



PROCEDURE FOR MANAGING ALLEGED STUDENT MISCONDUCT

Version:	Approved by:	Approval Date:	Effective Date:	Next Review:
9	Academic Board	9 July 2020	9 July 2020	3 July 2020
Responsible Officer:	General Manager	Document No:	UOWC-ADM-PRO-14	
Purpose:	This Procedure <ol style="list-style-type: none">1. Supports and should be read in conjunction with the <i>Academic Integrity and Student Conduct Policy</i>; and2. outlines the process which must be implemented when managing allegations of student misconduct.			
Scope:	This Procedure applies to the management of all allegations of misconduct by UOW College students.			
Related Documents:	Privacy Policy Records Management Policy Student Grievance and Appeals Policy Student Handbook			
References and Legislation:	Higher Education Standards Framework Public Health Act 2010 (NSW) State Records Act 1998 (NSW) TEQSA Guidance Note: Academic Integrity			



Contents

1	Definitions	4
2	General Misconduct	5
3	Academic Misconduct	5
4	Managing Alleged Student Misconduct.....	6
5	Stage 1 – Initial Determination by the relevant Head of Program	6
6	Stage 2 – Investigation by the PIO	8
7	Stage 3 - Investigation by a Misconduct Panel	10
8	Misconduct Panel Investigation Procedure.....	11
9	Outcome of a Misconduct Panel Investigation.....	13
10	Appealing against a Student Misconduct Decision	14
11	Termination of Investigation Proceedings	15
12	Urgency Provisions.....	15
13	Roles and Responsibilities	16
14	Extension of time limits	17
15	Record Keeping.....	17



UOW
COLLEGE
AUSTRALIA

16	Templates	17
17	Version Control Table:.....	17
18	Appendix A: General Misconduct Outcomes	19
19	Appendix B: Academic Misconduct Outcomes.....	21



1 Definitions

Word/Term	Definition
Central Register	A register and file of student misconduct investigations controlled and maintained by the College.
Complainant	A person who claims that a student has acted in a manner that does not comply with the College's or UOW's Rules, codes, policies or procedures
Conflict of Interest	A conflict between a person's private interests and College's obligations
Due Process	Procedural rights under this procedure, including the application of the principles of natural justice
Misconduct Panel	A panel assembled for the purpose of examining allegations of general or academic misconduct.
Nominated delegate	The staff member appointed by a delegated authority to conduct an investigation of an allegation of student misconduct under this procedure
Primary Investigation Officer (PIO)	A nominated officer at UOW College who is responsible for making (or helping to make) an initial determination of the allegation of student misconduct, and for actioning low-level outcomes where appropriate. <i>Ex officio</i> PIOs are nominated at 15.
SOLSmial	Student Online Services messaging system.
Student	Any person who is enrolled in any course or program offer at, or in conjunction with, the College. For vocational, this may be referred to as learner.

All other definitions relating to student conduct are detailed in Part 4 of the *Academic Integrity and Student Conduct Policy*.



2 General Misconduct

- 1) General student misconduct is defined in clause 8.2 of the Academic Integrity and Student Conduct Policy.
- 2) The relevant Head of Program may determine that the action of a student represents poor conduct rather than general misconduct.

Poor Conduct

- 3) Poor conduct is defined in clause 8.3 of the Academic Integrity and Student Conduct Policy.
- 4) In the case of poor conduct, the relevant Head of Program may determine that an informal response is required to educate the student on acceptable conduct at the College.
- 5) Actions that can be taken under an informal response are:
 - a. Warning;
 - b. Referral to Support Services.
- 6) The Head of Program has authority to issue the student with an informal response.
- 7) A record of the interaction will be kept by the Head of Program.
- 8) The Head of Program will refer to poor conduct records in any future allegations of general misconduct by the student.

3 Academic Misconduct

- 1) Academic Misconduct is defined in clause 8.4 of the Academic Integrity and Student Conduct Policy.
- 2) The relevant Head of Program may determine that the action of a student undertaking coursework represents poor academic practice rather than academic misconduct.

Poor Academic Practice

- 1) Poor academic practice is defined in clause 8.6 of the Academic Integrity and Student Conduct Policy.
- 2) In the case of poor academic practice the relevant Head of Program may determine that an informal response to the student's conduct is required, to educate the student on correct academic practice.
- 3) Actions that can be taken under an informal response are:
 - a. Warning;



- b. Referral to English Language Resource Centre;
 - c. Resubmission of the assessment item without penalty;
 - d. Provision of additional material to support the assessment item;
 - e. Minor mark penalty (up to a maximum of 20%).
- 4) The Head of Program has authority to issue the student with an informal response.
 - 5) A record of the interaction will be kept by the relevant Head of Program.
 - 6) The Head of Program will refer to poor academic practice records in any future allegations of academic misconduct by the student.

4 Managing Alleged Student Misconduct

- 1) This procedure provides a staged investigation for dealing with all allegations of student misconduct:

Stage 1: Initial determination by the relevant Head of Program (see Part 7)

Stage 2: Investigation by the relevant PIO (see Part 8)

Stage 3: Investigation by Misconduct Panel (see Part 9)

- 2) Where an act of general or academic misconduct is determined to have occurred, it will be managed with either a Low-level, Medium-level or High-Level Response. The following table outlines the office or officer responsible in each case:

Low-Level Response	Primary Investigation Officer
Medium-Level Response	Misconduct Panel
High-Level Response	Misconduct Panel

- 3) In circumstances where the office or officer managing the investigation of an allegation of student misconduct requires additional time to fully investigate the allegation to ensure an appropriate outcome, the student will be advised of these circumstances in writing by the office or officer responsible in each case.

5 Stage 1 – Initial Determination by the relevant Head of Program

- 1) An assessor or complainant must bring an allegation of student misconduct to the attention of the relevant Head of Program as soon as possible once it has been identified.



- 2) The assessor or complainant shall provide the relevant Head of Program with any information and evidence relating to the allegation. If necessary, the relevant Head of Program may collect further evidence relating to the allegation.
- 3) In cases where it is alleged that a student has presented work that is not their own, the Head of Program may require the student to undertake an oral examination of the assessment content. Where oral examination is required, the Subject Coordinator, or another suitable teaching staff member in the relevant field of education, will be commissioned to conduct the oral examination with the student. The outcomes of the oral examination will be considered by the Head of Program and will contribute to the Stage 1 determination.
- 4) The Head of Program may nominate another suitable delegate to conduct an initial investigation of an allegation of student misconduct and examine all relevant documentation and evidence provided. The nominated delegate may also consult with the PIO at any stage, discuss the allegation with the student and seek a student response to the allegation in order to make a recommendation to the Head of Program.
- 5) If, after all reasonable efforts have been made to contact and discuss the allegation with the student, and the Head or Program or nominated delegate has not been able to do so, they may proceed with the investigation without discussing the issue with the student.
- 6) Based on the evidence collected, including discussions with the student, findings of any oral examination conducted during the Stage 1 investigation and the recommendation made by the nominated delegate where applicable, the relevant Head of Program will determine if there is sufficient evidence that an act of misconduct has occurred.
- 7) The relevant Head of Program must make this determination as soon as possible and within a maximum of ten (10) working days of having received the allegation.
- 8) Where appropriate, the student should be instructed to continue their normal academic work while an initial determination is being made, unless directed to do otherwise by:
 - a. the General Manager,
 - b. the relevant Head of Program,
 - c. the Student Services Manager.

Allegation of Misconduct Dismissed

- 9) If the relevant Head of Program determines that there is insufficient evidence that misconduct has occurred, the allegation will be dismissed.



- 10) The relevant Head of Program will notify the student in writing that the allegation has been dismissed.
- 11) The relevant Head of Program may determine that an allegation of misconduct represents poor conduct or poor academic practice rather than misconduct, and may impose an informal response.

Allegation of Misconduct Determined

- 12) If the relevant Head of Program determines that there is sufficient evidence that misconduct may have occurred, the allegation will progress to a Stage 2 Investigation.
- 13) The relevant Head of Program will notify the relevant PIO of the case.

6 Stage 2 – Investigation by the PIO

- 1) The PIO will review the information provided by the Head of Program and may, where there is ambiguity or the Head of Program was unable to contact the student, contact the student to discuss the allegation and seek their response.
- 2) If, after all reasonable efforts have been made to contact and discuss the allegation with the student and the PIO has not been able to do so, they may proceed with the investigation without discussion with the student.
- 3) The PIO must make a determination as soon as possible and within a maximum of ten (10) working days of having received the allegation from the Head of Program.

Allegation of Misconduct Dismissed

- 4) If, at the completion of an investigation, the PIO determines that on the balance of probabilities, misconduct has not occurred, the allegation will be dismissed.
- 5) The PIO will advise the student and relevant Head of Program in writing that the allegation has been dismissed.
- 6) When dismissing allegations of misconduct, the PIO may determine that poor conduct or poor academic practice has occurred and that an informal response to the student's conduct is required. Actions that may be taken under an informal response include:
 - a. Warning;
 - b. Requirement of a formal apology from the student;
 - c. Any recommendation deemed reasonable by the PIO to educate the student on acceptable conduct standards.
- 7) The PIO may take action under an informal response at his/her discretion.
- 8) A record of all interactions shall be kept by the PIO.

Allegation of Misconduct Upheld

- 9) If, at the completion of an investigation, the PIO determines that on the balance of probabilities, misconduct has occurred, the allegation will be upheld.
- 10) The PIO will request the relevant Head of Program to check the Central Register and poor academic practice records to determine whether an entry exists for the student regarding any previous misconduct offences or alleged misconduct offences.
- 11) The PIO shall determine the appropriate level of response and outcome.
- 12) In determining the appropriate level of response and outcome, the PIO may give consideration to the factors listed in the appendices.
- 13) If the PIO determines that a low-level response is appropriate, they will continue with management of the case in accordance with Stage 2 - Conclusion of investigation by Primary Investigation Officer.
- 14) If the PIO determines that a Medium or High-level response is appropriate, the PIO will refer the case to the Misconduct Panel, in accordance with Stage 3 – Investigation by a Misconduct Panel.

Conclusion of an Investigation by the Primary Investigation Officer

Low Level Response

- 15) The PIO will determine the appropriate Low-level outcome to be applied in accordance with the appendices to this procedure.
- 16) The PIO may discuss the prospective outcomes and potential consequences of each outcome with the relevant Head of Program to ensure that students are not unfairly reprimanded.
- 17) The PIO will:
 - a. Impose the outcome;
 - b. Advise the Head of Program to enter the case and outcome on the Central Register;
 - c. Advise the student of the outcome using the appropriate Notice of Outcome of Investigation template; and
 - d. Advise the complainant and other relevant staff of the outcome, as necessary.

Medium and High-level Responses

- 18) If the PIO determines that a Medium or High-level response is appropriate, the PIO will refer the case to the Misconduct Panel.
- 19) When referring a matter to the Misconduct Panel, the PIO must:



- a. Use the Referral of Misconduct Investigation Template to record full details of the case, including:
 - i. A detailed explanation of the allegation;
 - ii. Evidence supporting the allegation;
 - iii. Result of discussion or interview with the student;
 - iv. The student's conduct history;
 - v. The recommended outcome; and
 - vi. Supporting materials.
 - b. Update the record of the case on the Central Register;
 - c. Advise the student of the referral using the appropriate notice letter template.
- 20) The concerned student must be informed of the referral through the service of an Investigation Notice (clauses 8.1 - 8.5).

7 Stage 3 - Investigation by a Misconduct Panel

- 1) The Misconduct Panel shall consider cases referred to it by the relevant PIO.

Membership of a Misconduct Panel

- 2) The Misconduct Panel shall comprise:
 - a. The General Manager or nominee as Chair;
 - b. A Head of Program; and
 - c. One other staff member (appointed by the Chair) who is not involved with the teaching or assessment of the student concerned.
- 3) The PIO or nominee appointed by the Chair shall act as Secretary to the Panel. The Secretary, who is not a member of the Panel, shall assist the Panel as directed by the Chair.
- 4) Both genders must be represented on the Panel.
- 5) A person may not sit on the Panel investigating an allegation of student misconduct where that person has previously been involved with the allegation or there is a potential conflict of interest.
- 6) A member of the Panel who, during an investigation, ceases to hold the office by virtue of which they are a member of the Panel, may remain a member of the Panel until the investigation has been completed.
- 7) If during the course of an investigation or appeal a member of the Panel becomes unable (through illness or any other cause) to act for a period that would unduly delay



the completion of the investigation, the Panel may complete its investigation or appeal in their absence as long as at least two other members are still able to act.

8 Misconduct Panel Investigation Procedure

Service of a Panel Investigation Notice

- 1) Where a matter has been referred to a Misconduct Panel, the Secretary of the Panel must serve the student with a written Investigation Notice as soon as possible and within a maximum of ten (10) working days of the referral.
- 2) An Investigation Notice served under clause 8.1 must include:
 - a. Details of the allegation;
 - b. Reference to any rule, policy or code allegedly breached;
 - c. Advice on withholding assessment results (where relevant);
 - d. An invitation to attend an interview at a given date, time and location;
 - e. The option for the student to be assisted by a support person of their choice at the interview;
 - f. Attached copies of any documentation being considered (subject to any requirement to maintain the privacy or safety of another person) and any relevant rule, policy or code;
 - g. An invitation to the student to provide a written statement of how they wish to answer the allegation and any supporting evidence, including counselling reports in advance of the investigation interview; and
 - h. Advice that, if the student chooses not to attend, the matter shall be determined in their absence.
- 3) A notice may be served on a student using the most appropriate communication method under this procedure including:
 - a. By email ; or
 - b. Personally within the College or elsewhere (e.g. at their residence); or
 - c. By post addressed to the student's last known place of residence.
- 4) If a notice is served by way of post, it shall be deemed to have been served on the student on the date on which it would have been delivered in the ordinary course of the post.
- 5) A copy of the notice served on a student under clause 8.1 must be provided to the Head of Program and PIO, for advice to other relevant officers of the College.

Panel Investigation Meetings



- 6) The Panel meeting should be held as soon as possible and within a maximum of twenty (20) working days of the date of service of the Investigation Notice.
- 7) If a student wishes to submit documentation listed below to the Panel, it must be provided at least two working days before the Panel meeting:
 - a. A written statement of how they intend to respond to the allegations;
 - b. Other written material pertinent to their case;
 - c. The names of any witness(es) and/or any person supporting the student during the meeting;
 - d. Any other supporting documentation including professional report(s), statement(s) of extenuating circumstances or character reference(s) may be provided.
- 8) At their discretion, the Chair may consider documentation which is presented by a student less than two working days before the Panel meeting where it can be authenticated.

Completing a Panel Investigation

- 9) Where a student who has been given due notice chooses not to attend a Panel meeting, the Panel may investigate the matter or hear an appeal in the student's absence.
- 10) In conducting an investigation meeting, the Panel shall:
 - a. Give the student an opportunity to be heard;
 - b. Explain the allegation to the student and give the student the opportunity to respond to the allegation;
 - c. With the permission of the student, make an audio recording of the interview between the panel and the student and attach to the Panel file;
 - d. Give the PIO, complainant and/or any other staff member or student involved in the event(s) leading up to the complaint an opportunity to be heard;
 - e. Permit the student to be assisted by a support person;
 - f. at the discretion of the Chair, permit any person appearing before the Panel to be assisted by a support person;
 - g. Permit any support person attending the meeting to provide advice to the student and to address the Panel in a summary statement only - the support person is not permitted to interview witnesses or to address the Panel directly during interviews;
 - h. Permit the student to nominate witnesses to appear to support their defence against the complaint;



- i. Permit any person appearing before the Panel in accordance with (d) above to nominate witnesses to appear to support their evidence;
 - j. Disallow questions which it considers to be unseemly or irrelevant for the nature of its investigation;
 - k. Caution all persons appearing before the Panel that they are expected to conduct themselves in a reasonable and responsible manner during the proceedings and that any form of behavior which is an impediment to the proceedings shall of itself be regarded as a breach of the Policy;
 - l. Where there is reasonable concern by the Panel or any witness or participant in the proceedings that an individual's safety may be compromised by contact with the student who is the subject of the allegation (e.g. where the student is subject to an Apprehended Violence Order), be entitled to allow the evidence to be presented without the student being present;
 - m. Where the conduct of any person interferes with any other person's right to be heard, be entitled to remove that person from the meeting and to hear their evidence separately;
 - n. In cases where the Panel finds that the complaint is proven, give the student the opportunity to be heard on the issue of penalty,
 - o. Hold all its proceedings in private; and
 - p. Keep adequate records of the Panel meeting proceedings.
- 11) Decisions of the Panel are made by majority.
- 12) Where multiple investigations of alleged misconduct by a particular student are taking place concurrently, the determination of an appropriate outcome for the latter investigation/s may be deferred until the determination of an outcome for the former investigation has been made.
- 13) A comprehensive file of all relevant documentation, including records of the Panel proceedings, evidence presented and the Panel's decision shall be created, maintained and retained by the College in accordance with Part 15 of this procedure.

9 Outcome of a Misconduct Panel Investigation

Allegation of Misconduct Dismissed

- 1) If the Misconduct Panel determines that, on the balance of probabilities, misconduct has not occurred, the allegation will be dismissed.
- 2) The Misconduct Panel must:



- a. Advise the PIO to update the record of the case on the Central Register; and
- b. Advise the student and Head of Program of the outcome using the appropriate Notice of Outcome of Investigation template.

Allegation of Misconduct Upheld

- 3) If the Misconduct Panel determines that, on the balance of probabilities, misconduct has occurred, the allegation will be upheld.
- 4) The Panel will then determine the appropriate level of outcome in accordance with the appendices.
- 5) The Misconduct Panel will determine the level of response and outcome that is appropriate and will:
 - a. Impose an outcome;
 - b. Advise the PIO to update the case and outcome on the Central Register accordingly; and
 - c. Advise the student and Head of Program of the outcome using the appropriate Notice of Outcome of Investigation template.

Notification of a Panel Investigation Outcome

- 6) As soon as practicable after a meeting of the Panel, and within a maximum of ten (10) working days, the Chair (or nominee) must serve the student with written notice of the outcome of the investigation using the Notice of Outcome of Investigation template.
- 7) Where the outcome includes a reprimand from the General Manager, the notice shall be signed by the General Manager.
- 8) A copy of the outcome notice served on a student must be provided to the relevant Head of Program and PIO, for advice to relevant officers of the College.

10 Appealing against a Student Misconduct Decision

- 1) A student has the right to appeal a decision at any stage of a misconduct determination or investigation under the Student Grievance and Appeals Policy.
- 2) All appeals will commence at Stage 3 – Appeal to Director Legal and Governance.
- 3) The officer managing the student appeal will keep all parties informed of the progress.



11 Termination of Investigation Proceedings

- 1) Any misconduct investigation proceedings, including appeal proceedings, may be suspended by the General Manager if the student ceases to be enrolled at the College.
- 2) If misconduct investigation proceedings are suspended under rule 13.1, the General Manager will advise the student that:
 - a. They have no automatic right to return to the College, and
 - b. If they apply for re-enrolment, they shall not be re-enrolled until the misconduct investigation proceedings are completed.
- 3) The General Manager will ensure that the record of the investigation on the Central Register is updated.

12 Urgency Provisions

- 1) On recommendation, the General Manager may take urgent action before the completion of a misconduct investigation if the allegation:
 - a. Is the subject of investigation by police or other civil authorities;
 - b. Concerns an action that threatens the welfare or study of other students or staff;
or,
 - c. Is otherwise considered to be serious enough to warrant urgent action.
- 2) Urgent actions that may be taken by the General Manager under the urgency provisions include:
 - a. Temporary block of the student's IT access;
 - b. Limitation of the student's right of access to the College;
 - c. Termination of the student's right of access to the College;
 - d. Immediate suspension of the student from the College; or
 - e. Urgent referral of the matter to the Misconduct Panel.
- 3) After a preliminary review of an allegation, the following officers may make a recommendation to the General Manager for urgent action under the urgency provisions:
 - a. Relevant Head of Program;
 - b. Primary Investigation Officer;
 - c. Nominated Chair of the Misconduct Panel.
- 4) Upon receiving a recommendation under clause 12.1, the General Manager may:



- a. Accept the recommendation and take action under clause 10.2 as soon as possible (ideally within five (5) working days and extending no later than is reasonably necessary for the convening of a Panel); or
 - b. Not accept the recommendation and refer the matter back to the officer to complete the investigation in accordance with the normal procedure.
- 5) Where urgent action is taken under the urgency provision, the officer that recommended the action will:
- a. Ensure that the student is served with a written notice of the temporary block of IT access, limitation or termination of right of access, or suspension, as a matter of urgency;
 - b. Urgently refer the matter to the Panel for the service of an Investigation Notice; and
 - c. Notify the relevant officers in writing.

13 Roles and Responsibilities

- 1) Roles and responsibilities are detailed in Part 11 of the Academic Integrity and Student Conduct Policy.
- 2) Officers who will hold the position of Primary Investigation Officer (PIO) in a student misconduct investigation are detailed below:

Academic Misconduct	Manager Regulatory Affairs and Policy, or nominee
Misconduct involving library services	Director, Library Services or nominee
Misconduct involving IT services	Director, IMTS or nominee
Misconduct involving student accommodation	Head of University Residence, Director, Accommodation Services or nominee;
Other Misconduct	Manager Regulatory Affairs and Policy or nominee

- 3) A PIO is permitted to seek advice from the other PIOs during the investigation of alleged student misconduct.



14 Extension of time limits

- 1) Any time limit set in this Procedure may be extended at the discretion of the PIO or Chair of the Misconduct Panel to provide adequate time to gather evidence and convene a meeting, or because of special circumstances demonstrated by the student.
- 2) Where time limits are extended, the student will be notified.

15 Record Keeping

- 1) All files relating to investigations of student misconduct shall be retained and disposed of in accordance with the UOW Global Enterprises' Records Management Policy.
- 2) Cases of student misconduct shall be recorded on the Central Register by the relevant Head of Program or PIO.

16 Templates

- 1) Investigation and Outcome Notice Templates:
 - a. F-UOWC-09.1.1 Notice of Outcome of Investigation,
 - b. F-UOWC-09.1.2 Notice of Investigation Committee Meeting.

17 Version Control Table:

Version Control	Date Effective	Approved By	Amendment
1	23 June 2008	Academic Board	New Procedure
2	20/06/11	Ian Tobin	Administrative Update – Updated for name change, positions titles updated.
3	13/09/13	Patricia McGrellis	Administrative Update – Templates given document numbers and added to procedure
4	08/09/2015	Georgia Chapman, Policy Officer and Law Clerk	Administrative Update – Merged to new template, and position title changes. Removal of no longer use stage 5 appeal.
5	21/07/2016	Steve Federici, Compliance Officer	Administrative Update – Current branding and document formatting updated.
6	08/06/2017	Academic Board	Merger of Procedure for Managing Alleged Academic Misconduct by a Student and Procedure for Managing Alleged General Misconduct by a



			Student; renaming of combined document as Procedure for Managing Alleged Student Misconduct; Re-ordering of procedures.
7	30/08/2017	Simon Potts, Policy Officer	Administrative Update – correct typographical error at 9.2 made during the merger of the General and Academic Procedures.
8	3 July 2019	Julie Renwick General Manager	Minor amendments to allow for time extensions and delegation by Head of Program.
9	9 July 2020	Academic Board	Amended to provide for Head of Program to commission the Subject Coordinator or other delegate to conduct oral examinations (viva voce) when investigating allegations of misconduct.



18 Appendix A: General Misconduct Outcomes

- 1) Acts of general misconduct by a student will result in a Low-level, Medium-level or High-level Outcome.
- 2) The outcomes that may be applied at each level of response are as follows:

Level of Response	Outcome	Authorised Persons
Low-Level Response	<ol style="list-style-type: none">a. Reprimand from the PIO or standing nominee,b. Fine up to \$250 or charge for costs incurred up to \$1000,c. Requirement to complete online behaviour programs or attend Counselling service,d. Limitation of access to College property and/or any College associated service (Library, IT, Student Accommodation) for a period of no longer than one (1) session,e. Reprimand from the General Manager.	Primary Investigation Officer
Medium-level response	<ol style="list-style-type: none">a. Any informal response (as listed at clause 2.5),b. Any Low-level outcome,c. Reprimand from the Misconduct Panel,d. Probation status covering access to College property and/or the use of any College associated service for a period no longer than one (1) academic year.	Misconduct Panel
High-Level Response	<ol style="list-style-type: none">e. Fine up to \$1000 or charge for costs incurred above \$1000,f. Denial of access to College property and/or any College associated service (Library, IT, including eviction from Student Accommodation),g. Immediate suspension,	Misconduct Panel



Level of Response	Outcome	Authorised Persons
	<ul style="list-style-type: none">h. Deferred suspension subject to one or more conditions (e.g. good behaviour, demonstrated consultation with a registered professional, meeting academic performance targets),i. Exclusion from the College,j. Expulsion from the College,k. Withhold official certification (e.g. academic transcript, degree testamur, certificate) for up to three months,l. Rescission of diploma by the UOW College Academic Board,m. Rescission of certificate or award,n. Referral to external licensing bodies,o. Any other penalty deemed appropriate	

Considerations for Determining General Misconduct Outcomes

- 3) The following factors may be given consideration when determining an appropriate outcome for an act of general student misconduct:
 - a. Any relevant individual circumstances of the student;
 - b. Whether the student has previously been found in breach of general standards for student conduct or poor conduct and is the subject of an entry on the Central Register;
 - c. Any apparent intention to commit the offence by the student; and, if any,
 - d. The level and effect of that intention.



19 Appendix B: Academic Misconduct Outcomes

- 1) Where academic misconduct by a student is determined, a Low-level response, Medium-level response or High-level response will be imposed.
- 2) The outcomes that may be applied at each level of response are as follows:

Level of Response	Outcome	Authorised Persons
Low-Level Response	<ol style="list-style-type: none">a. Any informal outcome (as listed at 3.5 or 6.5);b. Submission of an alternate assessment task; or<ol style="list-style-type: none">– Assessment penalties that do not directly result in the student receiving a technical fail for the subject, including:<ul style="list-style-type: none">○ Resubmission of assessment task with a mark penalty;○ Deduction of marks for assessment task;○ Zero mark in assessment task where the assessment is less than 50% of the final grade for the subject; or○ Reduced mark in subject (e.g. student restricted to a pass grade).	Primary Investigation Officer
Medium-Level Response	<ol style="list-style-type: none">a. Any informal outcome (as listed at clause 3.5 or 6.5);b. Any Low-Level outcome; orc. Zero mark or reduced mark in subject	Misconduct Panel
High-Level Response	<ol style="list-style-type: none">a. Any informal outcome (as listed at clause 3.5 or 6.5);b. Any Low-Level outcome;c. Any Medium-Level outcome; and/or any of the following:d. Reprimand from the General Manager;e. Immediate Suspension by the General Manager;f. Deferred Suspension by the General Manager subject to one or more conditions (e.g. good behavior, demonstrated	Misconduct Panel



Level of Response	Outcome	Authorised Persons
	<p>consultation with a registered professional, academic performance);</p> <p>g. Exclusion from the College by the General Manager;</p> <p>h. Expulsion from the College by the General Manager;</p> <p>i. Withhold official certification (e.g. academic transcript, degree testamur) for up to three months; or</p> <p>j. Rescission of diploma by the UOW College Academic Board:</p> <p>k. Rescission of certificate by the General Manager</p>	

Considerations for Determining Academic Misconduct Outcomes

- 1) The following factors may be given consideration when determining an appropriate outcome for an act of academic student misconduct:
 - a. Whether the misconduct is considered important or of consequence to the assessment item in which it has occurred, also taking into account the nature of the misconduct and the context in which it is found,
 - b. The extent of the misconduct in an assessment item,
 - c. The proportion of the overall course mark represented by the assessment item,
 - d. The nature of the course and the assessment item,
 - e. The conventions associated with the particular academic discipline,
 - f. The year or study level of the student,
 - g. The language proficiency of the student,
 - h. Any relevant individual circumstances of the student,
 - i. Whether the student has previously been found in breach of academic misconduct or poor academic practice and is the subject of an entry on the Central Register,
 - j. Any apparent intention to deceive by a student and, if any,
 - k. The level and effect of that intention.