

NON-EXAMINATION CHEATING PLAGIARISM & COLLUSION POLICY AND PROCEDURES Faculty of Education

1. RULES OF PROCEDURE FOR REFERRING CASES OF PLAGIARISM TO FACULTY DISCIPLINE COMMITTEE

1.1 Identifying cases of plagiarism (under point 7 of University's policy on plagiarism)¹

Plagiarism occurs when students fail to acknowledge that ideas have been borrowed from another source. Plagiarism has occurred when,

- i. phrases and passages are used verbatim without quotation marks and without a reference to the author;
- ii. an author's work is paraphrased and presented without a reference;
- iii. another students' work is copied;
- iv. items of assessment are written in conjunction with other students without the chief examiner's (or nominee's) prior permission;
- v. a piece of work has already been submitted or assessed in the unit the student is currently enrolled in or another unit he/she completed.

1.1.1. If a case of plagiarism is suspected by the chief examiner (or nominee) it is incumbent upon him/her to make a judgment on the following:

- A. Whether there is any intent to conceal the instance of plagiarism identified.**
- B. Whether there is an intentional act of plagiarism (or attempt at dishonesty) by concealing reference etc.**

1.1.2. Before the Chief Examiner (or nominee) makes a decision as to whether plagiarism was intentional the Chief Examiner (or nominee) must put the matter to the student and give them an opportunity to respond. This is best done by calling the student to a meeting, and giving him/her particulars of the plagiarism charge. The student should be informed of the provisions of the Statute 4.1 – Discipline² as to what penalties may be applied if cheating is found to have occurred. If the student is unable to attend a meeting with the Chief Examiner (or nominee), particulars of the plagiarism should be put to the student in writing (both email and hardcopy) and the student should be asked to respond within 10 working days from the date of the written communication.

1.1.3. On the basis of the meeting/response from the student the Chief Examiner (or nominee) must decide whether or not he/she believes that plagiarism was likely to have been intentional or unintentional. If the student is unable to provide a satisfactory explanation of the relationship

¹ <http://www.policy.monash.edu/policy-bank/academic/education/conduct/plagiarism-policy.html>

² <http://www.monash.edu.au/pubs/calendar/statutes/statutes04.html#Heading102>

between the student's work and the sources identified by the staff member, the Chief Examiner may infer that plagiarism was done with intention to cheat.

1.1.4. In type A cases, where the failure to acknowledge the ideas of others is judged to be not intentional, the only offence the student has committed is the academic misdemeanour of failing to reference a source correctly and academic penalties may be applied. In these cases, the Chief Examiner (or nominee) must inform the student in writing within 10 working days of the meeting/response from the student as to the course of action to be taken. The Chief Examiner (or nominee) is required to do one of the following:

- Advise the student that the paper will be marked without penalty. The Chief Examiner (or nominee) will assess the assignment using normal five point scale; or
- Advise the student that the paper will be marked with a penalty. The Chief Examiner (or nominee) will assess the assignment on a pass/fail basis only or with deduction of marks; or
- Advise the student that he/she is required to resubmit the work and that the paper will be marked on a pass/fail basis only.

1.1.4.1 The Chief Examiner is obliged to

- i. give formal advice to the student that incorrect referencing practices have been identified
- ii. counsel the student regarding referencing practices in writing and
- iii. ensure (as far as possible) that the student understands what plagiarism involves.

1.1.5 In type B cases, where the Chief Examiner (or nominee) is reasonably satisfied that the plagiarism was done with the intention to obtain an unfair advantage in assessment, the matter must be reported as suspected cheating pursuant to University Statute 4.1 - Discipline (see paragraph 8.2.2). One of the following actions will then occur:

1.1.5.1 The assignment will not be assessed and the Chief Examiner will enter a WH grade will be entered against the student's unit attempt (see [paragraph 8.2.1](#) of Statute 4.1).

1.1.5.2 Instances of plagiarism identified by the Chief Examiner (or nominee) in a student's assignment will be highlighted and the corresponding passage(s) in the source document will also be highlighted before it is sent to the secretary of the Faculty Discipline Committee.

1.1.5.3 Instances of plagiarism will be highlighted in sequential order (A, B, C, D, etc.) on both the assignment and corresponding source document. If the Chief Examiner (or nominee) has not marked up both the assignment and source documents correctly it will be brought to the Chief Examiner's (or nominee's) attention and returned. One copy of the assignment and corresponding source document will be submitted to the Secretary of the Faculty Discipline Committee.

1.1.5.4 A suspected case of plagiarism will be referred to the Faculty Discipline Committee, and the Chair of this Committee will determine whether the instance of suspected plagiarism warrants a hearing.

1.1.5.5 If it is deemed by the Chair that the instance of plagiarism is not serious enough to go to the Faculty Discipline Committee and rather warrants counselling by the Chief Examiner (or nominee) then the assignment will be returned to the Chief Examiner (or nominee) accompanied by an email outlining the reasons.

1.1.5.6 Cases that have been identified by the chair as warranting a hearing will be followed up by a charge letter to the student outlining the details of the plagiarism charge and copies of the Chief Examiner's (or nominee's) marked up assignment and source articles. Documents to be included are:

- i. Student's assignment(s) with alleged plagiarised passages highlighted
- ii. Source documents with alleged corresponding plagiarised passages highlighted
- iii. Document of "Rules of procedure for hearing by Faculty Discipline Committee"
- iv. A hardcopy of the University Discipline Statute 4.1 (Students)
- v. Student Support Services information

1.1.5.7 An email copy of the charge letter sent to the student will also be sent to the Chief Examiner (or nominee) regarding notification of Faculty Discipline Committee hearing date. (see [paragraph 9.2.2](#))

1.1.5.1 The student must be advised that they have the right to defend the charge in writing and request their submission be considered by members of the Faculty Discipline Committee prior to the hearing. (See [paragraph 8.3.2](#))

1.2 Collusion

1.2.1 Collusion may take the form of similar work submitted by students who may have worked together under circumstances where this is not allowed. This is quite distinct from collaboration where students work together on a joint project.

- i. Collusion involves a student assisting a student with an examination or other written or practical work with the intention that the student will thereby obtain an unfair advantage.
- ii. If students present as their own work that is nearly identical to that of another student, copied from another person, that has been presented by a previous student, or has been presented by a student at another institution, this may be interpreted as cheating.
- iii. Where work submitted for assessment by two or more persons is the same or substantially the same, the work so submitted is prima facie evidence of cheating by those persons.

1.2.2 In cases where a student has engaged in unauthorised collaboration on assessable work with another student, the Chief Examiner (or nominee) should follow procedures outlined under Section 1. In cases of collusion both or all student(s) suspected of colluding should be approached by the Chief Examiner in an attempt to determine responsibility.

1.3 Plagiarism Register

1.3.1 In cases identified type (A) and (B) (see 1.1.1), the student's details must be entered on the Faculty plagiarism register which records warnings and the outcomes (if any) of an accusation of

plagiarism. Both an electronic database and hardcopy reference file must be maintained by the Secretary of the Faculty Discipline Committee.

1.3.2 A student's involvement in alleged plagiarism will be retained on the plagiarism register while still enrolled or intermitted in any course and academic staff will have access to this information when considering any subsequent allegations of plagiarism.

2. ORGANISING THE FACULTY DISCIPLINE COMMITTEE HEARING

2.1 The Secretary of the Faculty Discipline Committee should arrange a hearing date no less than 2 weeks after to the charge letter has been sent to the student concerning the meeting of the Faculty Discipline Committee to consider their case.

2.2 Once a date has been confirmed with members of the Faculty Discipline Committee members which include the Chair (The Associate Dean Teaching or nominee), an academic staff representative and student representative, (see [subsection 9.5](#)), the student should be notified, if they have not already been notified, and chief examiners also advised of the date of the hearing. The Chief examiner or the teaching staff member (chief examiner's nominee) who made the report under [subsection 8.1](#) cannot attend or be included in the membership of the Faculty Discipline Committee (see [paragraph 9.6.1](#))

2.3 An appropriate venue should be arranged for the hearing. Voice point should be booked if the student is unable to attend hearing in person (e.g. Offshore students). If the student is unable to attend the hearing, the secretary should request a preferred contact phone number from the student.

2.4 Three days (minimum) prior to the date of the Faculty Discipline Committee hearing, the secretary must distribute to members of the Faculty Discipline Committee the following documents:

- Marked up copies of the Assignment(s) and respective source documents. The copies must be colour highlighted in order to identify passages in question.
- A hardcopy of the University Discipline Statute 4.1
- A copy of the Rules of Procedure for the Faculty Discipline Committee hearing (see below)
- Any written submissions from the student defending the charges.
- A copy of the hearing times and student details (this includes all student correspondence re: charge, whether the student has appeared before FDC before or whether they are listed on the plagiarism register, previous warning letters etc.

3. RULES OF PROCEDURE FOR HEARING BY FACULTY DISCIPLINE COMMITTEE

3.1 Order of Proceedings

3.1.1 The chair reads the charge to the student.

3.1.2 The chair:

- i. gives the background of the proceeding;
- ii. explains the issues;
- iii. summarises the evidence/gives names of witnesses to be called by the Faculty and/or the student (if any);
- iv. informs the student of any other means by which the Committee intends to inform itself.

3.1.3 The chair asks the student whether the charge is admitted. If the student admits the charge, the student is asked whether he/she would like to submit any evidence in mitigation and/or any information which the committee should take into consideration when determining the penalty to be imposed.

3.1.4 If the student denies the charge, the chair commences the inquiry by putting questions to the student. Other members of the Committee may question the student in turn.

3.1.5 The Faculty witnesses, if any, are called. In the presence of the student, questions are put to each witness by the chair and the other members of the committee. The student is then permitted to put questions to the witness.

3.1.6 The student may then call their witnesses (if any). The student explains why each witness has been called. Questions are put to the witness in accordance with 5.

3.1.7 Witnesses are excluded from the hearing when not giving evidence.

3.1.8 The Committee may call for and consider any relevant information such as:

- i. a record of student's library borrowings;
- ii. other assignments.

3.1.9 When the Committee has completed its inquiries, the Chair invites the student to make a final address to the Committee. The student should be advised not to make submissions for leniency at this stage. (See 11 below).

3.1.10 The Chair asks the student and the student's support person to leave while the committee makes a determination. This is normally done on the same day but may be deferred if the Committee is waiting on additional information.

3.1.11 The student and the support person are called back and informed of the committee's finding. If the committee has decided that the student is guilty of the misconduct, the student is given an opportunity to make a submission on the penalty to be imposed.

3.2 Submissions from the student

3.2.1 The Committee must assess the credibility and weight of any personal information provided by the student in order to determine an appropriate penalty.

3.3 Decision of the Faculty Discipline Committee

3.3.1 The Chair announces the committee's finding and the penalty to be imposed under Statute 4.1-Discipline (see [section 14](#)).

3.3.2 Where a discipline committee determines that cheating has occurred the committee must impose one or more of the following penalties under [subsection 14.3](#):

- i. a reprimand (under [paragraph 14.3.1](#))
- ii. disallowance of the work concerned by prohibiting assessment or, where the work has been assessed, annulling the result in the assessed work (under [paragraph 14.3.2](#))

- iii. failure in the unit of which the work concerned forms the whole or a part (under [paragraph 14.3.3](#))
- iv. suspension from the university for a specified period (under [paragraph 14.3.4](#))
- v. exclusion from the university (under [paragraph 14.3.5](#))

3.3.3 In cases where there has been a disallowance of the work concerned under [paragraph 14.3.2](#) then the committee should decide on the following under [subsection 14.4](#) of the Statute:

- i. Permit the student to submit, within a specified period, a substitute piece of work for assessment as outlined by the committee (under [paragraph 14.4.1](#)). The Faculty Discipline Committee is required to determine and advise the student and chief examiner whether the assessment will be according to a pass/fail basis only or normal five point scale. Four weeks is the standard time frame, from the date of the hearing, for resubmission of work by the student to the chief examiner.
- ii. Deem the disallowance to be a failure on the part of the student in the examination or work (under [paragraph 14.4.2](#)).

3.3.4 Where, after hearing a charge of cheating, the Faculty Discipline Committee determines that cheating has not been established under [subsection 14.5](#) the committee must

- i. Impose only a reprimand under paragraph 14.3.1.
- ii. Instruct the chief examiner to make an assessment of the work concerned.
- iii. Remove the student's name from the Faculty's plagiarism register.

4. POST- HEARING PROCEDURES

4.1 The hearing details and the Faculty Discipline Committee decision must be minuted by the Secretary of Faculty Discipline Committee according to the wording of the Faculty Discipline Statute 4.1.

4.2 After a matter has been heard and determined by the committee, an outcome letter outlining the decision of the Faculty Discipline Committee must be sent to the student concerned. An email copy of this letter should be sent to the Chief Examiner and Chair of the Faculty Discipline Committee.

4.3 The student's details (name, unit code, semester, and outcome details) should be recorded on the Faculty's plagiarism register (both the electronic database and hardcopy folder). (See exception above: 3.3.4.)

4.4 Student is advised in the outcome letter of their right to appeal the Faculty Discipline Committee decision to the Central Discipline Committee (Appeals) under [Section 15](#) of Statute 4.1 – Discipline.

5. POLICY REFERENCES

University Plagiarism Policy

<http://www.policy.monash.edu/policy-bank/academic/education/conduct/plagiarism-policy.html>

Statute 4.1 - Discipline

<http://www.monash.edu.au/pubs/calendar/statutes/statutes04.html#Heading102>