student's home college or school

iii. The Academic Dean of the student's home college or school

iv. Another person with relevant expertise, either internal or external to the University.

b) For all other members of the University, ensuring that no member of the panel has a perceived conflict of interest:

i. Two members of the Council, usually including the Chair of the Academic Board

ii. Two other persons with relevant expertise, either internal or external to the University.

iii. The Authorised Officer of the University conducting the investigation under 6.7.13.1

6.7.13.4 The University Secretary and Vice-Chancellor should appoint a Panel Chair.

6.7.13.5 Where a breach of academic integrity involves the Vice-Chancellor, the matter is referred to the Chancellor for action, modifying these procedures as appropriate.

6.7.13.6 Four members of the Panel constitute a quorum. All decisions of the Panel are made by majority vote of the members; the Chair has the casting vote in the event of a tied vote.

6.7.13.7 Minutes must be taken of all Panel meetings.

6.7.13.8 The Panel must meet as soon as possible after the matter is referred to a University Authorised Officer and usually not more than 10 working days later. All deliberations must be strictly confidential.

6.7.13.9 The Panel may solicit submissions in writing from any interested party and may undertake any other activity to ensure a fair, just and equitable outcome, while maintaining confidentiality as far as practicable.

6.7.13.10 The Panel must inform the person under consideration that the matter has been referred to the Panel. The Panel should meet with the person under consideration in the

process of deliberations. The person under consideration may bring a support person to that meeting, but this person cannot be a legal representative.

6.7.13.11 The Panel determines an outcome in accordance with the outcomes in Schedule D.

6.7.13.12 The Panel Chair should share the Panel's findings and any recommended actions for the University to the University Secretary and Vice-Chancellor.

6.7.13.13 The findings of the Panel should be communicated to the person under consideration in a meeting with the Vice-Chancellor or appropriate delegate.

6.7.13.14 A written summary of the determination and outcomes taken or required by the Panel should be sent to the person under consideration within 2 business days.

6.7.13.15 The University Secretary will upload the findings, and any documents required to the Academic Integrity Register System.

6.7.13.16 The Vice-Chancellor may approve Schedules to this Policy to establish further guidelines on the classification of common cases of potential breaches of academic integrity of Concerning or Serious gravity provided that such guidelines are consistent with the Academic Integrity Policy.

6.8 Follow-up on Actions

6.8.1 The Home College Academic Dean of the student is responsible for ensuring the student is provided with the support and resources needed to complete the required outcomes..

6.8.2 The Academic Integrity Register System will generate a reminder communication to the person under consideration and the Home College Academic Dean before the end of the Semester in which the outcomes were to be completed.

6.8.3 The Home College Academic Dean will follow up with the person under consideration to determine whether the outcomes have been completed, and if the student needs any other support.

6.8.4 If person under consideration has not completed the outcomes, and mitigating circumstances apply, then the Home College Academic Dean may grant a short extension of no greater than 30 days.

6.8.5 If person under consideration has not completed the required outcomes, the College Academic Dean may recommend the Dean of Academic Programs, Dean of School of Graduate Research or Vice-Chancellor enforce Regulation 9 Code of Conduct penalties.

6.8.6 Once the Home College Academic Dean is satisfied that the required actions have been completed, confirmation will be uploaded to the Academic Integrity Register System.

7. Appeals

7.1 A member of the University who is found to have committed a breach of academic integrity may appeal the decision through the University's Appeals Policy.

8. Reporting

8.1 All reporting will be generated from the Academic Integrity Register System.

- 8.2 The University Secretary is responsible for maintaining the Academic Integrity Register which records actual breaches of academic integrity, and the total number of investigations conducted.
- 8.3 Information on the Academic Integrity Register is confidential to the University Secretary and Governance Officers. Deidentified information may be compiled for the purpose of meeting reporting requirements under this policy. Otherwise, information may only be shared by them:
- to support an investigation of a potential breach of academic integrity (for example, record of prior history of potential or actual breach)
 - to support consideration of an appeal under the Appeals Policy
 - to comply with external statutory or regulatory requirements
 - to adhere to a direction of the Council.
- 8.4 The records in the Academic Integrity Register will be protected and only accessible in line with the table below:

Classification	<i>Poor Academic Practice</i>	<i>Concerning Misconduct</i>	<i>Serious Misconduct</i>
Student related information	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> College only 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> College OVC 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> College OVC
Form of Conduct information	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> College OVC can access aggregated for de-identified confidential reporting only 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> College OVC for de-identified confidential reporting 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> College OVC for de-identified confidential reporting

9. **Accountability and Improvement**

- 9.1 The Dean of Academic Programs with support of the University Secretary provides a summary report to the Academic Board annually on:
- practices to enhance academic integrity
 - number of reports of potential breaches of academic integrity, deidentifying Colleges and individuals
 - number of actual breaches of academic integrity by gravity, deidentifying Colleges and individuals
 - issues identified
 - support plans and actions put into action

f) outcomes of actions undertaken

e) recommended actions to strengthen academic integrity in the University.

9.2 The Academic Board must report annually to the University Council on the number of actual breaches of academic integrity and the penalties applied, deidentifying Colleges and individuals, and how it has monitored, reviewed and reported on strategies to promote academic integrity and minimise breaches of academic integrity.

10. **Date of Next Review**

10.1 This Policy must be reviewed no later than 31 December 2028.

Schedule A: Assessment Submission Declaration

Approved by Academic Board: 15 November 2019

This declaration must be affirmed by every student of the University when submitting a written assessment task. In the case of a group project, all group members are required to affirm this declaration.

I declare that

- a) the material submitted for assessment is the result of my own work or as part of a group assessment of which I am a member.
- b) all sources on which it is based, and any assistance received in completing the assignment have been acknowledged.
- c) material has not been copied or purchased or written by someone other than me in preparation of this assessment
- d) I complied with the Generative Artificial Intelligence (GenAI) permission criteria of this assessment task.
- e) I have been made aware that this task will be processed through Similarity and AI detection software

Schedule B: Thesis Declaration for Higher Degree Research and Minor Thesis Students

Approved by Academic Board: 15 November 2019

Name:

Thesis Title:

I declare that:

- a) the thesis submitted for examination is the result of my own work
- b) all sources on which the thesis is based, and any assistance received in completing the thesis have been acknowledged in the scholarly apparatus
- c) no material in the thesis has been copied or purchased or written by someone other than me
- d) I complied with the Generative Artificial Intelligence (GenAI) permission criteria of this minor thesis task.
- e) I have been made aware that this task will be processed through Similarity and AI detection software
- f) any research involving human subjects has been approved by the Human Research Ethics Committee and is reported in the thesis in accordance with that approval.

Schedule C: Classification of Breaches of Academic Integrity Standards

Classification	Type of Breach	Nature of Conduct
Poor Academic Practice	Plagiarism Lack of appropriate citation, quotations, paraphrasing, and or referencing	Unintentional, inadvertent, or careless
Concerning Academic Misconduct	Reproduced other people's work as their own Copied other student's assignments Submitted own previously submitted work Submitted GenAI generated work without proper attribution	Reckless Negligent Intended to gain marks or advantage
Serious Academic Misconduct	Reproduced sections or essential elements created by other people without appropriate acknowledgement Copied other student's assignments Submitted own previously submitted work Submitted GenAI generated work without proper attribution Submitted work of others as own, that was passed through paraphrasing tools Impersonated other people in invigilated assessments Fabricated or falsified results or data Contravened invigilated exams requirements	Intentional Deliberate Planned Intended to gain marks or advantage

Schedule D: Possible Outcomes for Classified Breaches of Academic Integrity Standards

If the action has been classified as **Poor Academic Practice**, the person under consideration will:

- a) be required to (re-)complete the Academic Integrity Module.
- b) be required to either:
 - i. (re-)complete the Academic Skills Module, or
 - ii. meet with Academic Skills support staff

The person under consideration may also:

- a) require an Academic Support / Intervention Plan to be designed for them and overseen by their home College or School
- b) Be given an opportunity to re-submit the affected work.
- c) Have marks deducted for the portion of marks allocated to writing and citing in the assessment criteria.

If the action has been classified as a **Concerning Academic Misconduct**, the Academic Integrity Officer may impose the following penalties.

- a) For the first offence of Concerning Academic Misconduct
 - i. The student is required to complete the Academic Skills Module.
 - ii. The student is required to complete the Academic Integrity Education Modules
 - iii. The student may be given an opportunity to re-submit the affected work, with a maximum mark for the re-submission of 50%.
 - iv. The Academic Integrity Register is updated with the determination.
- b) For a second offence of Concerning Academic Misconduct
 - i. The student is required to complete the Academic Integrity Education Modules.
 - ii. A zero (0) mark may be assigned for the assessment task in which the academic misconduct occurred, or
 - iii. A Fail is recorded for the unit of study undertaken by the student.
 - iv. The Academic Integrity Register is updated with the determination
- c) For a third offence of Concerning Academic Misconduct
 - i. All marks for the assessment task in which the academic misconduct occurred are disallowed, or
 - ii. A Fail is recorded for the unit of study undertaken by the student.
 - iii. Academic Integrity Register is updated with the determination

If the action has been classified as a Serious Academic Misconduct, and the panel substantiated the findings, the following penalties may be applied:

a) For the first offence of Serious Academic Misconduct

- i. The student is required to complete the Academic Skills Module.
- ii. The student is required to complete the Academic Integrity Education Modules
- iii. Either all marks for the assessment task in which the academic misconduct occurred to be disallowed, or
- iv. A Fail by the student in the unit of study is recorded, or
- v. The member is referred to relevant authorities if the offence is of criminal nature, or
- vi. The member provides a statement of regret or apology, where appropriate, or
- vii. The member is required to retract their work, such as an academic publication, or
- viii. Disciplinary action in accordance with Regulation 9.4 is imposed on the member that may include suspension or expulsion from the university.

b) For a second offence of Serious Academic Misconduct

- i. The student marks for the assessment task in which the academic misconduct occurred to be disallowed, or
- ii. A Fail by the student in the unit of study is recorded, and
- iii. The member is referred to relevant authorities if the offence is of criminal nature, or
- iv. The member provides a statement of regret or apology, where appropriate, or
- v. The member is required to retract their work, such as an academic publication, or
- vi. Disciplinary action in accordance with Regulation 9.4 is imposed on the member that may include suspension or expulsion from the university.

The Academic Integrity Register System will generate the following reports:

- The determination and required actions made in 6.7.2.6 will be sent to the student
- The determination and required actions made in 6.7.2.6 will be sent to the Provider Academic Dean and the Academic Dean of the Home College or School (if they are different).
- The determination and required actions made in 6.7.2.6 will be sent to the Dean of Academic Programs (Coursework) or Dean of Graduate Studies (HDR)