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2 BACKGROUND AND AUDIENCE

TRIM is the backend of the University’s corporate recordkeeping system known as Records Online. It has been maintained by Archives and Records Management Services since 2000.

In August 2015, The Vice-Chancellor’s Academic Misconduct and Plagiarism Taskforce recommended the TRIM workflow system used by the Faculty of Arts and Social Sciences since 2014 for handling cases of alleged academic dishonesty and plagiarism be redeveloped and expanded for use by The University’s other faculties (see Appendix A). This recommendation was endorsed shortly thereafter by the Senior Executive Group.

After several months of consultation with key university and faculty stakeholders, the redeveloped case referral and recordkeeping system went live in March 2016. Both elements of the system have been designed to explicitly support the efforts of academic and professional staff in implementing the University’s Academic Honesty in Coursework Policy 2015 and the related procedures.

This manual provides an overview of the recordkeeping system and the detailed instructions required by faculty administrators and relevant academic decision makers to effectively use this system. The manual will be updated frequently and the latest version can be accessed via the Records Management Services website.

While of general interest to all staff of the University, this manual will be of most use to:
1. Faculty staff members responsible for administering the educational integrity process;
2. Each faculty’s Educational Integrity Coordinator (EIC) and nominated academics;
3. The Office of Educational Integrity; and
4. The Workflow support officers in Records Management Services.

A separate manual for using the online referral form can be accessed via the University’s Intranet on the Office of Educational Integrity’s website.
3 SYSTEM REQUIREMENTS AND ACCESS

3.1 Software requirements

The online referral form and recordkeeping systems are powered by the HP Records Manager (HPRM or TRIM) native application. While it is not essential to use this software, it is recommended for faculty administrators.

If you are using a Mac, you may have to use the TRIM Citrix interface or Records Online web interface (see following section).

Please contact the Records Online Help Desk (recordonline@sydney.edu.au or 903 69537) if you require assistance or wish to have TRIM installed on your computer.

3.2 Web applications and systems access

The online case referral form and recordkeeping workflow system have been configured for use with Mozilla Firefox, Google Chrome or Microsoft’s Internet Explorer.

Faculty administrators and academic decision makers can access all current cases in their respective workflows via the portal at following link: https://recordsonline2.sydney.edu.au/workflowportal/Content/InTray.aspx.

Records related to individual cases, particularly those that have been concluded, can be accessed via TRIM or Records Online: https://recordsonline.sydney.edu.au/?utm_source=intranet&source=intranet&source=sydney&source=system-logins&utm_medium=web&utm_content=system-logins&utm_campaign=intranet

3.3 Off-campus access: VPN

If you are working off-campus and outside of the University’s fixed network, you will need to be logged in to the University’s Virtual Private Network (VPN) in order to access the recordkeeping system and any documents held therein.

To download and install the VPN client to access the University network while working remotely, please see the information provided on the ICT website.

3.4 Records Online user accounts

Faculty administrators, Educational Integrity Coordinators and nominated academics are required to have an active Records Online/TRIM user profile. If you are not already a registered Records Online user, please request access via:

1. Login to the Self Service Portal on the Staff Intranet using your Unikey.
2. Click the ICT Services hyperlink.
3. Click the UniKey and Account Management hyperlink.
5. Once the required fields have been completed, select Order to submit the request.

3.5 Access controls

In order to maintain the security and confidentiality of case records, the following access controls have been established:

1. Faculty administrators have been granted access to all case workflows and records relating to their own faculty only.
2. **Educational Integrity Coordinators and nominated academics** have been granted access to case workflows and records across all faculties.

3. **Staff from the Office of Educational Integrity, the DVC Education Portfolio, and Student Affairs Unit** have been granted access to case workflows and records across all faculties.

4. **Case initiators and Unit of Study Coordinators** do not have access to any case workflows or records, although they will receive e-mail notifications regarding the progress and outcomes of relevant cases.

Access groups have been established in TRIM/Records Online as follows:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Who</th>
<th>Access group</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Office of Educational Integrity, relevant DVC Education staff, and Student Affairs Unit</td>
<td>{WF - EI - Admin}</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Educational Integrity Coordinators and Nominated Academics</td>
<td>{WF - EI - EIC or NA}</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Faculty Educational Integrity Administrators</td>
<td>{WF - EI - Agriculture and Environment}</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>{WF - EI - Architecture, Design and Planning}</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>{WF - EI - Arts and Social Sciences}</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>{WF - EI - Business (Business School)}</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>{WF - EI - Dentistry}</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>{WF - EI - Education and Social Work}</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>{WF - EI - Engineering and Information Technologies}</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>{WF - EI - Health Sciences}</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>{WF - EI - Law (Sydney Law School)}</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>{WF - EI - Medicine (Sydney Medical School)}</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>{WF - EI - Nursing (Sydney Nursing School)}</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>{WF - EI - Pharmacy}</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>{WF - EI - Science}</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>{WF - EI - Sydney College of the Arts}</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>{WF - EI - Sydney Conservatorium of Music}</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The contact details of faculty administrators and EICs/nominated academics can be found on the Office of Educational Integrity’s website.

### 3.6 Retention of case records

The retention of case records is governed by the NSW State Records Act 1998 and retention schedule GDA23-03.02.02. This legislation and retention schedule requires all documentation related to workflow cases to be retained for a period of 6 years after the last action date. However, The University may wish to retain such records for a longer period if there is a compelling business requirement.

### 3.7 Learning Management System access

Faculty administrators, Educational Integrity Coordinators, and nominated academics may in certain circumstances be required to access documentation held in relevant Learning Management Systems sites and Turnitin assignment drop boxes. The authority for them to do so has been granted by the University’s Deputy Vice-Chancellor (Education), Professor Pip Patterson.

Please contact Sydney eLearning (sydney.elearning@sydney.edu.au or 935 18728) for further information on the use of and to gain access to relevant LMS sites, including to make a request for training in these systems.
4 ADMINISTRATION OF CASE WORKFLOWS

4.1 Roles and system engagement

The following table provides an overview of key stakeholders, the functions they perform, and the way in which they engage with cases and the recordkeeping system.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Stakeholder</th>
<th>Engagement with system</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Case initiators</td>
<td>Receive email notifications at case lodgement and resolution</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>UOS Coordinators</td>
<td>Receive email notifications regarding case lodgement, progress and determination, and implements case outcomes as specified by EIC/NA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Students</td>
<td>Receive email notifications regarding allegations and decisions</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Faculty administrators</td>
<td>Administer individual cases and the faculty-level process via the workflow portal, including provision of policy and procedural advice to academic staff/decision makers</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Educational Integrity Co-ordinators (EIC) or nominated academics (NA)</td>
<td>Review and determine cases via e-mail (recommended) or the workflow portal, as well as provision of policy and procedural advice to academic staff</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Office of Educational Integrity (OEI)</td>
<td>Ensures compliance and exercises oversight of the university-wide process via workflow and TRIM, including provision of policy and procedural advice to faculty administrators, EICs/NAs and academic staff</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Registrar (via Student Affairs Unit)</td>
<td>Receives potential misconduct referrals via email notifications</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Records Management Services</td>
<td>Provides support and training related to the integrated referral and recordkeeping system</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

4.2 Preliminary assessments and case outcomes

Depending on the EIC/nominated academic’s preliminary assessment and conclusion in each case, one of the following outcomes will be formally recorded in accordance with the Academic Honesty in Coursework Policy 2015:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Preliminary assessments</th>
<th>Available case outcomes</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>No impropriety</td>
<td>No impropriety</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Additional development required</td>
<td>Development Course Completed (returns to Meeting Required if not completed)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Meeting required</td>
<td>No impropriety, plagiarism, academic dishonesty, potential misconduct</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Potential misconduct</td>
<td>Potential misconduct</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
4.3 Workflow actions by stakeholder and step

The following tables set out workflow steps to be completed, respectively, by faculty administrators and EICs/NAs. Instructions specific to each step are provided in Parts 7 and 8 of the manual (sections and pages given in each table), although they can be accessed here by holding CTRL and clicking on the name of the relevant step.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Step names</th>
<th>Section</th>
<th>Page</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1 Admin to prepare documentation for new case</td>
<td>7.1</td>
<td>26</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2A Admin to close off case - No Impropriety</td>
<td>7.2</td>
<td>27</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2B Admin to prepare case documentation - Further development required</td>
<td>7.3</td>
<td>27</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2B Admin - Further Development and Resubmission verification</td>
<td>7.4</td>
<td>28</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2C Admin to arrange interview</td>
<td>7.5</td>
<td>29</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3 Admin to hold awaiting meeting</td>
<td>7.6</td>
<td>30</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3C Admin to arrange interview</td>
<td>7.7</td>
<td>30</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4A Admin documentation and communication - No impropriety</td>
<td>7.8</td>
<td>31</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4B Admin to close off case - Development workshop completed</td>
<td>7.9</td>
<td>32</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4D Admin documentation and communication - Academic dishonesty</td>
<td>7.10</td>
<td>33</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4E Admin documentation and communication – Plagiarism</td>
<td>7.11</td>
<td>34</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4F Admin documentation and communication - Potential misconduct</td>
<td>7.12</td>
<td>35</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6D Academic dishonesty - Admin to verify and close off the case</td>
<td>7.13</td>
<td>36</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6E Admin to close off case - Plagiarism</td>
<td>7.14</td>
<td>37</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7F Admin to close off case - Potential misconduct</td>
<td>7.15</td>
<td>38</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Step names</td>
<td>Section</td>
<td>Page</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>---------</td>
<td>------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2e Action Required - EIC OR NA - Preliminary assessment on a new case</td>
<td>8.1</td>
<td>39</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2Bre Action Required - EIC OR NA - approve your decision letter to student</td>
<td>8.2</td>
<td>40</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2Cre Action Required - EIC OR NA - approve your decision letter to student</td>
<td>8.3</td>
<td>41</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3Be Action Required - EIC or NA - Preliminary assessment</td>
<td>8.4</td>
<td>42</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3Cre Action Required - EIC or NA - Approve interview request letter to student</td>
<td>8.5</td>
<td>43</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3e Action Required - EIC or NA - Case decision</td>
<td>8.6</td>
<td>44</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4Are Action Required - EIC or NA - Approve decision letter - No impropriety</td>
<td>8.7</td>
<td>45</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4Bre Action Required - EIC or NA - Approve outcome letter - Development workshop completed</td>
<td>8.8</td>
<td>46</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4Dre Action Required - EIC or NA - Approve outcome letter - Academic dishonesty</td>
<td>8.9</td>
<td>47</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4Ere Action Required - EIC or NA - Approve outcome letter - Plagiarism</td>
<td>8.10</td>
<td>48</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4Fre Action Required - EIC or NA - Approve outcome letter - Potential Misconduct</td>
<td>8.11</td>
<td>48</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
5 WORKING IN THE WORKFLOW PORTAL

5.1 Important note for EICs and nominated academics

For ease of access, EICs and nominated academics are strongly encouraged to access cases and complete their steps by way of the system generated e-mails sent directly to their staff e-mail accounts. However, it is also possible to do so via the workflow portal. Consequently, instructions for each mode of access are provided in the individual step instructions provided in Part B of this manual. In each step, please see the instructions given at A (for e-mail) or B (for workflow).

5.2 Workflow login

Access to the workflow is available only to registered Records Online users and as set out in Section 3.5 above. Users will need to authenticate their access using their Unikey credentials.

The workflow portal can be accessed at the following address: https://recordsonline2.sydney.edu.au/WorkflowPortal/Content/InTray.aspx.

We recommend that faculty administrators bookmark this link. Workflow users will also receive an e-mail notification at 3:00pm each day reminding them of the workflow items currently in their team and personal in-trays (see image below). The reminder e-mail also includes a link to the workflow portal, which users can also use to access the workflow portal.

5.3 Workflow portal in-trays

Once users have logged in to the portal, they are taken to the In-Tray page of the workflow portal. Here, you will find the My Items and Team Items tabs, which are the two in-trays faculty administrators will be required to work with. EICs/nominated academics need only ever access their My Items in-tray.

Please note that for this particular process, we are not using the suspension or delegation functions so you should not have any items under your Suspended Items or Delegated Items tabs.

Please note the following features in the Team Items in-tray in the following image:

1. It is recommended that you set the Page Size to display 1000 items.
2. You may limit the display items only relating to the “Student Misconduct Academic Case Handling” template – select it from the drop down menu.
5. The **Text Filter** box enables you to limit the items displayed for a specific SID or Unit of Study. To do so, type the value into the Text Filter box and then click the **Reload** button.

6. Click **Select All** to select all items in your My Items or Team Items in-trays.

7. Click **Select All** and then **Acquire Selected** to transfer all cases from the team in-tray to your own.

8. Click **Clear All** to deselect all items.

9. In-trays can be sorted by selected the column titles: **Status**, **Priority**, **Activity Due**, **Activity Name**, and **Workflow Name**.

10. The step at which each case is listed in the **Activity Name** column. For example, new cases will be listed as 1 Admin to prepare documentation for new case.

11. Click **Acquire/Open** to open a case from the Team Items in-tray for immediate action or **Acquire** to transfer a single item (or group of items if selected) to your My Items in-tray for action at a subsequent time.

12. New cases and subsequent administration tasks are always sent to the Team Items tray. Tasks for EICs/nominated academics to complete are always sent directly to their My Items in-tray.

---

Please note the following features specific to the **My Items** in-tray in the following image:

1. Click **Open** to action the relevant step.
2. Click **Select All** and then **Release Selected** to return all cases to the Team Items in-tray.
3. Click **Release** to return individual cases to the Team Items in-tray.
4. Click **Release Selected** after selecting one or more check boxes in the far left-hand column of the My Items in-tray to release a specified set of cases to the Team Items in-tray.
5.4 Individual case workflow items

After you have elected to open a case, the individual workflow item page will be displayed (see image on following page). The elements faculty administrators will use most are as follows:

1. The INSTRUCTIONS tab contains detailed, step-by-step instructions for completing the tasks required at each stage of the workflow process.
2. The CREATE AND REFERENCE RECORDS tab stores approved letter templates that can be downloaded and subsequently modified before being sent to students from both within the system and on your PC.

3. There is an in-built DOCUMENT UPLOADER that enables you to attach more documentation to the workflow as the case progresses.

4. Beneath the document uploader is the WORKFLOW DOCUMENTS pane, which lists all documents associated with the case workflow. Please note the following in relation to the following image:
   1. The first icon indicates the file format of each of the workflow documents.
   2. Select the icon to view the document's record metadata details.
   3. Select the icon to open the document in the TRIM desktop application.
   4. Select the icon to open the documents in the web interface.
   5. Select the icon to disassociate a document with the workflow. Please note, though, that this only deletes the document from the workflow item. It will still be saved in the relevant case folder in TRIM.
5. At the bottom of the workflow item page in the preceding image above, please note the following:

1. **Mandatory Nomination** fields are included in most workflow steps to be completed by faculty administrators and are used to assign specific activities to EICs/nominated academics and e-mail notifications to UOS Coordinators.

2. Select the icon in the bottom right-hand side of the workflow item page to view the notes associated with a case in the workflow portal.

3. Select the icon to complete the step/task.

4. Select the **Save and Exit Without Completion** button to save any comments you have added to the workflow comments pane before returning to the My Items in-tray.

5. Select the **Close** button to exit the task page to return to the My Items in-tray.

### 5.5 Uploading documents to the workflow

To associate new documents with a case via the workflow portal:

- Select "Choose File" (or "Browse") and then the relevant document on your computer.
- Name the document in the "**New Document Title**" field (this should be the same name as the file you are uploading).
- Select "Upload Document".
- Select the magnifying glass icon next to the draft letter and open the downloaded file.
- Check that it is the correct document and free from errors. If you identify errors, repeat the previous steps taken when creating the letter.
5.6 Creating letters from approved templates

All letters sent to students must be saved according to the following naming convention:
“Faculty UOS – Action – SID Full Name”

There are two ways to create and edit letters at each decision step in the process, either from templates stored in the workflow portal or that you may have saved on your hard drive.

1. CREATING THE DRAFT LETTER FROM A STORED WORKFLOW TEMPLATE
   - Choose the “Create and Reference Records” tab in the workflow portal.
   - Select the document template specified in the instructions for the step you are working on (e.g., “Decision – No Impropriety”).
   - In the field “New Documents Title”, replace “SID Full Name” and “UOS” with the student’s ID, name and the UOS code.

There are then two ways to edit the letter, either by way of a “live” edit in TRIM or on your desktop.

a) Editing the letter in HPRM:
   - Click the “Create Document From Template” button and open the downloaded file with the title tr5file.tr5.
   - Once HP Records Manager is open, right click this document and select ”Edit” from the drop down menu.
   - Copy the EIC’s or NA’s comments into the appropriate section of the template. Please also ensure you check the letter for errors, consistency of style, and clarity.
   - Once you are happy with the document, save and close the document in HP Records Manager, return to the workflow portal, and refresh the workflow page.

b) Editing the letter on your desktop:
   - Select the magnifying glass icon to the right of the new letter template saved to the workflow.
   - Open the downloaded template.
   - Copy the EIC’s or NA’s comments into the appropriate section of the template. Please also ensure you check the letter for errors, consistency of style, and clarity.
   - Save the letter to your hard drive with the name given to it when it was downloaded (PDF format preferred but no essential).
   - Upload the letter to the workflow using the document uploader (instructions at 5.5 above).

2. CREATING THE DRAFT LETTER FROM A TEMPLATE SAVED LOCALLY
   - Open the template saved on your hard drive.
   - Copy the EIC/nominated academic’s comments into the appropriate section of the template. Please also ensure you check the letter for errors, consistency of style, and clarity.
   - Save the letter to your hard drive with a title mirroring the title of the template (PDF format preferred but not essential).
   - Upload the letter to the workflow using the document uploader (instructions at 5.5 above).
### 6 SCENARIOS AND WORKFLOW STEPS

#### 6.1 Preliminary Assessment - No Impropriety

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Step</th>
<th>Complete within</th>
<th>Section</th>
<th>Page</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Acknowledgement sent to Case Initiator</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1 Admin to prepare documentation for new case</td>
<td>3 days</td>
<td>7.1</td>
<td>26</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1 FYI No Action Required - UoS Coordinator – A new educational</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>integrity case has been referred</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2e Action Required - EIC or NA - Preliminary assessment on a new</td>
<td>3 days</td>
<td>8.1</td>
<td>39</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>case</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2A Admin to close off case - No Impropriety</td>
<td>1 day</td>
<td>7.2</td>
<td>27</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3A Action Required - UOS Coordinator - No Impropriety</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4A FYI – Case initiator - Outcome of an educational integrity case</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>you have referred</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total days (maximum)</strong></td>
<td><strong>7 days</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

#### 6.2 Preliminary Assessment – Potential Misconduct

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Step</th>
<th>Complete within</th>
<th>Section</th>
<th>Page</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Acknowledge to Case Initiator</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1 Admin to prepare documentation for new case</td>
<td>3 days</td>
<td>7.1</td>
<td>26</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1 FYI No Action Required - UoS Coordinator – A new educational</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>integrity case has been referred</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2e Action Required - EIC or NA - Preliminary assessment on a new</td>
<td>3 days</td>
<td>8.1</td>
<td>39</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>case</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4F Admin documentation and communication - Potential misconduct</td>
<td>2 days</td>
<td>7.12</td>
<td>35</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4Fe Action Required - EIC or NA - Approve outcome letter - Potential</td>
<td>2 days</td>
<td>8.11</td>
<td>48</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Misconduct</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4fs Notification to student – Referral to Registrar</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4Fe FYI No Action Required - UOS Coordinator - Potential misconduct</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5Fe Notification to Registrar - Potential misconduct</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6Fe FYI – Case initiator - Outcome of an educational integrity case</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>you have referred</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7F Admin to close off case - Potential misconduct</td>
<td>30 days</td>
<td>7.15</td>
<td>38</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total days (maximum)</strong></td>
<td><strong>40 days</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
# 6.3 Further Development and Resubmission — Development Workshop Completed

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Step</th>
<th>Description</th>
<th>Complete within</th>
<th>Section</th>
<th>Page</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Acknowledge to <strong>Case Initiator</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1. <strong>Admin to prepare documentation for new case</strong></td>
<td>3 days</td>
<td>7.1</td>
<td>26</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1e <strong>FYI No Action Required - UoS Coordinator</strong> - A new educational integrity case has been referred</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2e <strong>Action Required - EIC or NA - Preliminary assessment on a new case</strong></td>
<td>3 days</td>
<td>8.1</td>
<td>39</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2B <strong>Admin to prepare case documentation - Further development required</strong></td>
<td>2 days</td>
<td>7.3</td>
<td>27</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2Bre <strong>Action Required - EIC OR NA - approve your decision letter to student</strong></td>
<td>2 days</td>
<td>8.2</td>
<td>40</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2bs <strong>Notification to student</strong> - Additional Development and Resubmission</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2Be <strong>FYI No Action Required - UOS Coordinator</strong> - Further Development and Resubmission</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2B <strong>Admin - Further Development and Resubmission verification</strong></td>
<td>14 days</td>
<td>7.4</td>
<td>28</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3Be <strong>Action Required - EIC or NA - Preliminary assessment</strong></td>
<td>3 days</td>
<td>8.4</td>
<td>42</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4B <strong>Admin to close off case - Development workshop completed</strong></td>
<td>2 days</td>
<td>7.9</td>
<td>32</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4Bre <strong>Action Required - EIC or NA - Approve outcome letter - Development workshop completed</strong></td>
<td>2 days</td>
<td>8.8</td>
<td>46</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5Be <strong>Action Required - UOS Coordinator</strong> - Development workshop completed</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5Bs <strong>Notification to student</strong> – Development workshop completed</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6Be <strong>FYI</strong> – <strong>Case initiator</strong> - Outcome of an educational integrity case you have referred</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Total days (maximum)**: 31 days
6.4 Further Development and Resubmission – Meeting Required – No Impropriety

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Step</th>
<th>Complete within</th>
<th>Section</th>
<th>Page</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Acknowledge to <strong>Case Initiator</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1. admin to prepare documentation for new case</td>
<td>3 days</td>
<td>7.1</td>
<td>26</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1e FYI No Action Required - <strong>UoS Coordinator</strong> - A new educational integrity case has been referred</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2e Action Required - EIC or NA - Preliminary assessment on a new case</td>
<td>3 days</td>
<td>8.1</td>
<td>39</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2B Admin to prepare case documentation - Further development required</td>
<td>2 days</td>
<td>7.3</td>
<td>27</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2Bre Action Required - EIC OR NA - approve your decision letter to student</td>
<td>2 days</td>
<td>8.2</td>
<td>40</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2bs Notification to <strong>student</strong> - Additional Development and Resubmission</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2Be FYI No Action Required - <strong>UOS Coordinator</strong> - Further Development and Resubmission</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2B Admin - Further Development and Resubmission verification</td>
<td>14 days</td>
<td>7.4</td>
<td>28</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3Be Action Required - EIC or NA - Preliminary assessment</td>
<td>3 days</td>
<td>8.4</td>
<td>42</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3C Admin to arrange interview</td>
<td>2 days</td>
<td>7.7</td>
<td>30</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3Cre Action Required - EIC or NA - Approve interview request letter to student</td>
<td>2 days</td>
<td>8.5</td>
<td>43</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3C FYI No Action Required - <strong>UOS Coordinator</strong> - Meeting required after re-assessment of case</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3cs Notification to <strong>student</strong> – Interview required</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Admin to hold awaiting meeting</td>
<td>14 days</td>
<td>7.6</td>
<td>30</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3e Action Required - EIC or NA - Case decision</td>
<td>2 days</td>
<td>8.6</td>
<td>44</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4A Admin documentation and communication - No impropriety</td>
<td>1 days</td>
<td>7.8</td>
<td>33</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4Are Action Required - EIC or NA - Approve decision letter - No impropriety</td>
<td>2 days</td>
<td>8.7</td>
<td>45</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4as Notification to <strong>student</strong> - No impropriety</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4Ae FYI No Action Required - <strong>UOS Coordinator</strong> - No impropriety</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4Ae FYI – <strong>Case initiator</strong> - Outcome of an educational integrity case you have referred</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Total days (maximum)** 50 days
### 6.5 Further Development and Resubmission – Meeting Required – Plagiarism

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Step</th>
<th>Complete within</th>
<th>Section</th>
<th>Page</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Acknowledge to <strong>Case Initiator</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>1.</strong> Admin to prepare documentation for new case</td>
<td>3 days</td>
<td>7.1</td>
<td>26</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>1e</strong> FYI No Action Required - <strong>UoS Coordinator</strong> - A new educational integrity case has been referred</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>2e</strong> Action Required - EIC or NA - Preliminary assessment on a new case</td>
<td>3 days</td>
<td>8.1</td>
<td>39</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>2B</strong> Admin to prepare case documentation - Further development required</td>
<td>2 days</td>
<td>7.3</td>
<td>27</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>2Bre</strong> Action Required - EIC OR NA - approve your decision letter to student</td>
<td>2 days</td>
<td>8.2</td>
<td>40</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>2bs</strong> Notification to <strong>student</strong> - Additional Development and Resubmission</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>2Be</strong> FYI No Action Required - <strong>UOS Coordinator</strong> - Further Development and Resubmission</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>2B</strong> Admin - Further Development and Resubmission verification</td>
<td>14 days</td>
<td>7.4</td>
<td>28</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>3Be</strong> Action Required - EIC or NA - Preliminary assessment</td>
<td>3 days</td>
<td>8.4</td>
<td>42</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>3C</strong> Admin to arrange interview</td>
<td>2 days</td>
<td>7.7</td>
<td>30</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>3Cre</strong> Action Required - EIC or NA - Approve interview request letter to student</td>
<td>2 days</td>
<td>8.5</td>
<td>43</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>3C</strong> FYI No Action Required - <strong>UOS Coordinator</strong> - Meeting required after re-assessment of case</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>3cs</strong> Notification to <strong>student</strong> – Interview required</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>3.</strong> Admin to hold awaiting meeting</td>
<td>14 days</td>
<td>7.6</td>
<td>30</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>3e</strong> Action Required - EIC or NA - Case decision</td>
<td>2 days</td>
<td>8.6</td>
<td>44</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>4E</strong> Admin documentation and communication – Plagiarism</td>
<td>2 days</td>
<td>7.12</td>
<td>35</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>4Ere</strong> Action Required - EIC or NA - Approve outcome letter - Plagiarism</td>
<td>2 days</td>
<td>8.10</td>
<td>48</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>4Es</strong> Notification to <strong>student</strong> - Outcome of investigation – Plagiarism</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>4Ee</strong> Action Required - <strong>UOS Coordinator</strong> – Plagiarism outcome</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>5Ee</strong> FYI – <strong>Case Initiator</strong> - Outcome of an educational integrity case you have referred</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>6E</strong> Admin to close off case - Plagiarism</td>
<td>21 days</td>
<td>7.14</td>
<td>37</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Total days (maximum)**: 72 days
### 6.6 Further Development and Resubmission – Meeting Required – Academic Dishonesty

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Step</th>
<th>Description</th>
<th>Complete within</th>
<th>Section</th>
<th>Page</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Acknowledge to Case Initiator</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>Admin to prepare documentation for new case</td>
<td>3 days</td>
<td>7.1</td>
<td>26</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1e</td>
<td>FYI No Action Required - <strong>UoS Coordinator</strong> - A new educational integrity case has been referred</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2e</td>
<td>Action Required - EIC or NA - Preliminary assessment on a new case</td>
<td>3 days</td>
<td>8.1</td>
<td>39</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2B</td>
<td>Admin to prepare case documentation - Further development required</td>
<td>2 days</td>
<td>7.3</td>
<td>27</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2Bre</td>
<td>Action Required - EIC OR NA - approve your decision letter to student</td>
<td>2 days</td>
<td>8.2</td>
<td>40</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2bs</td>
<td>Notification to <strong>student</strong> - Additional Development and Resubmission</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2B</td>
<td>FYI No Action Required - <strong>UOS Coordinator</strong> - Further Development and Resubmission</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2B</td>
<td>Admin - Further Development and Resubmission verification</td>
<td>14 days</td>
<td>7.4</td>
<td>28</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3Be</td>
<td>Action Required - EIC or NA - Preliminary assessment</td>
<td>3 days</td>
<td>8.4</td>
<td>42</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3C</td>
<td>Admin to arrange interview</td>
<td>2 days</td>
<td>7.7</td>
<td>30</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3Cre</td>
<td>Action Required - EIC or NA - Approve interview request letter to student</td>
<td>2 days</td>
<td>8.5</td>
<td>43</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3C</td>
<td>FYI No Action Required - <strong>UOS Coordinator</strong> - Meeting required after re-assessment of case</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3cs</td>
<td>Notification to <strong>student</strong> – Interview required</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>Admin to hold awaiting meeting</td>
<td>14 days</td>
<td>7.6</td>
<td>30</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3e</td>
<td>Action Required - EIC or NA - Case decision</td>
<td>2 days</td>
<td>8.6</td>
<td>44</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4D</td>
<td>Admin documentation and communication - Academic dishonesty</td>
<td>2 days</td>
<td>7.10</td>
<td>33</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4D</td>
<td>Action Required - EIC or NA - Approve outcome letter - Academic dishonesty</td>
<td>2 days</td>
<td>8.9</td>
<td>47</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4D</td>
<td>FYI – <strong>Case initiator</strong> - Outcome of an educational integrity case you have referred</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5D</td>
<td>Academic dishonesty - Admin to verify and close off the case</td>
<td>21 days</td>
<td>7.13</td>
<td>36</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Total days (maximum)** 72 days
## 6.7 Further Development and Resubmission – Meeting Required – Potential Misconduct

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Step</th>
<th>Complete within</th>
<th>Section</th>
<th>Page</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Acknowledge to <strong>Case Initiator</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1. Admin to prepare documentation for new case</td>
<td>3 days</td>
<td>7.1</td>
<td>26</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1e FYI No Action Required - <strong>UoS Coordinator</strong> - A new educational integrity case has been referred</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2e Action Required - EIC or NA - Preliminary assessment on a new case</td>
<td>3 days</td>
<td>8.1</td>
<td>39</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2B Admin to prepare case documentation - Further development required</td>
<td>2 days</td>
<td>7.3</td>
<td>27</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2Br Action Required - EIC OR NA - approve your decision letter to student</td>
<td>2 days</td>
<td>8.2</td>
<td>40</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2bs Notification to <strong>student</strong> - Additional Development and Resubmission</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2Be FYI No Action Required - <strong>UOS Coordinator</strong> - Further Development and Resubmission</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2B Admin - Further Development and Resubmission verification</td>
<td>14 days</td>
<td>7.4</td>
<td>28</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3Be Action Required - EIC or NA - Preliminary assessment</td>
<td>3 days</td>
<td>8.4</td>
<td>42</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3C Admin to arrange interview</td>
<td>2 days</td>
<td>7.7</td>
<td>30</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3Cre Action Required - EIC or NA - Approve interview request letter to student</td>
<td>2 days</td>
<td>8.5</td>
<td>43</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3C FYI No Action Required - <strong>UOS Coordinator</strong> - Meeting required after re-assessment of case</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3cs Notification to <strong>student</strong> – Interview required</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3 Admin to hold awaiting meeting</td>
<td>14 days</td>
<td>7.6</td>
<td>30</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3e Action Required - EIC or NA - Case decision</td>
<td>2 days</td>
<td>8.6</td>
<td>44</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4F Admin documentation and communication - Potential misconduct</td>
<td>2 days</td>
<td>7.12</td>
<td>35</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4Fre Action Required - EIC or NA - Approve outcome letter - Potential Misconduct</td>
<td>2 days</td>
<td>8.11</td>
<td>48</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4Fs Notification to <strong>student</strong> – Referral to Registrar</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4Fe FYI No Action Required - <strong>UOS Coordinator</strong> - Potential misconduct</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5Fe Notification to <strong>Registrar</strong> - Potential misconduct</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6Fe FYI – <strong>Case initiator</strong> - Outcome of an educational integrity case you have referred</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7F Admin to close off case - Potential misconduct</td>
<td>30 days</td>
<td>7.15</td>
<td>38</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total days (maximum)</strong></td>
<td><strong>91 days</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
6.8 Meeting Required – No Impropriety

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Step</th>
<th>Description</th>
<th>Complete within</th>
<th>Section</th>
<th>Page</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. Acknowledge to <strong>Case Initiator</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1. FYI Admin to prepare documentation for new case</td>
<td>3 days</td>
<td>7.1</td>
<td>26</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1e. FYI No Action Required - UoS Coordinator - A new educational integrity case has been referred</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2e. Action Required - EIC or NA - Preliminary assessment on a new case</td>
<td>3 days</td>
<td>8.1</td>
<td>39</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2C. Admin to arrange interview</td>
<td>2 days</td>
<td>7.5</td>
<td>29</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2Cre Action Required - EIC OR NA - approve your decision letter to student</td>
<td>2 days</td>
<td>8.3</td>
<td>41</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2Ce. FYI No Action Required - <strong>UOS Coordinator</strong> - Interview to be held</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2cs. Notification to <strong>student</strong> – Interview required</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Admin to hold awaiting meeting</td>
<td>14 days</td>
<td>7.6</td>
<td>30</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3e. Action Required - EIC or NA - Case decision</td>
<td>2 days</td>
<td>8.6</td>
<td>44</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4A. Admin documentation and communication - No impropriety</td>
<td>1 days</td>
<td>7.8</td>
<td>31</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4Are. Action Required - EIC or NA - Approve decision letter - No impropriety</td>
<td>2 days</td>
<td>8.7</td>
<td>45</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4as. Notification to <strong>student</strong> - No impropriety</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4Ae. FYI No Action Required - <strong>UOS Coordinator</strong> - No impropriety</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4Ae. FYI – <strong>Case Initiator</strong> - Outcome of an educational integrity case you have referred</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total days (maximum)</td>
<td>29 days</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
# 6.9 Meeting Required – Plagiarism

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Step</th>
<th>Action</th>
<th>Complete within</th>
<th>Section</th>
<th>Page</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Acknowledge to Case Initiator</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>Admin to prepare documentation for new case</td>
<td>3 days</td>
<td>7.1</td>
<td>26</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1e</td>
<td>FYI No Action Required - UoS Coordinator - A new educational integrity case has been referred</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2e</td>
<td>Action Required - EIC or NA - Preliminary assessment on a new case</td>
<td>3 days</td>
<td>8.1</td>
<td>39</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2C</td>
<td>Admin to arrange interview</td>
<td>2 days</td>
<td>7.5</td>
<td>29</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2C3</td>
<td>Action Required - EIC OR NA - approve your decision letter to student</td>
<td>2 days</td>
<td>8.3</td>
<td>41</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2cs</td>
<td>Notification to student – Interview required</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>Admin to hold awaiting meeting</td>
<td>14 days</td>
<td>7.6</td>
<td>30</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3e</td>
<td>Action Required - EIC or NA - Case decision</td>
<td>2 days</td>
<td>8.6</td>
<td>44</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4E</td>
<td>Admin documentation and communication – Plagiarism</td>
<td>2 days</td>
<td>7.12</td>
<td>35</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4E3</td>
<td>Action Required - EIC or NA - Approve outcome letter - Plagiarism</td>
<td>2 days</td>
<td>8.10</td>
<td>48</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4es</td>
<td>Notification to student - Outcome of investigation – Plagiarism</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4E3</td>
<td>Action Required - UOS Coordinator – Plagiarism outcome</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5E</td>
<td>FYI – Case initiator - Outcome of an educational integrity case you have referred</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6E</td>
<td>Admin to close off case - Plagiarism</td>
<td>21 days</td>
<td>7.14</td>
<td>37</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Total days (maximum)**: 51 days
### 6.10 Meeting Required – Academic Dishonesty

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Step</th>
<th>Complete within</th>
<th>Section</th>
<th>Page</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Acknowledge to Case Initiator</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1 Admin to prepare documentation for new case</td>
<td>3 days</td>
<td>7.1</td>
<td>26</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1e FYI No Action Required - UoS Coordinator - A new educational integrity case has been referred</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2e Action Required - EIC or NA - Preliminary assessment on a new case</td>
<td>3 day</td>
<td>8.1</td>
<td>39</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2C Admin to arrange interview</td>
<td>2 days</td>
<td>7.5</td>
<td>29</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2Cre Action Required - EIC OR NA - approve your decision letter to student</td>
<td>2 days</td>
<td>8.3</td>
<td>41</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2Ce FYI No Action Required - UOS Coordinator - Interview to be held</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2cs Notification to student – Interview required</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3 Admin to hold awaiting meeting</td>
<td>14 days</td>
<td>7.6</td>
<td>30</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3e Action Required - EIC or NA - Case decision</td>
<td>2 days</td>
<td>8.6</td>
<td>44</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4D Admin documentation and communication - Academic dishonesty</td>
<td>2 days</td>
<td>7.10</td>
<td>33</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4Dre Action Required - EIC or NA - Approve outcome letter - Academic dishonesty</td>
<td>2 days</td>
<td>8.9</td>
<td>47</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4ds Notification to student - Outcome of investigation – Academic Dishonesty</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4De Action Required - UOS Coordinator - Academic dishonesty</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5De FYI – Case initiator - Outcome of an educational integrity case you have referred</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6D Academic dishonesty - Admin to verify and close off the case</td>
<td>21 days</td>
<td>7.13</td>
<td>36</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total days (maximum)</strong></td>
<td><strong>51 days</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### 6.11 Meeting Required – Potential Misconduct

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Step</th>
<th>Description</th>
<th>Complete within</th>
<th>Section</th>
<th>Page</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>Acknowledge to Case Initiator</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1e</td>
<td>FYI No Action Required - UoS Coordinator - A new educational integrity case has been referred</td>
<td>3 days</td>
<td>7.1</td>
<td>26</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2e</td>
<td>Action Required - EIC or NA - Preliminary assessment on a new case</td>
<td>3 days</td>
<td>8.1</td>
<td>39</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2C</td>
<td>Admin to arrange interview</td>
<td>2 days</td>
<td>7.5</td>
<td>29</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2Cre</td>
<td>Action Required - EIC OR NA - approve your decision letter to student</td>
<td>2 days</td>
<td>8.3</td>
<td>41</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2C</td>
<td>FYI No Action Required - UOS Coordinator - Interview to be held</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2cs</td>
<td>Notification to student – Interview required</td>
<td>14 days</td>
<td>7.6</td>
<td>30</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>Admin to hold awaiting meeting</td>
<td>14 days</td>
<td>7.6</td>
<td>30</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3e</td>
<td>Action Required - EIC or NA - Case decision</td>
<td>2 days</td>
<td>8.6</td>
<td>44</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4F</td>
<td>Admin documentation and communication - Potential misconduct</td>
<td>2 days</td>
<td>7.12</td>
<td>35</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4Fre</td>
<td>Action Required - EIC or NA - Approve outcome letter - Potential Misconduct</td>
<td>2 days</td>
<td>8.11</td>
<td>48</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4fs</td>
<td>Notification to student – Referral to Registrar</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4Fe</td>
<td>FYI No Action Required - UOS Coordinator - Potential misconduct</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5Fe</td>
<td>Notification to Registrar - Potential misconduct</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6Fe</td>
<td>FYI – Case initiator - Outcome of an educational integrity case you have referred</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7F</td>
<td>Admin to close off case - Potential misconduct</td>
<td>30 days</td>
<td>7.15</td>
<td>38</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td><strong>Total days</strong></td>
<td><strong>60 days</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
7  STEP INSTRUCTIONS FOR ADMINISTRATORS

7.1 1 Admin to prepare documentation for new case

A new case of alleged academic dishonesty or plagiarism has been referred for the consideration of the faculty’s Educational Integrity Coordinator (EIC) or another of its nominated academics.

The educational integrity administrator (Admin) is now required to prepare the case for review. This involves verifying the information provided by the case initiator, ensuring all relevant documentation is attached to the workflow, and nominating the correct unit of study coordinator and the academic decision-maker to whom the case should be sent for preliminary assessment.

1. VIEW THE DOCUMENTS LODGED WITH THE CASE
   - Select “Open All Documents” to view case documentation.
   - Ensure name and SID given in the document title correspond with details contained within the document.
   - Additional supporting documentation may need to be extracted from relevant LMS/Blackboard site or requested from the Unit of Study Coordinator.

Relevant documentation may include, but is not limited to:
- Unit of study outline
- Assessment task instructions and marking rubric
- Examination incident report if the case is examination-related
- Related Turnitin report and/or examiners’ comments if a text-based written assessment
- Original file submitted to Turnitin by the student
- Any other supporting documentation (e.g., source materials, etc.)

2. UPLOAD NEW DOCUMENTS/FILES TO THE WORKFLOW USING THE DOCUMENT UPLOADER (see 5.5 above)

3. NOMINATE THE UNIT OF STUDY COORDINATOR AND EIC/NOMINATED ACADEMIC
   - UOS Coordinator should already be listed. Please check that this is the correct coordinator for the relevant session. If not, begin manually entering their name and then select their name from the drop down menu that appears below this field.
   - The academic decision-maker must be either the Faculty’s EIC or another of its nominated academics. If you are not sure who to forward this case to, please contact your EIC for further direction.
   - Please contact Records Management Services (records.online@sydney.edu.au) if you are not able to nominate either or both persons.

4. FORWARD THE CASE FOR PRELIMINARY ASSESSMENT
   - Select “Complete” to forward the case.

N.B. If you are waiting for additional documentation or information:
- You can add case notes in the “Comments to apply to this workflow” pane to record the actions you have already taken. These comments are generally not visible to students, but please be aware that they are subject to the GIPA Act and could be made available to the student upon request.
- Once you have added comments, select the “Save and Exit Without Completion” button so that you can return to the case again at a subsequent time.
7.2 2A Admin to close off case - No Impropriety

The faculty’s EIC/nominated academic has decided that the student involved in this case has engaged in no impropriety.

The educational integrity administrator is now required to close this case out. The steps for doing so are as follows:

1. **Nominate the UOS Coordinator in the Mandatory Nomination Field**
   - Please contact Records Management Services (records.online@sydney.edu.au) if you are not able to do so.

2. **Close the Case**
   - Select “Complete” to formally close the case. An email notification will then be sent to the UOS Coordinator and the case initiator notifying them of the outcome.

7.3 2B Admin to Prepare Case Documentation - Further Development Required

The faculty’s EIC/nominated academic has decided that the student involved in this case is required to attend a further development course and submit a corrected or alternative version of the work.

The educational integrity administrator is now required to draft a letter to the student:

1. **Open the EIC/Nominated Academic’s Preliminary Assessment**
   - The response can be found in either “Workflow Notes” or a document titled “response from 'name.surname@sydney.edu.au' at 'dd/mm/yyyy hh:mm:ss'”.

2. **Draft the Letter to the Student** (see 5.6 above)
   - Do this by creating the letter from the “Academic Honesty Development Workshop Required” template either stored under “Create and Reference Records” or that you may have saved on your hard drive.

3. **Nominate or Validate the UOS Coordinator and EIC/Nominated Academic in the Mandatory Nomination Field**
   - Please contact Records Management Services (records.online@sydney.edu.au) if you are not able to do so.

4. **Review the Letter Once it Has Been Saved to the Workflow and Mark Documents for Sending to Student**
   - Select the magnifying glass icon next to the draft letter.
   - If there are errors, repeat steps taken at 2 above.
   - If there are not, ensure you select the “Send” checkbox for the letter and relevant supporting documents.

5. **Forward the Letter to the EIC/Nominated Academic for Review**
   - Select “Complete” to forward the letter for review.

The case will then be forwarded via the system to the EIC or NA, who is required to review the letter and then either send the letter directly to the student or return the letter to you for modification. Please note that the letter must be sent to the student via the workflow system.

**COMPLETE STEP 6 IF THE TITLE OF THIS TASK INCLUDES THE PREFIX “RETURN FOR REVISION”**.
6. EDIT THE LETTER AND RETURN TO EIC/NOMINATED ACADEMIC FOR FINAL APPROVAL
   - Check the EIC/nominated academic's instructions for revisions to be made.
   - This information is provided in a replying e-mail ("response from 'name.surname@sydney.edu.au' at 'dd/mm/yyyy hh:mm:ss'"), via "Workflow Notes" or by attaching/uploading the FINAL edited document to the workflow.
   - Repeat steps 2 to 4, ensuring that you delete the earlier version of the letter (if applicable) and select the "Send" checkbox for the FINAL version to be sent to the student.
   - Select "Complete" to forward the letter for approval and sending to the student.

7.4 2B ADMIN - FURTHER DEVELOPMENT AND RESUBMISSION VERIFICATION

The faculty's EIC/nominated academic instructed the student to complete an additional development course and submit a corrected or alternative piece of work.

The educational integrity administrator is now required to verify that they have done so. The steps for doing so are as follows:

1. VERIFY THAT THE STUDENT HAS COMPLETED THE ADDITIONAL DEVELOPMENT COURSE
   - For the time being, please contact the Office of Educational Integrity for this information.

2. VERIFY THAT THE STUDENT HAS RESUBMITTED THE CORRECTED/ALTERNATIVE PIECE OF WORK
   - Each faculty will have its own procedure for receiving student resubmissions, which could be via e-mail or a dedicated Turnitin drop box on a Faculty-based educational integrity LMS/Blackboard site.
   - Note that all text-based written assignments must be submitted to Turnitin.

3. UPLOAD THE SUBMITTED FILE AND TURNITIN REPORT TO THE WORKFLOW (see 5.5 above)

4. NOMINATE THE EIC/NOMINATED ACADEMIC IN THE MANDATORY NOMINATION FIELD
   - Please contact Records Management Services (records.online@sydney.edu.au) if you are not able to do so.

5. FORWARD CASE FOR SECOND PRELIMINARY ASSESSMENT
   - Depending on verifications made at steps 1 and 2 above, select either "has completed all requirements" or "has not satisfactorily complied with the requirements" under Outcomes below.
   - Select "Complete" to forward the case to the EIC/nominated academic.

N.B. If you are waiting for additional documentation or information:
   - You can add case notes in the "Comments to apply to this workflow" pane to record the actions you have already taken. These comments are generally not visible to students, but please be aware that they are subject to the GIPA Act and could be made available to the student upon request.
   - Once you have added comments, select the "Save and Exit Without Completion" button so that you can return to the case again at a subsequent time.
7.5 2C ADMIN TO ARRANGE INTERVIEW

The faculty’s EIC/nominated academic has decided that the student involved in this case is required to attend a meeting in order to discuss an allegation of plagiarism or academic dishonesty.

The educational integrity administrator is now required to draft a letter to the student:

1. OPEN THE EIC/NOMINATED ACADEMIC’S PRELIMINARY ASSESSMENT
   - The response can be found below in either “Workflow Notes” or a document titled “response from name.surname@sydney.edu.au’ at ’dd/mm/yyyy hh:mm:ss’”.

2. DRAFT THE LETTER TO THE STUDENT (see 5.6 above)
   - Do this by creating the letter from the “Academic Honesty Meeting Required” template either stored under “Create and Reference Records” or that you may have saved on your hard drive.

3. NOMINATE OR VALIDATE THE UOS COORDINATOR AND EIC/NOMINATED ACADEMIC IN THE MANDATORY NOMINATION FIELD
   - Please contact Records Management Services (records.online@sydney.edu.au) if you are not able to do so.

4. REVIEW THE LETTER ONCE IT HAS BEEN SAVED TO THE WORKFLOW AND MARK DOCUMENTS FOR SENDING TO STUDENT
   - Select the magnifying glass icon next to the draft letter.
   - If there are errors, repeat steps taken at 2 above.
   - If there are not, ensure you select the “Send” checkbox for the letter and relevant supporting documents.

5. FORWARD THE LETTER TO THE EIC/NOMINATED ACADEMIC FOR REVIEW
   - Select “Complete” to forward the letter for review.

The case will then be forwarded via the system to the EIC or NA, who is required to review the letter and then either send the letter directly to the student or return the letter to you for modification. Please note that the letter must be sent to the student via the workflow system.

COMPLETE STEP 6 IF THE TITLE OF THIS TASK INCLUDES THE PREFIX “RETURN FOR REVISION”.

6. EDIT THE LETTER AND RETURN TO EIC/NOMINATED ACADEMIC FOR FINAL APPROVAL
   - Check the EIC/nominated academic’s instructions for revisions to be made.
   - This information is provided in a replying e-mail (“response from name.surname@sydney.edu.au’ at ’dd/mm/yyyy hh:mm:ss’”), via “Workflow Notes” or by attaching/uploading the FINAL edited document to the workflow.
   - Repeat steps 2 to 4, ensuring that you delete the earlier version of the letter (if applicable) and select the “Send” checkbox for the FINAL version to be sent to the student.
   - Select “Complete” to forward the letter for approval and sending to the student.
7.6 3 ADMIN TO HOLD AWAITING MEETING

The faculty’s Educational Integrity Coordinator (EIC) or another of its nominated academics has requested a meeting with the student to discuss an allegation of academic dishonesty or plagiarism.

Once the meeting has occurred (or not), the educational integrity administrator is required to forward the case to the EIC or nominated academic so that they may take their decision. The steps for doing so are as follows:

1. **UPLOAD THE MEETING NOTES TO THE WORKFLOW (see 5.5 above)**
   - You can enter the meeting notes directly into the “Comments to apply to this workflow” pane below or by uploading a new document to the workflow using the document uploader.

2. **NOMINATE THE EIC/NOMINATED ACADEMIC IN THE MANDATORY NOMINATION FIELD**
   - Please contact Records Management Services (records.online@sydney.edu.au) if you are not able to do so.

3. **SAVE WORK IN PROGRESS OR FORWARD CASE FOR DETERMINATION**
   - Select “Save and Exit without Completion” to save comments/work in progress if you are waiting on additional documentation or information.
   - If not, select “Complete” to forward the case for determination.

7.7 3C ADMIN TO ARRANGE INTERVIEW

The faculty’s EIC/nominated academic has determined that the student involved in this case has not satisfactorily undertaken the corrective actions specified in their preliminary assessment and so is now required to attend a meeting to discuss a formal allegation of academic dishonesty or plagiarism.

The educational integrity administrator is now required to draft a letter to the student:

1. **OPEN THE EIC/NOMINATED ACADEMIC’S PRELIMINARY ASSESSMENT**
   - The response can be found in either “Workflow Notes” or a document titled “response from ‘name.surname@sydney.edu.au’ at ‘dd/mm/yyyy hh:mm:ss’”.

2. **DRAFT THE LETTER TO THE STUDENT (see 5.6 above)**
   - Do this by creating the letter from the “Academic Honesty Workshop Not Completed” template either stored under “Create and Reference Records” or that you may have saved on your hard drive.

3. **NOMINATE OR VALIDATE THE UOS COORDINATOR AND EIC/NOMINATED ACADEMIC IN THE MANDATORY NOMINATION FIELD**
   - Please contact Records Management Services (records.online@sydney.edu.au) if you are not able to do so.

4. **REVIEW THE LETTER ONCE IT HAS BEEN SAVED TO THE WORKFLOW AND MARK DOCUMENTS FOR SENDING TO STUDENT**
   - Select the magnifying glass icon next to the draft letter.
   - If there are errors, repeat steps taken at 2 above.
   - If there are not, ensure you select the “Send” checkbox for the letter and relevant supporting documents.

5. **FORWARD THE LETTER TO THE EIC/NOMINATED ACADEMIC FOR REVIEW**
   - Select “Complete” to forward the letter for review.
The case will then be forwarded via the system to the EIC or NA, who is required to review the letter and then either send the letter directly to the student or return the letter to you for modification. Please note that the letter must be sent to the student via the workflow system.

COMPLETE STEP 6 IF THE TITLE OF THIS TASK INCLUDES THE PREFIX “RETURN FOR REVISION”.

6. EDIT THE LETTER AND RETURN TO EIC/NOMINATED ACADEMIC FOR FINAL APPROVAL
   - Check the EIC/nominated academic’s instructions for revisions to be made.
   - This information is provided in a replying e-mail (“response from ‘name.surname@sydney.edu.au’ at ‘dd/mm/yyyy hh:mm:ss’”), via “Workflow Notes” or by attaching/uploading the FINAL edited document to the workflow.
   - Repeat steps 2 to 4, ensuring that you delete the earlier version of the letter (if applicable) and select the “Send” checkbox for the FINAL version to be sent to the student.
   - Select “Complete” to forward the letter for approval and sending to the student.

7.8 4A ADMIN DOCUMENTATION AND COMMUNICATION - NO IMPROPRIETY

The faculty’s Educational Integrity Coordinator (EIC) or another of its nominated academics has now met with the student involved in this case and has determined that the student has engaged in no impropriety.

The educational integrity administrator is now required to draft a letter to the student:

1. OPEN THE EIC/NOMINATED ACADEMIC’S DECISION
   - The response can be found in either “Workflow Notes” or a document titled “response from ‘name.surname@sydney.edu.au’ at ‘dd/mm/yyyy hh:mm:ss’”.

2. DRAFT THE LETTER TO THE STUDENT (see 5.6 above)
   - Do this by creating the letter from the “Decision – No Impropriety” template either stored under “Create and Reference Records” or that you may have saved on your hard drive.

3. NOMINATE OR VALIDATE THE UOS COORDINATOR AND EIC/NOMINATED ACADEMIC IN THE MANDATORY NOMINATION FIELD
   - Please contact Records Management Services (records.online@sydney.edu.au) if you are not able to do so.

4. PROVIDE INFORMATION FOR THE UOS COORDINATOR’S REFERENCE IF NECESSARY
   - This information should have been provided in the EIC/nominated academic’s response.
   - It must be added via the “Special Instructions” pane and should be as concise and direct as possible (tip: use bullets or numbering).

5. REVIEW THE LETTER ONCE IT HAS BEEN SAVED TO THE WORKFLOW AND MARK FOR SENDING
   - Select the magnifying glass icon next to the draft letter.
   - If there are errors, repeat steps taken at 2 above.
   - If there are not, ensure you select the “Send” checkbox for the letter.
   - Ensure that documents previously sent to the student have been deselected.

6. FORWARD THE LETTER TO THE EIC/NOMINATED ACADEMIC FOR REVIEW
   - Select “Complete” to forward the letter for review.

The case will then be forwarded via the system to the EIC or NA, who is required to review the letter and then either send the letter directly to the student or return the letter to you for modification. Please note that the letter must be sent to the student via the workflow system.
COMPLETE STEP 7 IF THE TITLE OF THIS TASK INCLUDES THE PREFIX “RETURN FOR REVISION”.

7. EDIT THE LETTER AND RETURN TO EIC/NOMINATED ACADEMIC FOR FINAL APPROVAL
   - Check the EIC/nominated academic’s instructions for revisions to be made.
   - This information is provided in a replying e-mail (“response from ‘name.surname@sydney.edu.au’ at ‘dd/mm/yyyy hh:mm:ss’”), via “Workflow Notes” or by attaching/uploading the FINAL edited document to the workflow.
   - Repeat steps 2 to 4, ensuring that you delete the earlier version of the letter (if applicable) and select the “Send” checkbox for the FINAL version to be sent to the student.
   - Select “Complete” to forward the letter for approval and sending to the student.

7.9 4B ADMIN TO CLOSE OFF CASE - DEVELOPMENT WORKSHOP COMPLETED

The faculty’s EIC/nominated academic has determined that the student involved in this case has satisfactorily undertaken the corrective actions specified in their preliminary assessment and so the matter has been resolved.

The educational integrity administrator is now required to draft a letter to the student. The steps for doing so are as follows:

1. OPEN THE EIC/NOMINATED ACADEMIC’S PRELIMINARY ASSESSMENT
   - The response can be found in either “Workflow Notes” or a document titled “response from ‘name.surname@sydney.edu.au’ at ‘dd/mm/yyyy hh:mm:ss’.”

2. DRAFT THE LETTER TO THE STUDENT (see 5.6 above)
   - Do this by creating the letter from the “Academic Honesty Development Workshop Completed” template either stored under “Create and Reference Records” or that you may have saved on your hard drive.

3. NOMINATE OR VALIDATE THE UOS COORDINATOR AND EIC/NOMINATED ACADEMIC IN THE MANDATORY NOMINATION FIELD
   - Please contact Records Management Services (records.online@sydney.edu.au) if you are not able to do so.

4. PROVIDE INFORMATION FOR THE UOS COORDINATOR’S REFERENCE IF NECESSARY
   - This information should have been provided in the EIC/nominated academic’s response.
   - It must be added via the “Special Instructions” pane and should be as concise and direct as possible (tip: use bullets or numbering).

5. REVIEW THE LETTER ONCE IT HAS BEEN SAVED TO THE WORKFLOW AND MARK FOR SENDING
   - Select the magnifying glass icon next to the draft letter.
   - If there are errors, repeat steps taken at 2 above.
   - If there are not, ensure you select the “Send” checkbox for the letter.
   - Ensure that documents previously sent to the student have been deselected.

6. FORWARD THE LETTER TO THE EIC/NOMINATED ACADEMIC FOR REVIEW
   Select “Complete” to forward the letter for review.

The case will then be forwarded via the system to the EIC or NA, who is required to review the letter and then either send the letter directly to the student or return the letter to you for modification. Please note that the letter must be sent to the student via the workflow system.

COMPLETE STEP 7 IF THE TITLE OF THIS TASK INCLUDES THE PREFIX “RETURN FOR REVISION”.
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7. EDIT THE LETTER AND RETURN TO EIC/NOMINATED ACADEMIC FOR FINAL APPROVAL
   - Check the EIC/nominated academic’s instructions for revisions to be made.
   - This information is provided in a replying e-mail ("response from 'name.surname@sydney.edu.au' at 'dd/mm/yyyy hh:mm:ss'"), via “Workflow Notes” or by attaching/uploading the FINAL edited document to the workflow.
   - Repeat steps 2 to 4, ensuring that you delete the earlier version of the letter (if applicable) and select the “Send” checkbox for the FINAL version to be sent to the student.
   - Select “Complete” to forward the letter for approval and sending to the student.

7.10 4D ADMIN DOCUMENTATION AND COMMUNICATION - ACADEMIC DISHONESTY

The faculty’s Educational Integrity Coordinator (EIC) or another of its nominated academics has now met with the student involved in this case and has determined that the student has engaged in a form of academic dishonesty.

The educational integrity administrator is now required to draft a letter to the student:

1. OPEN THE EIC/NOMINATED ACADEMIC’S DECISION
   - The response can be found in either “Workflow Notes” or a document titled “response from 'name.surname@sydney.edu.au' at 'dd/mm/yyyy hh:mm:ss'”.

2. DRAFT THE LETTER TO THE STUDENT (see 5.6 above)
   - Do this by creating the letter from the “Decision – Academic Dishonesty” template either stored under “Create and Reference Records” or that you may have saved on your hard drive.

3. NOMINATE OR VALIDATE THE UOS COORDINATOR AND EIC/NOMINATED ACADEMIC IN THE MANDATORY NOMINATION FIELD
   - Please contact Records Management Services (records.online@sydney.edu.au) if you are not able to do so.

4. PROVIDE INFORMATION FOR THE UOS COORDINATOR’S REFERENCE IF NECESSARY
   - This information should have been provided in the EIC/nominated academic’s response.
   - It must be added via the “Special Instructions” pane and should be as concise and direct as possible (tip: use bullets or numbering).

5. REVIEW THE LETTER ONCE IT HAS BEEN SAVED TO THE WORKFLOW AND MARK FOR SENDING
   - Select the magnifying glass icon next to the draft letter.
   - If there are errors, repeat steps taken at 2 above.
   - If there are not, ensure you select the “Send” checkbox for the letter.
   - Ensure that documents previously sent to the student have been deselected.

6. FORWARD THE LETTER TO THE EIC/NOMINATED ACADEMIC FOR REVIEW
   - Select “Complete” to forward the letter for review.

The case will then be forwarded via the system to the EIC or NA, who is required to review the letter and then either send the letter directly to the student or return the letter to you for modification. Please note that the letter must be sent to the student via the workflow system.

COMPLETE STEP 7 IF THE TITLE OF THIS TASK INCLUDES THE PREFIX “RETURN FOR REVISION”. 
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7. **EDIT THE LETTER AND RETURN TO EIC/NOMINATED ACADEMIC FOR FINAL APPROVAL**
   - Check the EIC/nominated academic's instructions for revisions to be made.
   - This information is provided in a replying e-mail ("response from 'name.surname@sydney.edu.au' at 'dd/mm/yyyy hh:mm:ss'"), via “Workflow Notes” or by attaching/uploading the FINAL edited document to the workflow.
   - Repeat steps 2 to 4, ensuring that you delete the earlier version of the letter (if applicable) and select the “Send” checkbox for the FINAL version to be sent to the student.
   - Select “Complete” to forward the letter for approval and sending to the student.

7.11 **4E ADMIN DOCUMENTATION AND COMMUNICATION – PLAGIARISM**

The faculty’s EIC/nominated academic has now met with the student involved in this case and has determined that the student has engaged in plagiarism likely to have been caused by the student’s failure to fully understand referencing requirements rather than dishonestly.

The educational integrity administrator is now required to draft a letter to the student:

1. **OPEN THE EIC/NOMINATED ACADEMIC’S DECISION**
   - The response can be found in either “Workflow Notes” or a document titled “response from 'name.surname@sydney.edu.au' at 'dd/mm/yyyy hh:mm:ss'”.

2. **DRAFT THE LETTER TO THE STUDENT (see 5.6 above)**
   - Do this by creating the letter from the “Decision – Plagiarism” template either stored under “Create and Reference Records” or that you may have saved on your hard drive.

3. **NOMINATE OR VALIDATE THE UOS COORDINATOR AND EIC/NOMINATED ACADEMIC IN THE MANDATORY NOMINATION FIELD**
   - Please contact Records Management Services (records.online@sydney.edu.au) if you are not able to do so.

4. **PROVIDE INFORMATION FOR THE UOS COORDINATOR’S REFERENCE IF NECESSARY**
   - This information should have been provided in the EIC/nominated academic's response.
   - It must be added via the “Special Instructions” pane and should be as concise and direct as possible (tip: use bullets or numbering).

5. **REVIEW THE LETTER ONCE IT HAS BEEN SAVED TO THE WORKFLOW AND MARK FOR SENDING**
   - Select the magnifying glass icon next to the draft letter.
   - If there are errors, repeat steps taken at 2 above.
   - If there are not, ensure you select the “Send” checkbox for the letter.
   - Ensure that documents previously sent to the student have been deselected.

6. **FORWARD THE LETTER TO THE EIC/NOMINATED ACADEMIC FOR REVIEW**
   - Select “Complete” to forward the letter for review.

The case will then be forwarded via the system to the EIC or NA, who is required to review the letter and then either send the letter directly to the student or return the letter to you for modification. Please note that the letter must be sent to the student via the workflow system.

**COMPLETE STEP 7 IF THE TITLE OF THIS TASK INCLUDES THE PREFIX “RETURN FOR REVISION”**.

7. **EDIT THE LETTER AND RETURN TO EIC/NOMINATED ACADEMIC FOR FINAL APPROVAL**
   - Check the EIC/nominated academic’s instructions for revisions to be made.
This information is provided in a replying e-mail (“response from ‘name.surname@sydney.edu.au’ at ‘dd/mm/yyyy hh:mm:ss’”), via “Workflow Notes” or by attaching/uploading the FINAL edited document to the workflow.

Repeat steps 2 to 4, ensuring that you delete the earlier version of the letter (if applicable) and select the “Send” checkbox for the FINAL version to be sent to the student.

Select “Complete” to forward the letter for approval and sending to the student.

---

7.12 4F ADMIN DOCUMENTATION AND COMMUNICATION - POTENTIAL MISCONDUCT

The faculty’s Educational Integrity Coordinator (EIC) or another of its nominated academics has formed the view, either on preliminary assessment of the matter or after meeting with the student, that the student’s conduct is such that it may potentially constitute serious academic misconduct and so should be dealt with by the Registrar under the University of Sydney By-Law 1999.

The educational integrity administrator is now required to draft TWO letters:
- A decision letter to be sent to the student; and
- A letter of referral to be sent to the Registrar.

The steps for doing so are as follows:

1. OPEN THE EIC/NOMINATED ACADEMIC’S PRELIMINARY ASSESSMENT
   - The response can be found in either “Workflow Notes” or a document titled “response from ‘name.surname@sydney.edu.au’ at ‘dd/mm/yyyy hh:mm:ss’”.

2. DRAFT THE LETTER TO THE STUDENT (see 5.6 above)
   - Do this by creating the letter from the “Potential Misconduct” template either stored under “Create and Reference Records” or that you may have saved on your hard drive.

3. DRAFT THE LETTER OF REFERRAL TO THE REGISTRAR (see 5.6 above)
   - Do this by creating the letter from the “Letter of Referral” template either stored under “Create and Reference Records” in this system (see tabs above) or that you may have saved on your hard drive.

4. NOMINATE OR VALIDATE THE UOS COORDINATOR AND EIC/NOMINATED ACADEMIC IN THE MANDATORY NOMINATION FIELD
   - Please contact Records Management Services (records.online@sydney.edu.au) if you are not able to do so.

5. REVIEW THE LETTERS ONCE THEY HAVE BEEN SAVED TO THE WORKFLOW
   - Select the magnifying glass icon next to the draft letter.
   - If there are errors, repeat steps taken at 2 above.
   - If there are not, ensure you select the “Send” checkbox for the letter to the student ONLY and relevant supporting documents.
   - DO NOT MARK THE LETTER OF REFERRAL FOR SENDING.

6. FORWARD THE LETTERS TO THE EIC/NOMINATED ACADEMIC FOR REVIEW
   - Select “Complete” to forward the letters for review.

The case will then be forwarded via the system to the EIC or NA, who is required to review the letter and then either send the letter directly to the student or return the letter to you for modification. Please note that the letter must be sent to the student via the workflow system.

COMPLETE STEP 7 IF THE TITLE OF THIS TASK INCLUDES THE PREFIX “RETURN FOR REVISION”.

---
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7. EDIT THE LETTER AND RETURN TO EIC/NOMINATED ACADEMIC FOR FINAL APPROVAL
   – Check the EIC/nominated academic’s instructions for revisions to be made.
   – This information is provided in a replying e-mail (“response from ‘name.surname@sydney.edu.au’ at ‘dd/mm/yyyy hh:mm:ss’”), via “Workflow Notes” or by attaching/uploading the FINAL edited document to the workflow.
   – Repeat steps 2 to 4, ensuring that you delete the earlier version of the letter/s (if applicable) and select the “Send” checkbox for the FINAL version to be sent to the student. DO NOT MARK THE LETTER OF REFERRAL FOR SENDING.
   – Select “Complete” to forward the letters for approval and sending.

7.13 6D ACADEMIC DISHONESTY - ADMIN TO VERIFY AND CLOSE OFF THE CASE

The faculty’s EIC/nominated academic determined that the student involved in this case had engaged in a form of academic dishonesty.

The educational integrity administrator is now required to verify that the outcome specified by the EIC/nominated academic has been appropriately actioned, either by the student, the unit of study coordinator, or both. Once this has been verified, the educational integrity administrator is then required to close out the case. The steps for doing so are set out below.

PLEASE NOTE THAT ALL E-MAIL CORRESPONDENCE AND DOCUMENTATION RELATED TO THIS STEP MUST BE SAVED TO THE WORKFLOW BEFORE THE CASE IS CLOSED OUT.

1. VERIFY THAT THE STUDENT HAS, IF PERMITTED, SUBMITTED THE CORRECTED/ALTERNATIVE PIECE OF WORK
   – Each faculty will have its own procedure for receiving student resubmissions, which could be via e-mail or a dedicated Turnitin drop box on a Faculty-based educational integrity LMS/Blackboard site.
   – Note that all text-based written assignments must be submitted to Turnitin.

   a) Upload file submitted by student and related Turnitin report to the workflow (see 5.6 above)

   b) Forward the student’s work to the EIC/nominated academic for review
      – This must be done via E-MAIL. The EIC/nominated academic will also send their response by e-mail.
      – If the new/revised work is compliant, the file submitted by the student and the related Turnitin report must then be e-mailed to the Unit of Study Coordinator for marking in accordance with the EIC/nominated academic’s determination.
      – If the new/revised work is NOT compliant, the EIC/nominated academic will make a revised decision, after which you will be required to draft a revised decision letter to be sent to the student.

   c) If required, draft a revised decision letter to the student
      – Do this either by creating the letter from the “Revised Decision – Did Not Comply” template stored under “Create and Reference Records” or that you may have saved on your hard drive.

   d) Forward the revised decision letter to the EIC/nominated academic for review
      – This must be done via E-MAIL. The EIC/nominated academic will also send their response/approval by e-mail.
      – Any editing required will occur outside of the workflow.

   e) Send revised decision letter to the student and inform unit of study coordinator of the revised outcome
      – This must be done via E-MAIL.
2. **VERIFY THAT ANY SPECIFIED PENALTIES HAVE BEEN APPLIED CORRECTLY**
   - You can do this by checking your faculty's results processing system, the GradeCentre in the relevant LMS/Blackboard site, or by directly contacting the Unit of Study Coordinator by e-mail.

3. **COMPLETE THE TO DO CHECK LIST BELOW AND CLOSE THE CASE**
   - Select the checkboxes for the To Do items.
   - Select “Complete” to close the case.
   - An email notification will then be sent to the person who referred the case informing them that the case has been resolved.

### 7.14  6E PLAGIARISM - ADMIN TO VERIFY AND CLOSE OFF THE CASE

The faculty’s Educational Integrity Coordinator (EIC) or another of its nominated academics determined that the student involved in this case had engaged in plagiarism likely to have been caused by the student’s failure to fully understand referencing requirements rather than dishonesty.

The educational integrity administrator is now required to verify that the outcome specified by the EIC/nominated academic has been appropriately actioned, either by the student, the unit of study coordinator, or both. Once this has been verified, the educational integrity administrator is then required to close out the case. The steps for doing so are set out below.

**PLEASE NOTE THAT ALL E-MAIL CORRESPONDENCE AND DOCUMENTATION RELATED TO THIS STEP MUST BE SAVED TO THE WORKFLOW BEFORE THE CASE IS CLOSED OUT.**

1. **VERIFY THAT THE STUDENT HAS COMPLETED THE ADDITIONAL DEVELOPMENT COURSE**
   - For the time being, please contact the Office of Educational Integrity for this information.
   - You will need to include this information in your e-mail to the EIC/nominated academic at step 2(b).

2. **VERIFY THAT THE STUDENT HAS, IF PERMITTED, SUBMITTED THE CORRECTED/ALTERNATIVE PIECE OF WORK**
   - Each faculty will have its own procedure for receiving student resubmissions, which could be via e-mail or a dedicated Turnitin drop box on a Faculty-based educational integrity LMS/Blackboard site. Note that all text-based written assignments must be submitted to Turnitin.

   a) Upload file submitted by student and related Turnitin report to the workflow (see 5.6 above)

   b) **Forward the student’s work to the EIC/nominated academic for review**
      - This must be done via E-MAIL. The EIC/nominated academic will also send their response by e-mail.
      - If the new/revised work is compliant, the file submitted by the student and the related Turnitin report must then be e-mailed to the Unit of Study Coordinator for marking in accordance with the EIC/nominated academic’s determination.
      - If the new/revised work is NOT compliant, the EIC/nominated academic will make a revised decision, after which you will be required to draft a revised decision letter to be sent to the student.

   c) If required, draft a revised decision letter to the student
      - Do this either by creating the letter from the “Revised Decision – Did Not Comply” template stored under “Create and Reference Records” or that you may have saved on your hard drive.

   d) **Forward the revised decision letter to the EIC/nominated academic for review**
      - This must be done via E-MAIL. The EIC/nominated academic will also send their response/approval by e-mail.
      - Any editing required will occur outside of the workflow.
e) Send revised decision letter to the student and inform unit of study coordinator of the revised outcome
   - This must be done via E-MAIL.

3. VERIFY THAT ANY PENALTIES HAVE BEEN ACTIONED APPROPRIATELY
   - You can do this by checking your faculty’s results processing system, the GradeCentre in the relevant LMS/Blackboard site, or by directly contacting the Unit of Study Coordinator by e-mail.

4. COMPLETE THE TO DO CHECK LIST AND CLOSE THE CASE
   - Select the checkboxes for the To Do items.
   - Select “Complete” to close the case.
   - An email notification will then be sent to the person who referred the case informing them that the case has been resolved.

7.15 7F ADMIN TO CLOSE OFF CASE - POTENTIAL MISCONDUCT

The faculty’s EIC/nominated academic formed the view the conduct of the student involved in this case was such that it potentially constituted serious academic misconduct and so should be to be dealt with by the Registrar under the University of Sydney By-Law 1999.

The educational integrity administrator is now have received the Registrar’s decision in this case via an e-mail from the Student Affairs Unit. Consequently, the educational integrity administrator is now required to implement any action specified by the Registrar and then close the case out. The steps for doing so are set out below.

PLEASE NOTE THAT ALL E-MAIL CORRESPONDENCE AND DOCUMENTATION RELATED TO THIS STEP MUST BE SAVED TO THE WORKFLOW BEFORE THE CASE IS CLOSED OUT.

1. UPLOAD THE E-MAIL CONTAINING THE REGISTRAR’S DECISION TO THE WORKFLOW (see 5.6 above)

2. IMPLEMENT ACTIONS SPECIFIED BY THE REGISTRAR
   - This could include applying a fail grade to the work or unit of study or processing a period of suspension on disciplinary grounds.

3. COMPLETE THE TO DO CHECK LIST AND CLOSE THE CASE
   - Select the checkboxes for the To Do items.
   - Select “Complete” to close the case.
   - An email notification will then be sent to the person who referred the case informing them that the case has been resolved.
8  STEP INSTRUCTIONS FOR EIC/NA TASKS

8.1 2e ACTION REQUIRED - EIC OR NA - PRELIMINARY ASSESSMENT ON A NEW CASE

At this stage of the process, a new case of alleged academic dishonesty or plagiarism has been referred for review by the Faculty’s Educational Integrity Coordinator (EIC) or another of its nominated academics.

After reviewing the case documentation, the EIC/nominated academic is required to make their preliminary assessment of the case according to one of the following options:

1. THE MATTER COULD NOT AMOUNT TO ACADEMIC DISHONESTY OR PLAGIARISM (NO IMPROPIETY).
   An outcome of ‘no impropriety’ will be formally recorded and no further action is to be taken beyond the assessment of the work on its academic merit in accordance with clause 17(2) of the Academic Honesty in Coursework Policy 2015.

2. THERE IS CONDUCT LIKELY TO HAVE BEEN CAUSED BY THE STUDENT’S FAILURE TO FULLY UNDERSTAND REFERENCING REQUIREMENTS RATHER THAN DISHONESTY. ADDITIONAL DEVELOPMENT AND RESUBMISSION IS APPROPRIATE.
   This preliminary assessment indicates that the matter may be resolved if the student both completes an approved further development course delivered by the Faculty or the Learning Centre and submits a corrected or alternative piece of work (within a specified timeframe and for a specified maximum mark) in accordance with clause 17(4) of the Policy. If the student complies with these conditions, the case will be closed with a result of “development workshop completed.” If they do not, they will be required to attend a meeting with you in accordance with clause 18 of the Policy.

3. A MEETING WITH THE STUDENT IS REQUIRED, AS SUFFICIENT EVIDENCE EXISTS TO SUPPORT AN ALLEGATION OF ACADEMIC DISHONESTY OR PLAGIARISM.
   In accordance with clause 18 of the Policy, the student must be provided with a sufficiently detailed explanation of the allegation being made and the available evidence on which this is based so that they can properly prepare their response.

4. SUFFICIENT EVIDENCE EXISTS TO SUPPORT AN ALLEGATION OF ACADEMIC MISCONDUCT TO BE HANDLED BY THE REGISTRAR UNDER THE BY-LAW.
   This action is to be taken in accordance with clause 17(8) the Policy. If it is taken, the student must be provided with an explanation of the reason/s for the referral in accordance with clause 17(9) the Policy.

COMPLETING THIS STEP
A. Preliminary assessment via e-mail

The case documentation can be accessed by clicking the links listed under “All documents associated with this workflow” included in the system-generated e-mail.

Once you have reviewed the available documentation and formed a preliminary view of the case corresponding to one of the options listed above, you should then select the relevant “action” listed alongside the specific outcome you have settled on.

Please note:
- If you select “No Impropriety”, please provide your reasons in your replying e-mail so that they may be forwarded to the Unit of Study Coordinator by a member of your educational integrity team in the following administration step.
- If you select “Additional Development and Resubmission”, please specify in your replying e-mail the specific course the student is to complete, whether they are to correct their work or complete an alternative task, the date by which they must do so, and the maximum mark available to them.
If you select “Decision to Meet with Student”, please include in your replying e-mail your reasons for proceeding to a meeting, including your formulation of the specific allegation being made and outlining the evidence upon which this is based.

If you select “Potential Misconduct (refer to Registrar)”, please include in your replying e-mail your reasons for proceeding with the referral, including your view of the evidence upon which this is based.

B. Preliminary assessment via the workflow portal
Select “Open All Documents” to access and review the case documentation.

Once you have reviewed the available documentation and formed a preliminary view of the case corresponding to one of the options listed above, you should then select ONE of the options listed under “Outcomes”.

Please note:
- If you select “No Impropriety”, please provide your reasons in the “Comments to apply to this workflow” pane so that they may be forwarded to the Unit of Study Coordinator by a member of your educational integrity team in the following administration step.
- If you select “Additional Development and Resubmission”, please specify in the “Comments to apply to this workflow” pane the specific course the student is to complete, whether they are to correct their work or complete an alternative task, the date by which they must do so, and the maximum mark available to them.
- If you select “Decision to Meet with Student”, please include in the “Comments to apply to this workflow” pane your reasons for proceeding to a meeting, including your formulation of the specific allegation being made and outlining the evidence upon which this is based.
- If you select “Potential Misconduct (refer to Registrar)”, please include in the “Comments to apply to this workflow” pane your reasons for proceeding with the referral, including your view of the evidence upon which this is based.

NEXT STEP
Once the preliminary assessment has been made, the case will then be returned to the faculty’s educational integrity team for further processing:
- For cases of no impropriety, a member of your faculty’s educational integrity team will add your comments to the e-mail notification to be sent to the UOS Coordinator. The case initiator will also be notified of the outcome.
- For cases where additional development/resubmission or a meeting is required, a member of your educational integrity team will then draft a letter to the student on your behalf and send it to you for review/approval.
- For cases referred to the Registrar, a letter of referral will also be drafted and forwarded to you for your review/approval. The case initiator will also be notified of the outcome.

8.2 2Bre ACTION REQUIRED - EIC OR NA - APPROVE YOUR DECISION LETTER TO STUDENT

Based on the EIC/nominated academic’s preliminary assessment, a member of the faculty’s educational integrity team has drafted a letter to the student instructing them to complete an additional development course and submit a corrected or alternative piece of work.

Having done so, the draft letter has been forwarded to the EIC/nominated academic for review and approval, with the document title containing the text “Academic Honesty Development Course Required”.

After reviewing the letter, the EIC/nominated academic is required to approve the letter to be sent directly to the student as it is or to provide further instruction on any changes to be made.
COMPLETING THIS STEP
A. Reviewing the letter via e-mail
1. View the letter by clicking the relevant link listed under “All documents associated with this workflow” included in the system-generated e-mail.
2. If the letter requires:
   a) **No further editing**, select the "Okay to Proceed" action item listed in the e-mail and then "Send".
   b) **Further editing**, select “Return for Revision” and then enter the revisions you wish to be made in your replying e-mail. Alternatively, you can attach an edited, final version of the letter to your replying e-mail, which will be automatically saved to the workflow once your e-mail has been sent. If you edit the letter yourself, please ensure you add the suffix FINAL to the document title before attaching it to your e-mail.

B. Reviewing the letter via the workflow portal
1. View the letter by clicking the magnifying glass icon listed alongside the relevant document.
2. If the letter requires:
   a) **No further editing**, select "Okay to Proceed" under “Outcomes”, and then “Complete”.
   b) **Further editing**, select “Return for Revision” under “Outcomes”, enter the revisions you wish to be made in the “Comments to apply to this workflow” pane, and then select “Rollback”. Alternatively, you can upload an edited, final version of the letter directly to the workflow before selecting Rollback. If you edit the letter yourself, please ensure you add the suffix FINAL to the document title before uploading it.

For instructions on uploading documents to the workflow, please see §5.5 above.

8.3 2Cre ACTION REQUIRED - EIC OR NA - APPROVE YOUR DECISION LETTER TO STUDENT

Based on instructions provided in a previous step, a member of the faculty’s educational integrity team has drafted a letter to the student informing them that they are required to attend a meeting with the EIC/nominated academic to discuss an allegation of academic dishonesty or plagiarism.

Having done so, the draft letter has been forwarded to the EIC/nominated academic for review and approval, with the document title containing the text “Academic Honesty Meeting Required”.

After reviewing the letter, the EIC/nominated academic is required to approve the letter to be sent directly to the student as it is or to provide further instruction on any changes to be made.

COMPLETING THIS STEP
A. Reviewing the letter via e-mail
1. View the letter by clicking the relevant link listed under “All documents associated with this workflow” included in the system-generated e-mail.
2. If the letter requires:
   a) **No further editing**, select the "Okay to Proceed" action item listed in the e-mail and then "Send".
   b) **Further editing**, select “Return for Revision” and then enter the revisions you wish to be made in your replying e-mail. Alternatively, you can attach an edited, final version of the letter to your replying e-mail, which will be automatically saved to the workflow once your e-mail has been sent. If you edit the letter yourself, please ensure you add the suffix FINAL to the document title before attaching it to your e-mail.

B. Reviewing the letter via the workflow portal
1. View the letter by clicking the magnifying glass icon listed alongside the relevant document.
2. If the letter requires:
   a) **No further editing**, select "Okay to Proceed" under “Outcomes”, and then “Complete".
b) **Further editing**, select “Return for Revision” under “Outcomes”, enter the revisions you wish to be made in to the “Comments to apply to this workflow” pane, and then select “Rollback”. Alternatively, you can upload an edited, final version of the letter directly to the workflow before selecting Rollback. If you edit the letter yourself, please ensure you add the suffix **FINAL** to the document title before uploading it. 

For instructions on uploading documents to the workflow, please see 5.5 above.

### 8.4 3Be ACTION REQUIRED - EIC OR NA - PRELIMINARY ASSESSMENT

At this stage of the process, a case in which a student was required to complete an additional development course and submit a corrected or alternative piece of work has been returned to the EIC/nominated academic for reassessment.

As such, the EIC/nominated academic is required to determine whether the student satisfactorily completed the development course and that the resubmitted work is compliant:

- **If it is**, the matter has been **resolved** and the resubmitted work forwarded to the Unit of Study Coordinator for marking purposes.
- **If it is not**, or if the student did not also attend the additional development course, they are now required to attend a meeting with you to discuss the allegation of academic dishonesty or plagiarism outlined in your previous letter to them.

Consequently, after reviewing the **new** case documentation, the EIC/nominated academic is required to make their preliminary assessment of each case according to one of the following options:

1. **THE STUDENT HAS SATISFACTORILY COMPLETED THE SPECIFIED CORRECTIVE ACTIONS**

   The resubmitted work is to be forwarded to the Unit of Study Coordinator to be marked in accordance with your preliminary assessment. The outcome of the case will then be recorded as “development course completed” in accordance with clause 17(6) of the [Academic Honesty in Coursework Policy 2015](#).

2. **A MEETING IS REQUIRED AS THE STUDENT HAS NOT SATISFACTORILY COMPLETED THE SPECIFIED CORRECTIVE ACTIONS**

   In accordance with clause 17(7) of the [Policy](#), the student is now required to attend a meeting with you and follow the process as set out in clause 18 of the Policy. The student is to be provided with a sufficiently detailed explanation of the allegation being made and the available evidence on which this based so that they can properly prepare their response.

**COMPLETING THIS STEP**

**A. Preliminary assessment via e-mail**

The new case documentation will appear at the top of the links listed under “All documents associated with this workflow” included in the system-generated e-mail. If there is more than one Turnitin report, please ensure you check the Turnitin report related to the resubmitted work.

Once you have reviewed the available documentation and formed a preliminary view of the case corresponding to one of the options listed above, you should then select the relevant “action” listed alongside the specific outcome you have settled on.

Please note:

- **If you select** “Development Workshop Completed”, please provide in your replying e-mail any further information you wish to be forwarded to the Unit of Study Coordinator by a member of your educational integrity team in the following administration step.

- **If you select** “Meeting Required”, please specify in your replying e-mail any further information you wish to be communicated to the student in the letter to be sent at the subsequent step.
B. Preliminary assessment via the workflow portal

View the new case documentation by clicking the magnifying glass icon/s listed alongside the relevant document. New case documentation usually appears at the bottom of the list of documents attached to the workflow. If there is more than one Turnitin report, please ensure you check the Turnitin report related to the resubmitted work.

Once you have reviewed the available documentation and formed a second preliminary view of the case, you should then select the related option listed under “Outcomes”.

Please note:
- If you select “Development Workshop Completed”, please provide in the “Comments to apply to this workflow” pane any further information you wish to be forwarded to the Unit of Study Coordinator by a member of your educational integrity team in the following administration step.
- If you select “Meeting Required”, please specify in the “Comments to apply to this workflow” pane any further information you wish to be communicated to the student in the letter to be sent at the subsequent step.

For instructions on uploading documents to the workflow, please see 5.5 above.

NEXT STEP

In either scenario, a member of your educational integrity team will draft a letter to the student on your behalf and send it to you for review/approval.

8.5 3Cre ACTION REQUIRED - EIC OR NA - APPROVE INTERVIEW REQUEST LETTER TO STUDENT

Based on instructions provided in a previous step, a member of the faculty’s educational integrity team has drafted a letter to the student informing them that they are required to attend a meeting with the EIC/nominated academic because they failed to complete a specified additional development course, submit a compliant corrected or alternative piece of work, or both.

Having done so, the draft letter has been forwarded to the EIC/nominated academic for review and approval, with the document title containing the text “Academic Honesty Development Workshop Not Completed”.

After reviewing the letter, the EIC/nominated academic is required to approve the letter to be sent directly to the student as it is or to provide further instruction on any changes to be made.

COMPLETING THIS STEP

A. Reviewing the letter via e-mail

1. View the letter by clicking the relevant link listed under “All documents associated with this workflow” included in the system-generated e-mail.
2. If the letter requires:
   a) No further editing, select the “Okay to Proceed” action item listed in the e-mail and then “Send”.
   b) Further editing, select “Return for Revision” and then enter the revisions you wish to be made in your replying e-mail. Alternatively, you can attach an edited, final version of the letter to your replying e-mail, which will be automatically saved to the workflow once your e-mail has been sent. If you edit the letter yourself, please ensure you add the suffix FINAL to the document title before attaching it to your e-mail.

B. Reviewing the letter via the workflow portal

1. View the letter by clicking the magnifying glass icon listed alongside the relevant document.
2. If the letter requires:
   a) No further editing, select “Okay to Proceed” under “Outcomes”, and then “Complete”.
   b) Further editing, select “Return for Revision” under “Outcomes”, enter the revisions you wish to be made in to the “Comments to apply to this workflow” pane, and then select “Rollback”.
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Alternatively, you can upload an edited, final version of the letter directly to the workflow before selecting Rollback. If you edit the letter yourself, please ensure you add the suffix FINAL to the document title before uploading it.

For instructions on uploading documents to the workflow, please see 5.5 above.

### 8.6 3e Action Required - EIC or NA - Case decision

At this stage of the process, the student has been given the opportunity to respond to an allegation of academic dishonesty or plagiarism at a meeting with the EIC/nominated academic or in writing. The case has then been forwarded to EIC/nominated academic for final determination.

After considering the available evidence and the student’s response (if they provided one), the EIC/nominated academic is required to take a decision on the case according to one the following options:

1. **THE STUDENT HAS ENGAGED IN NO IMPROPIETY.**
   In accordance with clause 20 of the Academic Honesty in Coursework Policy 2015, an outcome of “No Impropriety” will be formally recorded for this case and no further action should be taken beyond the assessment of the work on its academic merit.

2. **THE STUDENT HAS ENGAGED IN PLAGIARISM YOU DO NOT CONSIDER AS BEING DISHONEST BUT RATHER THAT IS DUE TO THE STUDENT'S FAILURE TO FULLY UNDERSTAND REFERENCING REQUIREMENTS.**
   In accordance with clause 21(2) of the Policy, the student must complete an approved further development course delivered by the Faculty or the Learning Centre. Provided they are conferred no unfair advantage, they may also be instructed to submit a corrected or alternative piece of work within a specified timeframe and for a specified maximum mark. The outcome of the case will then be formally recorded as “Plagiarism” on the student's file.

3. **THE STUDENT HAS ENGAGED IN A FORM OF ACADEMIC DISHONESTY.**
   Clause 21(5) of the Policy lists the actions available in such cases:
   - Require the student to submit a corrected or alternative piece of work within a specified timeframe and for a specified maximum;
   - Require the student to undertake other remedial action (e.g., complete a specified additional development course).
   - Apply a fail grade, mark penalty or a specific mark to the student’s work.
   - Apply a fail grade or mark penalty to the student’s result for the unit of study.
   In all such cases, the outcome will be formally recorded as “Academic Dishonesty” on the student’s file. Please note, too, that where the student's conduct appears to be sufficiently serious, the matter should be referred to the Registrar for action under the By-Law (see following option).

4. **THE STUDENT’S CONDUCT IS SUFFICIENTLY SERIOUS THAT IT WOULD, IF PROVEN, CONSTITUTE ACADEMIC MISCONDUCT AND SO IS TO BE REFERRED TO THE REGISTRAR FOR ACTION UNDER THE BY-LAW.**
   This action is to be taken in accordance with clause 21(5)(e) and/or 21(7) of the Policy. If it is taken, the student must be provided with an explanation of the reason/s for the referral in accordance with clause 17(9) the Policy.

**COMPLETING THIS STEP**

**A. Making the decision via e-mail**

Should it be necessary, the case documentation can be accessed by clicking the links listed under “All documents associated with this workflow” included in the system-generated e-mail.

Once you have formed your conclusion on this case, you should then select the relevant “action” listed alongside the specific outcome you have settled on.
Please note:

- If you select “No Impropriety”, please provide your reasons in your replying e-mail so that they may be forwarded to the Unit of Study Coordinator by a member of your educational integrity team in the following administration step.

- If you select “Plagiarism”, please specify in your replying e-mail the specific course the student is to complete and whether they are to correct their work or complete an alternative task, the date by which they must do so, and the maximum mark available to them.

- If you select “Academic Dishonesty”, please include in your replying e-mail your reasons for the decision as well as the specific actions you wish to be undertaken in order to resolve the case.

- If you select “Potential Misconduct (refer to Registrar)”, please include in your replying e-mail your reasons for proceeding with the referral, including your view of the evidence upon which this is based.

B. Making the decision via the workflow portal

If applicable, any new case documentation will appear at the top of the links listed under “All documents associated with this workflow” included in the system-generated e-mail.

Once you have formed your conclusion on this case, you should then select the relevant “action” listed alongside the specific outcome you have settled on.

Please note:

- If you select “No Impropriety”, please provide your reasons in the “Comments to apply to this workflow” pane so that they may be forwarded to the Unit of Study Coordinator by a member of your educational integrity team in the following administration step.

- If you select “Plagiarism”, please specify in the “Comments to apply to this workflow” pane the specific course the student is to complete and whether they are to correct their work or complete an alternative task, the date by which they must do so, and the maximum mark available to them.

- If you select “Academic Dishonesty”, please include in the “Comments to apply to this workflow” pane your reasons for the decision as well as the specific actions you wish to be undertaken in order to resolve the case.

- If you select “Potential Misconduct (refer to Registrar)”, please include in the “Comments to apply to this workflow” pane your reasons for proceeding with the referral, including your view of the evidence upon which this is based.

NEXT STEP

- For cases of no impropriety, a member of your faculty’s educational integrity team will send the standard “no impropriety” letter directly and add your comments to the e-mail notification to be sent to the UOS Coordinator. The case initiator will also be notified of the outcome.

- For cases in which plagiarism or academic dishonesty is found, a member of your educational integrity team will draft a letter to the student on your behalf and send it to you for review/approval.

- For cases to be referred to the Registrar, a letter of referral will also be drafted and forwarded to you for your review/approval. The UOS Coordinator and case initiator will also be notified of the outcome.

8.7 4Are ACTION REQUIRED - EIC OR NA - APPROVE OUTCOME LETTER – NO IMPROPIETY

Based on the EIC/nominated academic’s decision on this case, a member of the faculty’s educational integrity team has drafted a letter to the student informing them that the EIC/nominated academic has determined that they have engaged in no impropriety.

Having done so, the draft letter has been forwarded to the EIC/nominated academic for review and approval, with the document title containing the text, with the title containing the text “Decision – No Impropriety”.
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After reviewing the letter, the EIC/nominated academic is required to approve the letter to be sent directly to the student as it is or to provide further instruction on any changes to be made.

**COMPLETING THIS STEP**

**A. Reviewing the letter via e-mail**
1. View the letter by clicking the relevant link listed under “**All documents associated with this workflow**” included in the system-generated e-mail.
2. If the letter requires:
   a) **No further editing**, select the "Okay to Proceed" action item listed in the e-mail and then "Send".
   b) **Further editing**, select “Return for Revision” and then enter the revisions you wish to be made in your replying e-mail. Alternatively, you can attach an edited, final version of the letter to your replying e-mail, which will be automatically saved to the workflow once your e-mail has been sent. If you edit the letter yourself, please ensure you add the suffix **FINAL** to the document title before attaching it to your e-mail.

**B. Reviewing the letter via the workflow portal**
1. View the letter by clicking the magnifying glass icon listed alongside the relevant document.
2. If the letter requires:
   a) **No further editing**, select "Okay to Proceed" under “Outcomes”, and then “Complete”.
   b) **Further editing**, select “Return for Revision” under “Outcomes”, enter the revisions you wish to be made in the “Comments to apply to this workflow” pane, and then select “Rollback”. Alternatively, you can upload an edited, final version of the letter directly to the workflow before selecting Rollback. If you edit the letter yourself, please ensure you add the suffix **FINAL** to the document title before uploading it.

For instructions on uploading documents to the workflow, please see **5.5 above**.

**8.8 4Bre ACTION REQUIRED - EIC OR NA - APPROVE OUTCOME LETTER - DEVELOPMENT WORKSHOP COMPLETED**

Based on the EIC/nominated academic’s second preliminary assessment of this case, a member of the faculty’s educational integrity team has drafted a letter to the student informing them that the EIC/nominated academic is satisfied that they have adequately complied with the preliminary assessment.

Having done so, the draft letter has been forwarded to the EIC/nominated academic for review and approval, with the document title containing the text, with the title containing the text “Academic Honesty Development Workshop Completed”.

After reviewing the letter, the EIC/nominated academic is required to approve the letter to be sent directly to the student as it is or to provide further instruction on any changes to be made.

**COMPLETING THIS STEP**

**A. Reviewing the letter via e-mail**
1. View the letter by clicking the relevant link listed under “**All documents associated with this workflow**” included in the system-generated e-mail.
2. If the letter requires:
   a) **No further editing**, select the "Okay to Proceed" action item listed in the e-mail and then "Send".
   b) **Further editing**, select “Return for Revision” and then enter the revisions you wish to be made in your replying e-mail. Alternatively, you can attach an edited, final version of the letter to your replying e-mail, which will be automatically saved to the workflow once your e-mail has been sent. If you edit the letter yourself, please ensure you add the suffix **FINAL** to the document title before attaching it to your e-mail.
B. Reviewing the letter via the workflow portal
1. View the letter by clicking the magnifying glass icon listed alongside the relevant document.
2. If the letter requires:
   a) **No further editing**, select "Okay to Proceed" under "Outcomes", and then "Complete".
   b) **Further editing**, select "Return for Revision" under "Outcomes", enter the revisions you wish to be made in to the "Comments to apply to this workflow" pane, and then select "Rollback".

Alternatively, you can upload an edited, final version of the letter directly to the workflow before selecting Rollback. If you edit the letter yourself, please ensure you add the suffix **FINAL** to the document title before uploading it.

For instructions on uploading documents to the workflow, please see 5.5 above.

---

8.9 4Dre ACTION REQUIRED - EIC OR NA - APPROVE OUTCOME LETTER – ACADEMIC DISHONESTY

Based on the EIC/nominated academic’s decision on this case, a member of the faculty’s educational integrity team has drafted a letter to the student informing them that the EIC/nominated academic has determined that they have engaged in a form of academic dishonesty.

Having done so, the draft letter has been forwarded to the EIC/nominated academic for review and approval, with the document title containing the text, with the title containing the text “Decision – Academic Dishonesty”.

After reviewing the letter, the EIC/nominated academic is required to approve the letter to be sent directly to the student as it is or to provide further instruction on any changes to be made.

COMPLETING THIS STEP

A. Reviewing the letter via e-mail
1. View the letter by clicking the relevant link listed under “All documents associated with this workflow” included in the system-generated e-mail.
2. If the letter requires:
   a) **No further editing**, select the "Okay to Proceed" action item listed in the e-mail and then "Send".
   b) **Further editing**, select "Return for Revision" and then enter the revisions you wish to be made in your replying e-mail. Alternatively, you can attach an edited, final version of the letter to your replying e-mail, which will be automatically saved to the workflow once your e-mail has been sent. If you edit the letter yourself, please ensure you add the suffix **FINAL** to the document title before attaching it to your e-mail.

B. Reviewing the letter via the workflow portal
1. View the letter by clicking the magnifying glass icon listed alongside the relevant document.
2. If the letter requires:
   a) **No further editing**, select "Okay to Proceed" under "Outcomes", and then "Complete".
   b) **Further editing**, select "Return for Revision" under "Outcomes", enter the revisions you wish to be made in to the "Comments to apply to this workflow" pane, and then select "Rollback".

Alternatively, you can upload an edited, final version of the letter directly to the workflow before selecting Rollback. If you edit the letter yourself, please ensure you add the suffix **FINAL** to the document title before uploading it.

For instructions on uploading documents to the workflow, please see 5.5 above.
8.10 4Ere ACTION REQUIRED - EIC OR NA - APPROVE OUTCOME LETTER – PLAGIARISM

Based on the EIC/nominated academic’s decision on this case, a member of the faculty’s educational integrity team has drafted a letter to the student informing them that the EIC/nominated academic has determined that they have engaged in plagiarism likely to have been caused by the student’s failure to fully understand referencing requirements rather than dishonesty.

Having done so, the draft letter has been forwarded to the EIC/nominated academic for review and approval, with the document title containing the text, with the title containing the text “Decision – Plagiarism”.

After reviewing the letter, the EIC/nominated academic is required to approve the letter to be sent directly to the student as it is or to provide further instruction on any changes to be made.

COMPLETING THIS STEP

A. Reviewing the letter via e-mail

1. View the letter by clicking the relevant link listed under “All documents associated with this workflow” included in the system-generated e-mail.

2. If the letter requires:
   a) **No further editing**, select the "Okay to Proceed" action item listed in the e-mail and then “Send”.
   b) **Further editing**, select “Return for Revision” and then enter the revisions you wish to be made in your replying e-mail. Alternatively, you can attach an edited, final version of the letter to your replying e-mail, which will be automatically saved to the workflow once your e-mail has been sent. If you edit the letter yourself, please ensure you add the suffix **FINAL** to the document title before attaching it to your e-mail.

B. Reviewing the letter via the workflow portal

1. View the letter by clicking the magnifying glass icon listed alongside the relevant document.

2. If the letter requires:
   a) **No further editing**, select "Okay to Proceed" under “Outcomes”, and then “Complete”.
   b) **Further editing**, select “Return for Revision” under “Outcomes”, enter the revisions you wish to be made in to the “Comments to apply to this workflow” pane, and then select “Rollback”. Alternatively, you can upload an edited, final version of the letter directly to the workflow before selecting Rollback. If you edit the letter yourself, please ensure you add the suffix **FINAL** to the document title before uploading it.

For instructions on uploading documents to the workflow, please see 5.5 above.

8.11 4Fre Action Required - EIC or NA - Approve outcome letter - Potential Misconduct

Based on the EIC/nominated academic’s decision on this case, a member of the faculty’s educational integrity team has drafted **TWO** letters specific to this outcome:

- **A letter to the student** informing them that the EIC/nominated academic has determined that their conduct is sufficiently serious that it potentially constitutes academic misconduct, and so has been referred to the Registrar for action under the **By-Law**.
- **A letter of referral to the Registrar** describing the case and outlining the steps taken in its preliminary investigation.

Having done so, the draft letters have been forwarded to the EIC/nominated academic for review and approval, with the first document title containing the text “**Potential Misconduct**” and the second, “**Letter of Referral**”.


After reviewing the letters, the EIC/nominated academic is required to either approve both letters to be sent, respectively, to the student and Registrar as they are or to provide further instruction on any changes to be made.

COMPLETING THIS STEP
A. Reviewing the letters via e-mail
   1. View the letters by clicking the relevant links listed under “All documents associated with this workflow” included in the system-generated e-mail.
   2. If either or both letters require:
      a) **No further editing**, select the "Okay to Proceed" action item listed in the e-mail and then "Send".
      b) **Further editing**, select "Return for Revision" and then enter the revisions you wish to be made to each specific letter in your replying e-mail. Alternatively, you can attach edited, final versions of each letter to your replying e-mail, which will be automatically saved to the workflow once your e-mail has been sent. If you edit the letters yourself, please ensure you add the suffix **FINAL** to the respective document title/s before attaching it to your e-mail.

B. Reviewing the letters via the workflow portal
   1. View the letters by clicking the magnifying glass icon listed alongside the relevant document.
   2. If either or both letters require:
      a) **No further editing**, select "Okay to Proceed" under “Outcomes”, and then “Complete”.
      b) **Further editing**, select “Return for Revision” under “Outcomes”, enter the revisions you wish to be made in to the “Comments to apply to this workflow” pane, and then select “Rollback”. Alternatively, you can upload edited, final versions of each letter directly to the workflow before selecting Rollback. If you edit the letters yourself, please ensure you add the suffix **FINAL** to the respective document title/s before proceeding with the upload.

For instructions on uploading documents to the workflow, please see 5.5 above.
9 GENERATING REPORTS

9.1 Simple searches and generating reports in the workflow portal

The Enquiry function in the workflow portal offers a simple way of searching for one or more workflow items. To do so:

1. **Click Enquiry** from the top menu bar – 2nd button to the right of the In-Tray (highlighted below).

2. **Select the Student Misconduct Academic Case Handling** as the **Workflow Template**.

3. **Set the Display Limit** to above 200 items.

4. **In the Workflow Title Filter**, enter your faculty code to search all cases for your faculty and then use the Date Registered to the right to limit the search in a date range.

5. You can also enter a SID within the Workflow Title Filter, to search for cases relating to one student. Please note that faculty administrators only have access to cases related to their own faculty. EICs/nominated academics can search for cases across faculties.

6. **Tick Include completed workflow** if appropriate.

7. **Click the Search button** to kick off a search. (In this particular case, the search returned 4 cases).

8. **Click the ‘+’ button** in front of the case to expand the work to show all activities.

9. **Click Report Viewer button** to generate a HTML table of the report.
10. Click Disc button to save the report to your computer, or click print button to print the report.
11. You may also click the Excel Report Generic button.
12. Save the report to your desktop.

9.2 Complex report using HPRM (TRIM)

1. Launch HPRM (TRIM) from your desktop shortcut.
2. Use the shortcut ‘Ctrl + W’ to launch the “Search for Workflow” dialogue box. Please Note: if you do not immediately see the below search window, please click the button and then select ‘Multi-field’ from the drop down list.

3. Enter your faculty code with an asterisk* at the beginning and end – e.g *SCIE* to search for faculty specific cases or,
4. Enter SID *299900001* (this is just a test SID) to search for cases relating to that student.
5. Select the ‘Student Misconduct Academic Case Handling template’.
6. Click on the **Workflow Dates** tab, and enter a **date range** for your search.

7. Click the **Additional Fields** tab; you can specify the fields outlined in red as filters. Double click on the field and set a value or searching criteria, click OK.
8. Click the **Filter** tab; you may filter the complete workflow items if you wish.

9. Click the **Sort** tab to sort how the results of the search will be displayed.
10. Click the **Results** tab to re-set the display fields and ordering of these fields.

11. Highlight fields on the left pane and click **Add** to add them to your display columns.
12. Highlight fields on the right pane and click **Remove** to remove them from your display columns.
13. Highlight fields on the right pane and click the **Up** or **Down** buttons to change the display fields order.
14. Click **Ok** to execute the search, and view the search results.

9.3 Saved Searches using HPRM (TRIM)

1. Click **Tools** and select **Saved Searches**. You should be able to see a list of existing saved searches.
2. Click on the **saved search name column** to sort the saved searches by name in descending order. **Please Note:** Saved searches relating to workflows will all begin with the prefix ‘WF’.

3. Click on the **WF all cases this year** saved search. The search will return a result for all workflow cases lodged this year.

   **If you wish to limit the search to a specific UOS, follow the steps below:**

4. Click the **refine search button**.

5. Enter the UOS with **Asterisk** before and after and UOS code (second image on following page).

6. Click **OK**. You will get a list of workflow items belonging to that specific UOS Code.
If you wish to search for workflow items relating to International students, please repeat steps 4-9 and then do the following:

7. Click on the Additional Fields tab (see image overleaf).
9. Click OK to execute the search.
10 Frequently Asked Questions

10.1 Educational Integrity Reporting – Online Form

1. Who can refer a case of alleged plagiarism or academic misconduct?
   Any staff member can log in using their Unikey and refer a case. If you are part of a large unit of study with a number of different markers, you may wish to discuss whether:
   Markers will refer cases themselves (UOS Coordinator will be automatically notified); or
   Markers will pass on cases to the UOS Coordinator who will refer all cases in that unit.

2. Can I refer a case from a previous year?
   Yes, the reporting system will allow you report a case up to two years prior to the current year.

3. Do I need to know the UOS code to refer a case?
   Yes, every case relates to a piece of work in a particular unit of study.

4. I want to refer a case, but I don’t know what the UOS code is. Where can I find the correct UOS code?
   Faculty handbooks are a good place to find correct UOS codes. If you are having continual problems lodging a case, please contact the Office of Educational Integrity.

5. I get an error message when I type in the UOS Code. What should I do?
   This means that the system cannot find the UOS code in the Sydney Student table of units available in this year (MAV table). Do you have the correct code, or are you putting it in for the correct year? Faculty handbooks are a good place to find correct UOS codes. If you are having continual problems lodging a case, please contact the Office of Educational Integrity.

6. I have put in the UOS code, but I get the wrong unit title. What should I do?
   Check that you have the correct code. The best place to check unit codes and titles is in the faculty handbooks. If you are having continual problems lodging a case, please contact the Office of Educational Integrity.

7. I have put in the UOS code, but I get the wrong UOS coordinator name. What should I do?
   That’s OK; whilst you are not able to correct or overwrite the name of UOS Coordinator in the online form, you may contact your faculty administration officer, who can re-assign the workflow items to a correct UOS Coordinator within the workflow portal.

8. Can I refer more than one student at a time?
   Yes, you can refer multiple students at a time, however each case referral must relate to one assignment under one unit of study code. You will need to lodge a new case referral for additional assignments or for different unit of study codes.

9. To refer a case with multiple students, please type or paste in the additional SIDs within the form’s lookup box. When lodging a case with multiple students, you will only need to upload the UOS documentation once, however each student will need their individual assignments uploaded against their name. Once the form has been lodged, the workflow will create an individual case and confirmation email for each.

10. When and how is a student notified that an allegation has been made?
    If the preliminary investigation determines that there has been no impropriety, the case is immediately closed without the student being notified. Otherwise, the workflow sends an email to their University email address with details of the allegation, information about what to do next, and how to contact the faculty with any questions. Markers and UOS Coordinators are not required to notify students about any allegations or outcomes of decisions.

11. I have additional supporting documents for a student’s alleged case of AMP which I wasn’t able to (or forgot to) upload within the web-form, what should I do?
Please email the additional attachments to your faculty administration officer (see contacts) who will attach them to the workflow for you. If you are sending through multiple documents, please ‘ZIP’ or compress the documents into one file and if dealing with multiple students, please ensure one ZIP file per student.

12. Will the Case Initiator be informed of the final outcome of the AMP investigation?
Yes, the case initiator will receive an email notification that the case has been lodged, and an email notification of the final outcome.

13. How do I tell if an issue is plagiarism, academic misconduct or misconduct under Chapter 8 of The By-Law?
As a person reporting an incident, it doesn’t matter. Please refer the case in the reporting system, and the Educational Integrity Coordinator (or nominated academic) will make that determination in accordance with the Academic Honesty in Coursework Policy 2015 and the University of Sydney By-Law 1999.

10.2 Case Handling Using HP RM (TRIM) Workflow

1. How will Educational Integrity Coordinators (EIC) or Nominated Academics (NA) know that they are required to provide an action or participate in a workflow process?
EICs/nominated academics will receive their tasks within email steps, sent to their University email address. These email steps will have detailed instructions and all relevant information to assist decision makers in making informed decisions relating to each alleged case of AMP.

EICs/nominated academics will be reminded of any outstanding or overdue tasks they are yet to perform by daily email reminders.

EICs/nominated academics in large faculties may choose to use the Workflow Portal if that is an easier way to manage their cases. Please use this link to log into the workflow portal.

2. Is it a conflict of interest if an EIC is also the UOSC for an case?
No, the Policy does not regard that being the UOSC and the decision maker will result in a conflict of interest. However, if making a decision about a student in your own UOS makes you uncomfortable, the case should be referred to one of the other Nominated Academics within your faculty.

3. Can I attach minutes of meetings with students to a workflow?
Yes, you can attach documents to any of the reply emails generated by the workflow. Your faculty administration officer can and will then complete this task for you within the workflow portal.

4. Why do I get a separate email about every individual student?
The Policy requires that each individual student case is investigated separately, therefore the workflow system will send individual emails and notifications for each student. If you have a large UOS with a number of cases active at a time, you may wish to request a regular summary report from your faculty administration officer (see contacts).
5. Can I use my mail account on my Mac?
Yes, all email clients (e.g., Outlook, Mail, etc.) that are linked to your University email account are supported and can complete workflow email steps. However, the workflow system will not recognise or accept e-mail responses from addresses that do not end with @sydney.edu.au.

My mail account has an automatic signature, how will this affect the workflow email steps?
This will not affect the workflow process.

6. I am a UOS Coordinator (UOSC). Can I get information about students under investigation under my UOS?
Yes, you can ask your faculty administration officer to provide you with a report. You can find contacts here.

7. I am a UOS coordinator (UOSC). How will I know what the outcome of investigations are, and what penalties to apply?
You will receive emails at various decision points informing you about the progress of the case. If the email subject begins with “FYI No Action Required”, this is just for your information. When a final decision has been made, you will be notified that the work is ready to be marked, with any specific information about penalties to be applied.

8. How will a Unit of Study Coordinator (UOSC) access a list of current Academic Misconduct & Plagiarism cases for their faculty?
UOSC’s may request reports from faculty administration officers outlining all cases and the status of these cases (including penalties) within their faculty or unit of study.

9. Will role based account logins be accepted in the workflow process?
No, role based accounts are not accepted due to reasons of security and access. However, you may use a role based account as the contact information in your faculty’s letter templates.

10. How will Faculty Administration staff know that they are required to provide an action or participate in a workflow process?
Faculty administration staff will receive their tasks within the Workflow Portal. Each Workflow Portal step they are required to action and complete will have detailed instructions and all relevant information required for them to move the case forward and assist the EIC’s and NA’s in the alleged case of AMP.

Faculty administration staff will be reminded of any outstanding or overdue tasks they are required to perform by daily email reminders. Faculty administration staff can access the Workflow Portal via this link.

11. If a student is required to complete a further education course, who determines what course the student must complete?
The course will be selected by the EIC and must be an approved course by the Office of Educational Integrity. The following Learning Centre workshops have been approved:
- Quoting, Summarising and Paraphrasing Evidence helps you to identify the differences between quoting and reporting, and gives practice in language strategies to help avoid plagiarism. This workshop is recommended as appropriate for most students. Additional workshops have been scheduled to cater to students referred for further education.
- Using Evidence in Essays covers evaluating sources of evidence, using evidence critically and to support your argument, synthesising evidence to find patterns and develop your argument and paraphrasing skills.
- Language Strategies for Referring to Evidence focuses on the range of grammatical structures, reporting verbs and tenses that are available, and presents guidelines for choosing appropriately.

Students can register themselves for these free workshops at the Learning Centre via this link.

Faculties wishing to run their own workshops should contact the Office of Educational Integrity to discuss the available options.
10.3 Educational Integrity Reporting and other Processes

1. Will the Academic Misconduct & Plagiarism (AMP) workflow process automatically create a results suppression for a student if the outcome of the investigation requires it?
   No. Results can only be suppressed under the provision of the By-Law, but not investigations under the Academic Honesty in Coursework Policy 2015. If the matter is serious enough to warrant a result suppression, then the matter should be referred to the Registrar for investigation under the By-law. All cases referred for investigation under the University of Sydney By-Law 1999 (as amended) have the results suppressed by the Student Affairs Unit.

2. Will the Special Consideration and Academic Misconduct & Plagiarism systems talk to one another?
   No, these two systems are not linked nor will they feed or draw information to and from each other.
APPENDIX A: VC Taskforce Recommendation

MEMO
06 August 2015
EXPAND AND IMPROVE THE TRIM WORKFLOW USED IN FASS

Project
To expand the TRIM workflow for the Academic Dishonesty and Plagiarism in Coursework Policy for FASS to:
- every other faculty of the University
- add a search function to find and report to Nominated Academics previous allegations against a student
- a reporting function to automatically produce reports for faculties and the Academic Board

Background
At its July meeting, SEG endorsed the report of the Academic Misconduct and Plagiarism Taskforce. One of the key recommendations in the report is to expand the TRIM workflow used in FASS to provide University-wide assistance and recordkeeping for matters related to student academic integrity. Relevant extracts of the Taskforce's report are at Attachment A. This paper is to provide an outline of the proposed project and the timelines for implementation.

Rationale
The Taskforce found recordkeeping varied widely across the University and that there was often no way to search for recidivism, to keep or find reliable statistics on incidence of academic dishonesty, and a large administrative burden that often impeded staff complying with the current policy. They also found that FASS, in collaboration with the Records Unit had used a TRIM workflow to develop a solution to this problem that:
- Reduced workload for reporting examiners
- Ensured a more consistent application of the policy
- Reduced workload for administrative staff and nominated academics by providing and sending letters

A description of this system from the Taskforce report is at Attachment B.

The Taskforce considered this system best-practice, but recommended a number of additions:
- Introduce a search function that can notify the Nominated Academic of previous cases at an appropriate point in the process
- Add a reporting function to automatically produce reports for faculties and the Academic Board

Challenges
Designing and rolling out this system across all faculties of the University will require:
- Training in the system will need to be delivered to Nominated Academics, the administrative support staff and to academics who will be the reporting examiners. Setting up the system will need to be done in consultation with each faculty to determine the relevant people in the decision tree, and a way to support changes in personnel will need to be found.
- Policy changes to the Academic Dishonesty and Plagiarism in Coursework Policy will need to be considered and decided by the relevant ASPC working party prior to the finalisation of the workflow, to ensure it is consistent with policy.
- The Academic Board and the faculties will need to determine the reporting they wish to be able to do from the system, to ensure the appropriate metadata is captured. Responsibilities for reporting should also be determined.
Timelines
SEG have endorsed the Taskforce’s recommendations with a view to implementing these by Semester 1 2016. Finalising this project is dependent on the policy working party finalising any policy changes.

Project Team and Administration
This project will be managed by a team from the Records Unit with academic oversight provided by Jennifer Barrett from FASS. The project manager, May Robertson, will report on implementation to the broader AMP Taskforce implementation program control board, which is overseeing all the projects to implement the Taskforce recommendations.

A demonstration of the workflow and discussion of its use in FASS could be given at the planned staff forum.

Attachment A – Extracts from the Taskforce’s first report on recordkeeping
Attachment B – Description of FASS system from the Taskforce report
13 April 2016

Dear «FirstName» «LastName»
SID: «SID»

I write to you regarding a potential breach of the University’s Academic Honesty in Coursework Policy 2015 in relation to work you recently submitted for assessment in UOS CODE AND NAME.

Specifically, outline specific allegation here. At end of allegation, note the documents in which this evidence has been identified.

On the basis of the above, I have formed the preliminary view that you have potentially engaged in conduct contrary clause 9 of Part 3 of the Policy. However, in considering all of the available evidence, I have also formed the view that your conduct is likely to have been caused by your failure to fully understand referencing requirements rather than dishonesty.

Consequently, in accordance with clause 17(4) of the Policy, you are now required to attend an additional development course and submit a corrected or alternative piece of work in order to address the areas of concern identified in your original submission.

Please note, too, that the resubmitted work will be eligible for a maximum mark of XX% of the total available marks only, also in accordance with clause 17(4) of the Policy.

Next steps
You are required to register for and attend the Quoting, Summarising and Paraphrasing Evidence workshop taught by the University’s Learning Centre. You can register for the workshop at the Learning Centre registration page. You must complete this workshop within the next seven (7) days, subject to availability. If this is not possible, please contact xxxxx@sydney.edu.au immediately.

RESUBMISSION OF CORRECTED WORK
You are then required to submit a corrected version of your work, which includes all necessary corrections to the citations and reference list. Please note that this is an educational opportunity only, so you must not make changes beyond those indicated here. You are also required to resubmit the corrected work even if you have already received mark. If this is a group assessment, you will need to reconvene your group, carry out the changes, and nominate one group member to resubmit the assessment.

Please make the following corrections to your work:
A
B
C
You must submit this work by no later than DATE/TIME to EMAIL/or Faculty specific resubmission mechanism (e.g., dedicated LMS site/Turnitin dropbox)

SUBMISSION OF ALTERNATIVE WORK
You are then required to submit an alternative piece of work, including all relevant citations and a complete list of references. You must now:
A
B
C

You must submit this work by no later than DATE/TIME to EMAIL/or Faculty specific resubmission mechanism (e.g., dedicated LMS site/Turnitin dropbox)

[DO NOT REMOVE]
Once you have met these requirements, your work will be marked on its merits in accordance with the conditions outlined above and any other applicable policies, procedures, resolutions and provisions. The case may then be closed with no formal finding of plagiarism or academic misconduct recorded on your student file.

Should you not meet these requirements, you will be required to attend an interview with me to discuss the allegation as formulated above.

If you believe that there are genuine grounds for contesting this preliminary view, you may request a meeting with me to discuss your concerns. This request must be made in writing within 7 days of the date of this letter to xxxx@sydney.edu.au.

For further information about and resources on Academic Honesty, please visit the University’s Educational Integrity website.

Please ensure that you continue to attend classes and submit assessments as normal.

Yours sincerely,

Prof John Citizen
Educational Integrity Coordinator
Faculty of xxxx
13 April 2016

Dear «FirstName» «LastName»
SID: «SID»

I wrote to you recently regarding a possible breach of the University's Academic Honesty in Coursework Policy 2015 in relation to work you submitted for assessment in UOS CODE AND NAME.

In that letter, I instructed you to attend an additional development course and submit either a corrected or an alternative assessment.

I note that you have satisfactorily completed the further development course and am satisfied that your resubmission is compliant.

Consequently, your work will now be marked on its merits in accordance with the conditions outlined in my previous letter to you and any other applicable policies, procedures, resolutions and provisions. The case will then be closed with no formal finding of plagiarism or academic misconduct recorded on your student file.

I am encouraged to see that you have taken up the opportunity to undertake additional development to demonstrate your understanding of the importance of academic integrity to the University. For further information about and resources on Academic Honesty, please visit the University’s Educational Integrity website.

Appealing this decision
If you genuinely believe that due academic process has not been followed in making this decision, you may appeal this decision to the Faculty in accordance with section 3.2 of the University of Sydney (Student Appeals Against Academic Decisions) Rule 2006.

Appeal letters and supporting documentation must be submitted within 20 working days of the date of this letter via email to xxxxx@sydney.edu.au.

For information on the appeals process, please see:
- The University of Sydney (Student Appeals Against Academic Decisions) Rule 2006
- The Student Affairs Unit website.

If you require assistance in preparing an appeal, please contact the Student Representative Council (SRC) (for undergraduate students) or the Sydney University Postgraduate Representative Association (SUPRA) (for postgraduate students).

Yours sincerely,

Prof John Citizen
Educational Integrity Coordinator
Faculty of xxxxx
13 April 2016

Dear «FirstName» «LastName»  
SID: «SID»

I wrote to you recently regarding a possible breach of the University’s Academic Honesty in Coursework Policy 2015 in relation to work you submitted for assessment in UOS CODE AND NAME.

In that letter, I instructed you to attend an additional development course and submit either a corrected or an alternative assessment. I note, however, that you have not complied with this instruction, either in part or in full. Consequently, you are now required to attend a meeting with me to discuss the allegation as formulated in my previous letter to you and in accordance with clauses 17(7) and 18(1) of the Policy.

This meeting is expected to take 20 minutes and has been scheduled for <<time>> on <<date>> in <<location>>.

I will be accompanied by a member of the Faculty’s professional staff, who will keep record of the meeting. You are also welcome to bring a person of support with you to the meeting, such as a caseworker from the Student’s Representative Council or Sydney University Postgraduate Representative Association or a family member.

Please write to xxxxx@sydney.edu.au to confirm your availability to attend the scheduled meeting as soon as possible and by no later than <<time>> on <<date>>. If you are not available to attend the meeting as scheduled, please also indicate whether:
You wish to arrange an alternative time to meet, albeit within 5 working days of the scheduled meeting; or
You will respond to the allegation in writing, also within 5 working days of the scheduled meeting.

Should you fail to respond to the allegation, either at a meeting or in writing, a decision may be taken in the absence of your response.

For further information about this process, please visit the University’s Educational Integrity website or contact xxxxx@sydney.edu.au.

You are encouraged to continue attending classes and completing your assignments while this case is in progress. You may also wish to seek personal support from the University’s Counselling and Psychological Services (CAPS).

Yours sincerely,

Prof John Citizen  
Educational Integrity Coordinator  
Faculty of xxxxx
13 April 2016

Dear «FirstName» «LastName»

SID: «SID»

I write to you regarding a possible breach of the University’s [Academic Honesty in Coursework Policy 2015](https://example.com) in relation to work you recently submitted for assessment in [UOS CODE AND NAME](https://example.com).

Specifically, outline specific allegation here. At end of allegation, note the documents in which this evidence has been identified.

On the basis of the above, I have formed the preliminary view that you have potentially engaged in conduct contrary to Part 3 of the [Policy](https://example.com) and so, in accordance with clause 18(1), you are now required to attend a meeting with me to discuss the allegation as formulated above.

This meeting is expected to take 20 minutes and has been scheduled for <<time>> on <<date>> in <<location>>.

I will be accompanied by a member of the Faculty’s professional staff, who will keep record of the meeting and <<name(s) of any other staff member(s) attending>>. You are also welcome to bring a person of support with you to the meeting, such as a caseworker from the [Student’s Representative Council](https://example.com) or [Sydney University Postgraduate Representative Association](https://example.com) or a family member.

Please write to [xxxxx@sydney.edu.au](mailto:xxxxx@sydney.edu.au) to confirm your availability to attend the scheduled meeting as soon as possible and by no later than <<time>> on <<date>>. If you are not available to attend the meeting as scheduled, please also indicate whether:

- You wish to arrange an alternative time to meet, albeit within 5 working days of the scheduled meeting; or
- You will respond to the allegation in writing, also within 5 working days of the scheduled meeting.

Should you fail to respond to the allegation, either at a meeting or in writing, a decision may be taken in the absence of your response.

For further information about this process, please visit the University’s Educational Integrity [website](https://example.com) or contact [xxxxx@sydney.edu.au](mailto:xxxxx@sydney.edu.au).

You are encouraged to continue attending classes and completing your assignments while this case is in progress. You may also wish to seek personal support from the University’s [Counselling and Psychological Services](https://example.com) (CAPS).

Yours sincerely,

**Prof John Citizen**

Educational Integrity Coordinator

Faculty of  [xxxxx](https://example.com)
13 April 2016

Dear «FirstName» «LastName»
SID: «SID»

I refer to our recent meeting regarding an allegation of plagiarism or academic dishonesty related to work you submitted for assessment in UOS CODE AND NAME.

Having considered your response and the available evidence, I have determined that you have engaged in no impropriety and, if not already, your work is to be assessed on its academic merit without penalty in accordance with clause 20 of the Academic Honesty in Coursework Policy 2015.

Please note that I have informed your Unit of Study Coordinator and/or the original examiner of the outcome of this case. Please also note that penalties specified in other applicable policies, procedures, resolutions or provisions may still be applied to your work (e.g., late work penalty).

As you will be aware, the University places the highest importance on academic honesty. Notwithstanding the decision in this case, if you feel that you need to develop your understanding of this issue further, I would encourage you to seek out additional opportunities to do so. For further information about and resources on academic honesty, please visit the University’s Educational Integrity website.

Appealing this decision
Although the decision is of no impropriety, I am obliged to inform you of your appeal rights in relation to any academic decision made about you. Accordingly, if you genuinely believe that due academic process has not been followed in making this decision, you may appeal this decision to the Faculty in accordance with section 3.2 of the University of Sydney (Student Appeals Against Academic Decisions) Rule 2006.

Appeal letters and supporting documentation must be submitted within 20 working days of the date of this letter via email to xxxx@sydney.edu.au.

For information on the appeals process, please see:

– The University of Sydney (Student Appeals Against Academic Decisions) Rule 2006
– The Student Affairs Unit website.

If you require assistance in preparing an appeal, please contact the Student Representative Council (SRC) (for undergraduate students) or the Sydney University Postgraduate Representative Association (SUPRA) (for postgraduate students).

If you have any questions about this decision or the related procedures, please do not hesitate to contact me by e-mailing me at xxxx@sydney.edu.au.

Yours sincerely,

Prof John Citizen
Educational Integrity Co-ordinator
Faculty of xxx
13 April 2016

Dear «FirstName» «LastName»
SID: «SID»

I refer to our recent meeting regarding an allegation of plagiarism or academic dishonesty related to work you submitted for assessment in UOS CODE AND NAME.

Having considered your response and the available evidence, I have determined that you have engaged in plagiarism as defined in clause 9 of Part 3 of the Academic Honesty in Coursework Policy 2015. However, I am also satisfied that your conduct is likely to have been caused by your failure to fully understand referencing requirements rather than dishonesty.

Consequently, in accordance with clause 21(2) of the Policy, you are now required to attend an additional development course and submit a corrected or alternative piece of work in order to address the areas of concern identified in your original submission.

Please note, too, that the resubmitted work will be eligible for a maximum mark of XX% of the total available marks only, also in accordance with clause 21(2) of the Policy.

Next steps
You are required to register for and attend the Quoting, Summarising and Paraphrasing Evidence workshop taught by the University’s Learning Centre. You can register for the workshop at the Learning Centre registration page. You must complete this workshop within the next seven (7) days, subject to availability. If this is not possible, please contact xxxx@sydney.edu.au immediately.

[FAUCULTY TO DELETE IRRELEVANT]

RESUBMISSION OF CORRECTED WORK
You are then required to submit a corrected version of your work, which includes all necessary corrections to the citations and reference list. Please note that this is an educational opportunity only, so you must not make changes beyond those indicated here. You are also required to resubmit the corrected work even if you have already received mark. If this is a group assessment, you will need to reconvene your group, carry out the changes, and nominate one group member to resubmit the assessment.

Please make the following corrections to your work:
A
B
C

You must submit this work by no later than DATE/TIME to EMAIL/or Faculty specific resubmission mechanism (e.g., dedicated LMS site/Turnitin dropbox)
SUBMISSION OF ALTERNATIVE WORK
You are then required to submit an alternative piece of work, including all relevant citations and a complete list of references. You must now:
A
B
C

You must submit this work by no later than DATE/TIME to EMAIL/or Faculty specific resubmission mechanism (e.g., dedicated LMS site/Turnitin dropbox)

Once you have met these requirements, your work will be marked on its merits in accordance with the conditions outlined above and any other applicable policies, procedures, resolutions and provisions. The case will then be closed with a formal finding of plagiarism recorded on your student file.

Should you not meet these requirements, your work may be subject to harsher penalties in accordance with clauses 21(4) and (5) of the Policy.

Please note that I have informed your Unit of Study Coordinator and/or the original examiner of the outcome of this case. Please also note that penalties specified in other applicable policies, procedures, resolutions or provisions may still be applied to your work (e.g., late work penalty).

The above notwithstanding, I remind you here of the importance the University places on academic honesty, and encourage you to seek out additional development opportunities beyond those indicated above in this regard. For further information about and resources on academic honesty, please visit the University’s Educational Integrity website.

Appealing this decision
If you genuinely believe that due academic process has not been followed in making this decision, you may appeal this decision to the Faculty in accordance with section 3.2 of the University of Sydney (Student Appeals Against Academic Decisions) Rule 2006.

Appeal letters and supporting documentation must be submitted within 20 working days of the date of this letter via email to xxxxx@sydney.edu.au.

For information on the appeals process, please see:
– The University of Sydney (Student Appeals Against Academic Decisions) Rule 2006
– The Student Affairs Unit website.

If you require assistance in preparing an appeal, please contact the Student Representative Council (SRC) (for undergraduate students) or the Sydney University Postgraduate Representative Association (SUPRA) (for postgraduate students).

If you have any questions about this decision or the related procedures, please do not hesitate to contact me by e-mailing me at xxxxx@sydney.edu.au.

Yours sincerely,

Prof John Citizen
Educational Integrity Co-ordinator
Faculty of xxx
13 April 2016

Dear «FirstName» «LastName»

SID: «SID»

I refer to our recent meeting regarding an allegation of plagiarism or academic dishonesty related to work you submitted for assessment in UOS CODE AND NAME.

Having considered your response and the available evidence, I have determined that you have engaged in academic dishonesty as defined in clause 8 of Part 3 of the Academic Honesty in Coursework Policy 2015. (specific clauses may also be added to this paragraph)

RESUBMISSION OF CORRECTED WORK

Consequently, in accordance with clause 21(5)(a) of the Policy, you are now required to submit a corrected version of your work, which includes all necessary corrections to the citations and reference list. Please note that this is an educational opportunity only, so you must not make changes beyond those indicated here. You are also required to resubmit the corrected work even if you have already received mark. If this is a group assessment, you will need to reconvene your group, carry out the changes, and nominate one group member to resubmit the assessment.

Please make the following corrections to your work:

A

B

C

Please note, too, that the resubmitted work will be eligible for a maximum mark of XX% of the total available marks only, also in accordance with clause 21(5)(a) of the Policy.

You must submit this work by no later than DATE/TIME to EMAIL/or Faculty specific resubmission mechanism (e.g., dedicated LMS site/Turnitin dropbox)

Provided that your resubmission is compliant, it will be marked on its merits in accordance with the conditions outlined above and any other applicable policies, procedures, resolutions and provisions. If it is not compliant, or if you fail to resubmit the work as instructed, you may incur harsher penalties in accordance with clauses 21(5)(b) and (c) of the Policy. The case will then be closed with a formal finding of academic dishonesty recorded on your student file.

SUBMISSION OF ALTERNATIVE WORK

Consequently, in accordance with clause 21(5)(a) of the Policy, you are now required to an alternative piece of work, including all relevant citations and a complete list of references. You must now:

A

B

C

Please note, too, that the resubmitted work will be eligible for a maximum mark of XX% of the total available marks only, also in accordance with clause 21(5)(a) of the Policy.
You must submit this work by no later than DATE/TIME to EMAIL/or Faculty specific resubmission mechanism (e.g., dedicated LMS site/Turnitin dropbox)

Provided that your alternative submission is compliant, it will be marked on its merits in accordance with the conditions outlined above and any other applicable policies, procedures, resolutions and provisions. If it is not compliant, or if you fail to submit the work as instructed, you may incur harsher penalties in accordance with clauses 21(5)(b) and (c) of the Policy. The case will then be closed with a formal finding of academic dishonesty recorded on your student file.

**APPLY FAIL GRADE, MARK PENALTY OR SPECIFIC MARK TO THE WORK**
Consequently, in accordance with clause 21(5)(c) of the Policy, a mark equal to XX% of the total available marks will be recorded for you for this task. The case will then be closed with a formal finding of academic dishonesty recorded on your student file.

Consequently, in accordance with clause 21(5)(c) of the Policy, your work will be assessed on its merits, after which a penalty equal to XX% of the total available marks will be applied. The case will then be closed with a formal finding of academic dishonesty recorded on your student file.

**APPLY FAIL GRADE or MARK PENALTY TO UOS**
Consequently, in accordance with clause 21(5)(d) of the Policy, a Fail Grade equal to 0% will be recorded for you for this unit of study. The case will then be closed with a formal finding of academic dishonesty recorded on your student file.

Consequently, in accordance with clause 21(5)(d) of the Policy, a penalty equal to XX% of the total available marks will be applied to your final mark for this unit of study. The case will then be closed with a formal finding of academic dishonesty recorded on your student file.

**DO NOT REMOVE**
The above notwithstanding, I remind you here of the importance the University places on academic honesty, and encourage you to seek out additional development opportunities in this regard. For further information about and resources on academic honesty, please visit the University’s Educational Integrity website.

**Appealing this decision**
If you genuinely believe that due academic process has not been followed in making this decision, you may appeal this decision to the Faculty in accordance with section 3.2 of the University of Sydney (Student Appeals Against Academic Decisions) Rule 2006.

Appeal letters and supporting documentation must be submitted within 20 working days of the date of this letter via email to xxxxx@sydney.edu.au.

For information on the appeals process, please see:
- The University of Sydney (Student Appeals Against Academic Decisions) Rule 2006
- The Student Affairs Unit website.

If you require assistance in preparing an appeal, please contact the Student Representative Council (SRC) (for undergraduate students) or the Sydney University Postgraduate Representative Association (SUPRA) (for postgraduate students).

If you have any questions about this decision or the related procedures, please do not hesitate to contact me by e-mailing me at xxxxx@sydney.edu.au.

Yours sincerely,

**Prof John Citizen**  
Educational Integrity Co-ordinator  
Faculty of xxx
13 April 2016

Dear «FirstName» «LastName»
SID: «SID»

I refer to the decision letter I recently sent you regarding the outcome of the case of plagiarism or academic dishonesty in which you were involved in relation to work you submitted for assessment in UOS CODE AND NAME.

[FACULTY TO DELETE IRRELEVANT] FINDING OF PLAGIARISM
In that letter, I informed you that I had determined that you had engaged in plagiarism likely to have been caused by your failure to fully understand referencing requirements rather than dishonesty. You were also instructed to attend an additional development course and submit a corrected or alternative piece of work to be marked on its merits, albeit for a maximum mark of XX% of the total available marks only.

APPLY FAIL GRADE, MARK PENALTY OR SPECIFIC MARK TO THE WORK
I note, however, that you have not complied with this instruction. Consequently, in accordance with clause 21(5)(c) of the Policy, a mark equal to XX% of the total available marks will be recorded for you for this task. Per my previous letter to you, the case will now be closed with a formal finding of plagiarism recorded on your student file.

I note, however, that you have not complied with this instruction. Consequently, in accordance with clause 21(5)(c) of the Policy, your work will be assessed on its merits, after which a penalty equal to XX% of the total available marks will be applied. Per my previous letter to you, the case will now be closed with a formal finding of plagiarism recorded on your student file.

APPLY FAIL GRADE or MARK PENALTY TO UOS
I note, however, that you have not complied with this instruction. Consequently, in accordance with clause 21(5)(d) of the Policy, a Fail Grade equal to 0% will be recorded for you for this unit of study. Per my previous letter to you, the case will now be closed with a formal finding of plagiarism recorded on your student file.

I note, however, that you have not complied with this instruction. Consequently, in accordance with clause 21(5)(d) of the Policy, a penalty equal to XX% of the total available marks will be applied to your final mark for this unit of study. Per my previous letter to you, the case will now be closed with a formal finding of plagiarism recorded on your student file.

FINDING OF ACADEMIC DISHONESTY
In that letter, I informed you that I had determined that you had engaged in academic dishonesty. You were also instructed to submit a corrected or alternative piece of work to be marked on its merits, albeit for a maximum mark of XX% of the total available marks only.

APPLY FAIL GRADE, MARK PENALTY OR SPECIFIC MARK TO THE WORK
I note, however, that you have not complied with this instruction. Consequently, in accordance with clause 21(5)(c) of the Policy, a mark equal to XX% of the total available marks will be recorded for you for this task. Per my previous letter to you, the case will now be closed with a formal finding of plagiarism recorded on your student file.
I note, however, that you have not complied with this instruction. Consequently, in accordance with clause 21(5)(c) of the Policy, your work will be assessed on its merits, after which a penalty equal to XX% of the total available marks will be applied. Per my previous letter to you, the case will now be closed with a formal finding of plagiarism recorded on your student file.

**APPLY FAIL GRADE or MARK PENALTY TO UOS**

I note, however, that you have not complied with this instruction. Consequently, in accordance with clause 21(5)(d) of the Policy, a Fail Grade equal to 0% will be recorded for you for this unit of study. Per my previous letter to you, the case will now be closed with a formal finding of plagiarism recorded on your student file.

I note, however, that you have not complied with this instruction. Consequently, in accordance with clause 21(5)(d) of the Policy, a penalty equal to XX% of the total available marks will be applied to your final mark for this unit of study. Per my previous letter to you, the case will now be closed with a formal finding of plagiarism recorded on your student file.

[DO NOT REMOVE]
The above notwithstanding, I remind you here again of the importance the University places on academic honesty, and encourage you to seek out additional development opportunities in this regard. For further information about and resources on academic honesty, please visit the University's Educational Integrity website.

**Appealing this decision**

If you genuinely believe that due academic process has not been followed in making this decision, you may appeal this decision to the Faculty in accordance with section 3.2 of the University of Sydney (Student Appeals Against Academic Decisions) Rule 2006.

Appeal letters and supporting documentation must be submitted within 20 working days of the date of this letter via email to xxxxx@sydney.edu.au.

For information on the appeals process, please see:
- The University of Sydney (Student Appeals Against Academic Decisions) Rule 2006
- The Student Affairs Unit website.

If you require assistance in preparing an appeal, please contact the Student Representative Council (SRC) (for undergraduate students) or the Sydney University Postgraduate Representative Association (SUPRA) (for postgraduate students).

If you have any questions about this decision or the related procedures, please do not hesitate to contact me by e-mailing me at xxxxx@sydney.edu.au.

Yours sincerely,

**Prof John Citizen**
Educational Integrity Co-ordinator
Faculty of xxx
13 April 2016

Dear «FirstName» «LastName»
SID: «SID»

I write to you regarding a possible breach of the University’s Academic Honesty in Coursework Policy 2015 in relation to work you recently submitted for assessment in UOS CODE AND NAME.

Specifically, outline specific allegation here. At end of allegation, note the documents in which this evidence has been identified.

Having considered the available evidence, I have formed the view that your conduct may potentially constitute serious academic misconduct and so, in accordance with clause 17(8) of the Policy, I hereby undertake to refer the matter to the Registrar to be dealt with under the University of Sydney By-Law 1999.

I refer to our recent meeting regarding an allegation of plagiarism or academic dishonesty related to work you submitted for assessment in UOS CODE AND NAME.

COPY ALLEGATION AS FORMULATED IN MEETING REQUEST LETTER HERE IF NECESSARY, ADD FURTHER INFORMATION FROM MEETING HERE

Having considered your response and the available evidence, I have formed the view that your conduct may potentially constitute serious academic misconduct and so, in accordance with clauses 21(5)(e) and 21(7) of the Policy, I hereby undertake to refer the matter to the Registrar to be dealt with under the University of Sydney By-Law 1999.

You are encouraged to continue attending classes and completing your assignments while this case is in progress. You may also wish to seek personal support from the University’s Counselling and Psychological Services (CAPS).

This case will now be managed by the Student Affairs Unit.

If you require advice regarding this matter, please contact the Student Representative Council (SRC) (for undergraduate students) or the Sydney University Postgraduate Representative Association (SUPRA) (for postgraduate students).

If you have any questions about this matter, please do not hesitate to contact me by e-mailing me at xxx@sydney.edu.au.

Yours sincerely,

Prof John Citizen
Educational Integrity Coordinator
Faculty of xxx
13 April 2016

Professor Tyrone Carlin
Deputy Vice-Chancellor (Registrar)
Room L4.42 Quadrangle (A14)
The University of Sydney, NSW 2006

Dear Professor Carlin,

Re: Potential Academic Misconduct

I write to you to refer the conduct of <<Student's Name (SID)>> in relation to the University’s Academic Honesty in Coursework Policy 2015 for action under the University of Sydney By-Law 1999 (as amended).

The alleged misconduct relates to the student’s <<insert summary allegation>>. The details of the case and the process by which it was investigated are outlined below.

OUTLINE OF PRELIMINARY INVESTIGATION

On << Date>>,
On << Date>>,
On << Date>>,
On << Date>>,
On << Date>>,
On << Date>>,

Include here any other considerations made/views expressed by the EIC/nominated academic.

All documentation related to the case can be found in the Records file <<FILE NUMBER>>.

[FACTORY TO DELETE IRRELEVANT]

REFERRAL AFTER PRELIMINARY ASSESSMENT

On the basis of the above, and in accordance with clause 17(8) of the Academic Honesty in Coursework Policy 2015, I now forward this case to you for further consideration and action.

REFERRAL AFTER MEETING WITH STUDENT

On the basis of the above, and in accordance with clauses 21(5)(e) and 21(7) of the Academic Honesty in Coursework Policy 2015, I now forward this case to you for further consideration and action.
If you require further clarification of any of the matters outlined above, please do not hesitate to contact myself or a member of the Faculty’s educational integrity team on +61 2 xxxx yyyy or at xxxxx@sydney.edu.au.

Yours sincerely,

Prof John Citizen
Educational Integrity Coordinator
Faculty of xxx
# 13 APPENDIX C: Process Maps

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>University Staff member (Case Initiator) report a case online</th>
<th>lodgement acknowledged</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Admin to prepare and coordinate case documentation and evidence</td>
<td>Notification to UOS Co-ordinator</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Educational Integrity Co-ordinator (Nominated Academic) - Preliminary assessment</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>NO IMPROPERITY</th>
<th>ADDITIONAL DEVELOPMENT AND RESUBMISSION</th>
<th>POTENTIAL MISCONDUCT</th>
<th>*MEET WITH STUDENT</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Admit to prepare communication and close off case</td>
<td>Admin to prepare communication (EIC or NA review before sending)</td>
<td>Admin to prepare communication (EIC or NA review before sending)</td>
<td>Admin to arrange interview (EIC or NA review before sending)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>notify UOS Co-ordinator</td>
<td>notify student</td>
<td>notify student</td>
<td>Notify student about interview</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Notify Case Initiator</td>
<td>notify UOS Co-ordinator</td>
<td>notify UOS Co-ordinator</td>
<td>Informing UOS Co-ordinator regarding the interview</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Admin to verify (student attended further development and resubmitted work) | Refer to Registrar (SAU) |

Educational Integrity Co-ordinator (Nominated Academic) 2nd round Preliminary assessment

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>DEVELOPMENT WORKSHOP COMPLETED</th>
<th>MEET WITH STUDENT *</th>
<th>NO IMPROPERITY</th>
<th>PLAGIARISM</th>
<th>ACADEMIC DISHONESTY</th>
<th>POTENTIAL MISCONDUCT</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>notify student</td>
<td></td>
<td>Admin to prepare communication (EIC or NA review before sending)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>notify UOS Co-ordinator</td>
<td></td>
<td>notify student</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Notify Case Initiator</td>
<td></td>
<td>Admin to close off case</td>
<td>Notify Case Initiator</td>
<td>Notify Case Initiator</td>
<td>Refer to Registrar (SAU)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Admin to close off case</td>
<td></td>
<td>Admin to close off case</td>
<td>Admin to close off case</td>
<td>Admin to close off case</td>
<td>Notify Case Initiator</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
N.B., please use the zoom function to view this map.