

ACADEMIC INTEGRITY PROCEDURES 2022

Issued by: Chair, Academic Board

Dated: 15 November 2022 (commencing 20 February 2023)

Last amended: 24 April 2023 (administrative amendments)
2 February 2024 (administrative amendments)

Signature:

Name: Professor Jane Hanrahan

PART 1 PRELIMINARY

1 Purpose and application

- (1) These procedures are to give effect to the [Academic Integrity Policy 2022](#) and the [Research Code of Conduct 2023](#) (jointly “the policies”).
- (2) These procedures apply to:
 - (a) all coursework award courses;
 - (b) coursework units of study in higher degrees by research;
 - (c) all staff and affiliates;
 - (d) all students;
 - (e) former students who were enrolled at the time the conduct occurred;
and
 - (f) non-award students, exchange students and study abroad students in a unit of study at the University.

2 Commencement

These procedures commence on 20 February 2023.

PART 2 DEFINITIONS

3 Interpretation

- (1) Words and phrases used in these procedures and not otherwise defined in this document have the meanings they have in the policies.

Note: see clause 6 of each policy.

administrative unit means the central University administrative unit responsible for candidature management.

Associate Dean (Research) means, as appropriate:

- the Associate Dean of a faculty or University school with authority for matters relating to higher degrees by research;
- the Deputy Chairperson of a Board of Studies; or
- a person appointed by the relevant Dean to have authority for matters relating to higher degrees by research within a faculty.

census date means the date on which a student's enrolment in a unit of study becomes final.

code breach means a failure to comply with the principles and responsibilities set out in the [Research Code of Conduct 2023](#), which is not sufficiently serious as to constitute research misconduct

Note: See clauses 19 and 20 of the [Research Code of Conduct 2023](#).

copy-editing and proof reading means identifying errors in, and correcting, the presentation of a text so as to conform with standard usage and conventions. This may include line editing and detailed correction or advice on language, style or substance of a piece of work.

course code means a unique alpha-numeric code which identifies a University course.

coursework student means any student enrolled in any coursework award course or a non-award, exchange or study abroad student enrolled in a coursework unit of study.

Note: Higher degree by research students enrolled in coursework units of study are bound by the [Academic Integrity Policy 2022](#). See clause 17.



editor	means any person (whether or not accredited by an external organisation) undertaking paid or unpaid copy editing or proof reading.
inappropriate academic practice	<p>means a deviation (whether intentional or negligent) from accepted academic standards, including standards of:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none">• referencing and due acknowledgement of the work others;• ethics guidelines and ethical practice; or• data management. <p>It includes academic integrity or code breaches and research misconduct.</p>
progress evaluation panel	<p>has the meaning given in the Progress Planning and Review for Higher Degree by Research Students 2015. At that date of these procedures that is:</p> <p>means a panel established to conduct a progress evaluation in accordance with clause 11 [of that policy].</p>
submission check	<p>has the meaning given in the Thesis and Examination of Higher Degrees by Research Policy 2015. At the date of these procedures that is:</p> <p>means a review of a higher degree by research thesis undertaken at the point of submission by the central University administrative unit responsible for the processes of candidature management, as specified in clause 13 [of that policy].</p>
supervisor	<p>has the meaning given in the Higher Degree by Research Supervision Policy 2020. At the date of these procedures that is:</p> <p>means, in relation to a higher degree by research student, a person appointed to discharge the responsibilities set out in clauses 13 and 15 [of that policy].</p>
suppression of academic record	<p>means denying access to a student's academic record to:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none">• the student; and• any other person outside the University <p>except where legally required to do so.</p> <p>This includes access to results, grades and evidence of awards.</p>

PART 3 COURSEWORK STUDENTS

4 Education in academic integrity and discipline specific requirements

- (1) All students commencing a coursework award course must complete an online education module on academic honesty prior to the census date in their first semester, unless they have completed the module or an equivalent course approved by the Office of Educational Integrity in the previous five years.
- (2) Students commencing a coursework award course include:
 - (a) students commencing a new award course;
 - (b) students transferring award courses from another institution;
 - (c) exchange students;
 - (d) students commencing honours, where honours has a different course code; and
 - (e) students in a combined degree program where the course code changes during candidature.
- (3) If a student does not successfully complete the module by the last day of their first semester of enrolment, the Deputy Vice-Chancellor (Education) may direct that the student's academic record be suppressed until the module is successfully completed.
- (4) Faculties may do either or both of:
 - (a) make successful completion of the module an assessment requirement in a unit of study or other course component; or
 - (b) specify additional consequences of failure to complete the module.

5 Requirements for assessment tasks

- (1) If a unit of study coordinator believes that academic integrity breaches may occur they must take reasonable measures to eliminate or minimise this possibility, so that examiners can be reasonably satisfied that the submitted work was written by the student without assistance, except for legitimate cooperation.
 - (a) Such measures may include, but are not limited to any of:
 - (i) requiring an oral presentation of the work as part of the assessment;
 - (ii) assessing outlines, drafts and other iterations of the written work as it is developed;
 - (iii) requiring students to demonstrate learning outcomes in a supervised examination, where the student is required to reach a specified threshold in order to pass the unit of study; or
 - (iv) conducting an oral examination.



- (2) If a quiz or online assessment contributes significantly to the assessment mark for the unit, the unit of study coordinator must take appropriate steps to assure its academic integrity.
- (3) If a quiz or online assessment contributes a small percentage of the assessment mark for the unit, the unit of study coordinator must consider in its design but academic integrity assurance may be considered on the basis of the complete assessment approach for the unit.
- (4) If class tests and examinations contribute to the assessment mark, the unit of study coordinator must take active measures to mitigate integrity risks, including:
 - (a) appropriate seating arrangements and invigilation where tests or examinations are held on campus;
 - (b) invigilation for examinations delivered online;
 - (c) randomising multiple choice questions between candidates; or
 - (d) another appropriate method.

Note: See also Schedule One.

6 Reducing risk of academic integrity breaches in assessments

- (1) All faculties should develop guidelines for assessing the academic integrity risks of the assessment types used within their faculty.
- (2) When reviewing and revising assessments, staff should assess the degree of risk to academic integrity inherent in each assessment type, and implement appropriate mitigating measures.
 - (a) In doing so, staff should evaluate the likelihood of each risk occurring against the contribution of that particular assessment to the overall mark.
- (3) The process used should include the following steps.
 - (a) Unit of study coordinators complete a risk assessment to identify the risks and relevant mitigation strategies, as provided in in Schedule One.
 - (b) If an assessment has a high or very high risk rating, the relevant faculty committee may wish to discuss with the unit of study coordinators:
 - (i) whether it should be used; and
 - (ii) if so, what risk mitigation strategies should be applied.
 - (c) At the end of each semester, relevant faculty committees should consult the unit of study coordinators to:
 - (i) confirm the initial risk assessment;
 - (ii) discuss the effects of mitigating strategies; and
 - (iii) discuss what may be implemented in the future if the original strategy was not successful.



- (d) Faculties should report to the Academic Board on:
 - (i) any issues that have been identified with particular assessments or assessment types;
 - (ii) any consequential proposed changes to assessment or assessment types; and
 - (iii) any further strategies to mitigate these issues.

7 Reporting academic integrity breaches

- (1) Any person who reasonably believes that a student has breached academic integrity requirements should notify the University using the [online reporting form](#).
- (2) Any person may report contract cheating services or other services that are reasonably likely to promote or facilitate academic cheating misconduct to the Office of Educational Integrity.
 - (a) The University may report this information to relevant government authorities.

8 Managing alleged academic integrity breaches

- (1) In each case, a unit of study coordinator, Educational Integrity Coordinator or nominated academic must:
 - (a) review the evidence and relevant information, including:
 - (i) the student's record;
 - (ii) the student's stage of enrolment;
 - (iii) the severity of the suspected academic integrity breach and volume of inappropriate conduct or unattributed material;
 - (iv) other circumstances and material they consider to be relevant; and
 - (b) determine whether the matter is required to be referred to the Registrar or the Director, Research Integrity and Ethics Administration.
- (2) For matters not required to be referred to other decision makers, the unit of study coordinator, Educational Integrity Coordinator or nominated academic must then determine:
 - (a) whether an academic integrity breach has been substantiated;
 - (b) if so, its level of severity; and
 - (c) the penalty to be applied.
- (3) If the decision maker determines that the conduct does not amount to an academic integrity breach, they must:
 - (a) inform the examiner and the unit of study coordinator; and
 - (b) if the work has not already been assessed, return it to the examiner for assessment on its academic merit.



- (4) The Office of Educational Integrity will undertake the functions set out in subclauses 8(1) and 8(2) if:
 - (a) the conduct alleged involves relates to contract cheating; or
 - (b) the conduct alleged does not relate to a particular assignment (e.g., upload to a file-sharing platform).
- (5) The Office of Educational Integrity will assess anonymous reports and assign them to the appropriate decision maker.
- (6) If a student withdraws from the unit of study or degree in which a potential breach has been reported, the review must nevertheless continue to completion.

9 Process for handling minor breaches

- (1) If, upon reviewing work submitted by a student, the unit of study coordinator considers that a student has committed a minor breach of academic integrity the unit of study coordinator must check the central reporting system for any record of a prior breach.
- (2) If there is no record of a prior breach, the unit of study coordinator must:
 - (a) confirm the outcome as a minor breach of academic integrity; and, if so confirmed
 - (b) direct the student to undertake an approved development activity on academic integrity;
 - (c) inform the student of any penalty to be applied to the assessment task, if any. These may include:
 - (i) a mark reduction, in line with the published rubric;
 - (ii) a mark reduction proportionate to the unattributed content; or
 - (iii) submitting a corrected version of the assessment task, usually with a prescribed maximum mark; and
 - (d) record the outcome in the central reporting system.
- (3) If a student who has been required to attend and successfully complete an additional development course fails to do so, a penalty may apply.
- (4) The unit of study coordinator must inform the examiner of the outcome, and record the outcome on the student's file.
- (5) If there is a record of a prior breach or the unit of study coordinator believes the conduct may constitute a more serious breach, they will refer the case to the Educational Integrity or nominated academic for investigation.

10 Process for handling major breaches

- (1) If the relevant decision maker has made a preliminary assessment that the alleged conduct constitutes a major breach they must send written notice to the student that:
 - (a) states the alleged breach in sufficient detail to enable the student to properly consider the allegation and reply;
 - (b) specifies any supporting material to be used in determining the matter and provides copies of such material;



- (c) informs the student of the process to be followed, and specifies a reasonable time for providing a response; and
 - (d) includes a copy of the [Academic Integrity Policy 2022](#) and these procedures.
- (2) Students are encouraged to:
- (a) cooperate fully with investigations; and
 - (b) provide evidence of their engagement with an assessment task.
- (3) The decision maker may require that the student to provide notes, working drafts, and resource materials used in the preparation of the task.
- (4) Having given due consideration to procedural fairness, the relevant decision maker may request the student to do either or both of:
- (a) attend a meeting; or
 - (b) submit a written response.
- (5) The University will provide the student with a reasonable opportunity to attend a meeting if the student wishes to do so.
- (a) The decision maker must inform the student in advance of any staff members who will attend the meeting.
- (6) The student may choose not to participate in a meeting. However, if a student who has been given reasonable notice fails to attend without good reason, the relevant decision maker may determine the matter in the student's absence.
- (7) The decision maker may extend the time for a student to provide written responses.
- (8) The decision maker will review the evidence to determine if:
- (a) no breach has occurred;
 - (b) a minor breach has occurred;
 - (c) a major breach has occurred;
 - (d) conduct has occurred which is potentially a code breach or research misconduct, and will be referred to the Director, Research Integrity and Ethics Administration;
- Note:** See the [Research Code of Conduct 2023](#)
- (e) conduct has occurred which potentially constitutes student misconduct and will be referred to the Registrar.
- Note:** [University of Sydney \(Student Discipline\) Rule 2016](#).
- (9) If the decision maker determines that no breach has occurred, they must:
- (a) inform the student, and the examiner or unit of study coordinator; and
 - (b) if the work has not already been assessed, it must be returned to the examiner for assessment on its academic merit.
- (10) If the decision maker determines that a breach has occurred, but it is a minor breach, the decision maker must:
- (a) direct the student to undertake an approved development activity on academic integrity;



- (b) inform the student of any penalty to be applied to the assessment task, if any. These may include:
 - (i) a mark reduction, in line with the published rubric;
 - (ii) a mark reduction proportionate to the unattributed content; or
 - (iii) submitting a corrected version of the assessment task, usually with a prescribed maximum mark.
- (11) If the decision maker determines that a major academic integrity breach has occurred, but which does not warrant referral to another decision maker, they may take one or more of the following actions:
 - (a) apply a fail grade, a prescribed mark penalty or a mark to the work which reflects its unsatisfactory standard (which may be a mark of zero); or
 - (b) apply a fail grade or a mark penalty to the unit of study, which may be a mark of zero; and
 - (c) require the student to undertake remedial action.
- (12) The decision maker must inform the original examiner, the student and the unit of study coordinator of any determination made under subclauses 10(10) or (11), and any penalties, resubmission or other remedial action imposed.

11 Appeals

- (1) Students may appeal against a finding of academic integrity breach in the manner provided in the [University of Sydney \(Student Academic Appeals\) Rule 2021](#).
- (2) Such an appeal:
 - (a) is an appeal to the faculty as set out in section 3.1 of the [University of Sydney \(Student Academic Appeals\) Rule 2021](#); and
 - (b) should be determined by the Dean or Associate Dean.

12 Recordkeeping

- (1) The University will keep a record of all allegations of academic integrity breaches and their outcomes.
- (2) Information on academic integrity breaches, including files related to the investigation and outcomes, will be kept on the University's Records Management System. Outcomes are not recorded on the student's academic transcript.

Note: Academic integrity records are managed in accordance with the [Privacy Policy 2017](#) and [Recordkeeping Policy 2017](#).

PART 4 HIGHER DEGREES BY RESEARCH

13 Reporting allegations

- (1) Supervisors and progress evaluation panels must report any suspected academic integrity breach, code breach, or research misconduct by students whom they supervise or evaluate, using the [online reporting form](#).
- (2) Students or staff members who become aware of suspected academic integrity breaches or research misconduct by a student must report the allegations using the [online reporting form](#).

14 Process for handling allegations not involving the Higher Degree by Research examination process

- (1) The decision maker must consider all reports and come to a preliminary view as to whether the reported conduct potentially constitutes:
 - (a) no academic integrity breach;
 - (b) an academic integrity breach, but not a potential code breach or potential research misconduct;
 - (c) a potential code breach; or
 - (d) potential research misconduct.
- (2) If the decision maker's preliminary view is that the alleged conduct:
 - (a) is potentially research misconduct;
 - (b) relates to research work on a project funded by a research grant; or
 - (c) relates to research findings that have been published or which are about to be published;they must refer the matter to the Director of Research Integrity and Ethics Administration.
- (3) If the decision maker's preliminary view is that the alleged conduct is:
 - (a) potentially a code breach; but
 - (b) not potential research misconduct;the decision maker must
 - (c) consult with the Director of Research Integrity and Ethics Administration; and
 - (d) refer the matter to the Director of Research Integrity and Ethics Administration if requested.
- (4) Matters referred to the Director of Research Integrity and Ethics Administration will be managed in the manner set out in the [Research Code of Conduct 2023](#).
- (5) If the relevant decision maker's preliminary view is that the alleged conduct is:
 - (a) an academic integrity breach but
 - (b) not a potential code breach; and



- (c) not potential research misconduct;
the decision maker must:
 - (d) require the student to undertake additional education;
 - (e) inform the supervisor through the [online reporting form](#); and
 - (f) require the student to make corrections to data, findings, drafts, papers or other research work for appraisal by the supervisor as appropriate.
- (6) The decision maker may also require the student to attend an additional evaluation review in accordance with the [Progress Planning and Review for Higher Degree by Research Students Policy 2015](#).
- (7) If the decision maker is satisfied that there is evidence of persistent academic integrity breaches by a student, they may treat the matter as a potential code breach.
- (8) If:
 - (a) the relevant decision maker's preliminary view is that the alleged conduct is potentially a code breach but not research misconduct; and
 - (b) the Director of Research Integrity and Ethics Administration has not requested that the case be referred;the decision maker must deal with the matter in accordance with subclauses 14(9) – (14).
- (9) In all other cases, the decision maker must:
 - (a) set a time and place for an interview with the student; and
 - (b) provide the student with a written notice that:
 - (i) states the alleged breach in sufficient detail to enable the student to properly consider the allegation and reply;
 - (ii) specifies any supporting material to be used in determining the matter;
 - (iii) informs the student of the process to be followed and specifies a reasonable time for providing a response; and
 - (iv) includes a copy of the [Academic Integrity Policy 2022](#) and these procedures.
- (10) Having given due consideration to procedural fairness, the decision maker will determine the time and place for the interview.
- (11) The decision maker must inform the student in advance of any staff members who will attend the interview.
- (12) All participants in the interview should attend in person. However, if necessary, interviews may be held by telephone or any other telecommunications method which permits those present to attend and participate at the same time.
- (13) The decision maker may extend the time for a student to provide written responses to the allegations.
- (14) The student is not required to provide written responses and may choose not to do so.



- (15) The student may choose not to participate in an interview. However, if a student who has been given reasonable notice fails to attend without good reason, the relevant decision maker may determine the matter in the student's absence.
- (16) Once:
 - (a) any scheduled interview has been held or the appointed time for interview has passed; and
 - (b) the student has responded to the allegations or the deadline to do so has passed;then:
 - (c) the decision maker will make one of the following available determinations:
 - (i) potential research misconduct;
 - (ii) potential code breach;
 - (iii) inappropriate academic practice, but not a code breach or potential research misconduct;
 - (iv) other misconduct; or
 - (v) no impropriety.
- (17) The decision maker must inform the student and supervisor of the determination and consequent actions in writing.
- (18) If the decision maker makes a determination of potential research misconduct, they must refer the case to the Director of Research Integrity and Ethics Administration for examination.
- (19) If the decision maker makes a determination of potential code breach but not potential research misconduct they:
 - (a) must consult with the Director of Research Integrity and Ethics Administration; and
 - (b) if requested by the Director of Research Integrity and Ethics Administration, refer the case for investigation.
- (20) If the decision maker makes a determination of:
 - (a) potential code breach but not potential research misconduct, which is not requested to be referred to the Director of Research Integrity and Ethics Administration; or
 - (b) inappropriate academic practice but not a potential code breach or potential research misconduct;they must proceed in the manner specified in subclauses 14(5)(d) – (g).
- (21) If the decision maker makes a determination of other misconduct, they must refer the matter to the Registrar for investigation under the [University of Sydney \(Student Discipline\) Rule 2016](#).
- (22) If the decision maker makes a determination of no impropriety no further action will be taken.

15 Handling allegations relating to the Higher Degree by Research examination process

- (1) If, after conducting the checks required by the [Progress Planning and Review for Higher Degree by Research Students Policy 2015](#), the administrative unit suspects possible inappropriate academic practice, code breach or research misconduct, the administrative unit will use the [online reporting form](#) to refer the matter to the relevant decision maker.
- (2) Based on the evidence in the reports received from the administrative unit, the relevant decision maker will come to a preliminary view, and determine the required action according to this clause.
- (3) If the preliminary view is that there is evidence of potential code breach or research misconduct, the decision maker must refer the matter to the Director of Research Integrity and Ethics Administration.

Note: See the [Research Code of Conduct 2023](#).

- (4) If the preliminary view is that the apparent deficiencies in the thesis:
 - (a) constitute minor inappropriate academic practice that could be satisfactorily addressed as emendations to the thesis; and
 - (b) could not possibly constitute academic dishonesty, a code breach or research misconduct;the decision maker must:
 - (c) forward the thesis to examiners for examination; and
 - (d) lodge a report of any changes or emendations required to address deficiencies in the thesis using the [online reporting form](#).
- (5) If the preliminary view is that the apparent deficiencies in the thesis:
 - (a) constitute inappropriate academic practice that could not be satisfactorily addressed by emendations to the thesis; but
 - (b) could not constitute a code breach or research misconduct;the decision maker:
 - (c) must lodge a report of any changes or emendations required to address deficiencies in the thesis using the [online reporting form](#); and
 - (d) must refer the thesis and report to the relevant faculty committee to consider whether the thesis is suitable to examine in the light of information discovered in the submission check; and
 - (e) may make a recommendation to the relevant faculty committee that the faculty should decline to examine the thesis.
- (6) If the preliminary view is that there is no impropriety in the thesis, the decision maker must:
 - (a) forward the thesis for examination; and
 - (b) lodge a report of their investigation using the [online reporting form](#).



- (7) A report of the decision maker's findings including any emendations or changes required to address deficiencies in the thesis, must be:
- (a) included in the student's file; and
 - (b) forwarded to the committee determining the examination outcomes for their consideration.

Note: The committee determining the outcome for the examination will be either the relevant faculty committee or the HDR Examinations Subcommittee of the University Executive Research Committee. See the [Thesis and Examination of Higher Degrees by Research Policy 2015](#) and the [Thesis and Examination of Higher Degrees by Research Procedures 2020](#).

- (8) If the relevant faculty committee is asked to consider whether the thesis is suitable to examine on the referral of the relevant decision maker or an investigation managed by the Director of Research Integrity and Ethics Administration, it must do one of the following:
- (a) decline to examine the thesis;
 - (b) forward the thesis to examiners for examination; or
 - (c) refer the matter to the Director of Research Integrity and Ethics Administration in accordance with clause 21(1) of the [Research Code of Conduct 2023](#).

- (9) A report of the findings of the relevant faculty committee, including any determination of inappropriate academic practice and any emendations or changes required to address deficiencies in the thesis, must be:
- (a) lodged using the [online reporting form](#); and
 - (b) considered by the committee determining the examination outcome for their consideration.

Note: The committee determining the outcome for the examination will be either the relevant faculty committee or the HDR Examinations Subcommittee of the University Executive Research Committee. See the [Thesis and Examination of Higher Degrees by Research Policy 2015](#) and the [Thesis and Examination of Higher Degrees by Research Procedures 2020](#).

- (10) Any cases referred to the Director of Research Integrity and Ethics Administration will be managed in accordance with the [Research Code of Conduct 2023](#).

- (11) Where the Director of Research Integrity and Ethics Administration determines either to:
- (a) dismiss a matter; or
 - (b) refer it back to the faculty as a code breach but not research misconduct;

the relevant faculty committee will determine the outcome and any consequent action consistently with this clause.

- (12) If the relevant faculty committee declines to examine a thesis, it must:
- (a) report the circumstances and reasons for the decision to the HDR Examinations Subcommittee;



- (b) inform the student in writing of:
 - (i) the reasons for declining to examine the thesis;
 - (ii) any changes necessary to make the thesis acceptable for examination and;
 - (iii) any other actions required to be completed prior to examination.
 - (c) recommend to the Dean that the student be either:
 - (i) permitted to re-enrol in order to complete the necessary actions and changes and resubmit the thesis; or
 - (ii) be asked to show good cause why they should be permitted to re-enrol.
- (13) If the relevant faculty committee declines to examine a thesis, the Dean will decide whether the student will be permitted to re-enrol or show good cause.
- (14) If, during the examination process, there is a determination of any of:
- (a) inappropriate academic practice;
 - (b) code breach; or
 - (c) research misconduct

the committee determining the outcome of the examination must consider the reports of those determinations when forming its conclusion.

Note: See the [Thesis and Examination of Higher Degrees by Research Procedures 2020](#)

- (15) If the committee determining the outcome of examination is the relevant faculty committee, the committee's conclusion must be referred to the HDR Examinations Subcommittee for review.
- (16) All reports by the Associate Dean, postgraduate coordinator, relevant faculty committee, or the Director of Research Integrity and Ethics Administration must be forwarded to the HDR Examinations Subcommittee.
- (17) If the reports of the relevant decision maker or any subsequent decision maker require changes or emendations to address deficiencies in the thesis, these changes or emendations must be included in the emendations or changes required to be addressed under the [Thesis and Examination of Higher Degrees by Research Procedures 2020](#).
- (18) If an examiner of a thesis reports allegations of potential code breach or research misconduct, the relevant faculty committee will refer these matters for consideration, as required by the policies and these procedures.

16 Proof-reading and editing of thesis

Students are permitted to use editors or proof-readers in the preparation of their thesis for submission, as provided in the [Thesis and Examination of Higher Degrees by Research Policy 2015](#) and the [Thesis and Examination of Higher Degrees by Research Procedures 2020](#)

17 Rescissions and replacements

This document replaces the *Academic Honesty Procedures 2016* which is rescinded as from the date of commencement of this document:

SCHEDULE ONE – SUMMARY OF ASSESSMENT TYPES, RISKS AND MITIGATING STRATEGIES

Note: The below table lists common examples of academic integrity risks based on assessment types and suggested mitigation strategies. The list is not exhaustive and additional risks and mitigation strategies should be considered by staff as part of the risk assessment undertaken in accordance the relevant faculty guidelines and clause 6 above.

Assessment category	Assessment type*	Description of Assessment type	Potential Risks	Mitigation Strategies	Risk Rating	Rating After Mitigation
Exam or In-semester test	Final exam	Written exam, written exam with non-written elements, or non-written exam, however administered.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Impersonation • Use of prohibited materials (incl. notes, electronic devices, etc.) • Cheating in the form of collusion or external third party assistance • Sharing of questions and solutions during exam or test 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Identity Check • Online proctoring or in person invigilation • Use similarity detection software (if possible) • Avoid reusing past exam questions (even if confidential) or substantially rewrite questions if re-use is essential • Have a test bank of suitable questions/scenarios to reduce the likelihood of students been given “the same” question / Some randomisation of questions/answers (esp. if synchronous starts) 	High	Medium
	In-semester test	Written exam, written exam with non-written elements, or non-written exam, however administered.		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Minimise use of recall-type and single right answer questions • Require upload of working out/solutions for formula-based questions • Review student performance in exam relative to past tasks 	High	Medium
Skills-based assessment	Placements	Professional experience placement, internship, or site visit.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Impersonation • Student not attending placement • Contract cheating or external assistance for completed report or reflective diary associated with placement 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Visit or Zoom call to placement site, at least once during course of placement • Require a mid-way “check” of the student • Require student to produce ID card to placement site • Include short interview about placement activities (with preceptor if possible) 	Medium	Low

*Assessment type follows those specified within the [Assessment Procedures 2011](#).

Assessment category	Assessment type*	Description of Assessment type	Potential Risks	Mitigation Strategies	Risk Rating	Rating After Mitigation
Skills based assessment	Placements (continued from above)		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Forgery of signature of external educators on assessment reports or competency documents 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> All assessment pieces with educator signature to be duplicated and forward to University for cross check Electronic submission of placement assessment reports Keep a bank of authorized signatures for review Use watermarked documents that allow alterations to be clearly identified 	Medium	Low
	Skills based evaluation	Clinical skills assessment or lab skills assessment.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Falsification of data or results 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Require students to submit results or product before leaving the class 	Medium	Low
	Creative assessments / demonstrations	Performance, recital or jury-assessment performance, or exhibition.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Plagiarism or originality of submission 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Require written submission to accompany task (if suitable) be submitted to similarity detection software 	Low	Low
Submitted work	Assignment	Essay, report, case study, proposal, literature review, portfolio, or design.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Plagiarism or inappropriately attributed content (include reuse or recycling, peer-to-peer collusion) External assistance or outsourcing of work (i.e., contract cheating) Misunderstanding of assessment task 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Use similarity detection software Provide personalised or contextualised questions or topics where possible Implement scaffolded tasks which demonstrate progress on a task or require submission of draft documents Include an oral component with detailed questions Revise or modify assignment questions each iteration 	High	Medium
	Honours thesis or Dissertation	Non-HDR thesis.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Plagiarism or inappropriately attributed content (include reuse or recycling, peer-to-peer collusion) External assistance or outsourcing of work (i.e., contract cheating) 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Use similarity detection software Provide personalised or contextualised questions or topics where possible Implement scaffolded tasks which demonstrate progress on a task or require submission of draft documents 	High	Medium
In-class assessments	Tutorial quiz, small test or online task		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Sharing of questions or answers External assistance or outsourcing of work (i.e., contract cheating) 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> In person invigilation / Quarantine students before/after exam until all students with same questions have finished (if on campus) 	High	Medium

Assessment category	Assessment type*	Description of Assessment type	Potential Risks	Mitigation Strategies	Risk Rating	Rating After Mitigation
				<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Multiple versions or test bank of suitable questions/scenarios to reduce the likelihood of students been given "the same" question. Synchronous start and end times for higher weighted tasks Allow multiple attempts for formative tasks of a low weighting Re-test work in a formal (preferably barrier) exam 		
	Small continuous assessment		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Impersonation 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Identity check (present ID card) Review performance against other assessments 	Medium	Low
	Presentation	Oral presentation.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Impersonation External assistance or outsourcing of work (i.e., contract cheating) 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Identity check (present ID card) Include detailed questions to test student understanding of content 	Medium	Low
	Optional assignment or small test	Includes formative assessments.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Impersonation 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Identity check (present ID card) 	Medium	Low
	Attendance or participation	Requirement to attend lectures, tutorials, laboratory session or other learning experiences	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Impersonation Forgery of attendance records 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Identity check Keep weighting low, ensure content is retested in formal barrier examination 	Medium	Low
Group work	Presentation		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Plagiarism or inappropriately attributed content (include reuse or recycling, peer-to-peer collusion) External assistance or outsourcing of work (i.e., contract cheating) Non or unequal contribution to group submission 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Use similarity detection software Require written submission of presentation content Require declaration of contribution 	High	Medium
	Assignment	Written, non-written elements.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> As above 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> As above 	High	Medium

SCHEDULE TWO - EDUCATIONAL INTEGRITY OF ASSESSMENTS RISK ASSESSMENT MATRIX

		Potential Significance					
		Learning & Teaching Activity with low weighted contribution to final mark. Content can be retested in formal exam	Low weighted assessment e.g. short quiz. Content can be retested in formal exam	Assessment that contributes to a significant proportion of marks (~30%). Content can be retested in formal exam	Major assessment (~50%) but content can be retested in a formal exam or OSCE.	Major assessment e.g. final exam Honours thesis, dissertation, test of essential professional skills. Cannot be further examined.	
		Not Significant	Minor	Moderate	Major	Highly Significant	
Likelihood	Expected to occur regularly	Almost Certain	Medium	High	Very High	Very High	Very High
	Expected to occur	Likely	Medium	High	High	Very High	Very High
	Moderately likely	Possible	Low	Medium	High	High	Very High
	Not likely to occur	Unlikely	Low	Low	Medium	Medium	High
	May happen, but not often	Rare	Low	Low	Low	Low	Medium

NOTES

Academic Integrity Procedures 2022

Date adopted:	15 November 2022
Date commenced:	20 February 2023
Date amended:	16 March 2023 (administrative amendment) 19 April 2023 (administrative amendment) 2 February 2024 (administrative amendment)
Owner:	Deputy Vice-Chancellor (Education)
Review date:	20 February 2028
Rescinded documents:	Academic Honesty Procedures 2016
Related documents:	University of Sydney Act 1989 (as amended) Academic Integrity Policy 2022 University of Sydney (Student Academic Appeals) Rule 2021 University of Sydney (Student Discipline) Rule 2016 Research Code of Conduct 2023 Coursework Policy 2021 Learning and Teaching Policy 2019 Progress Planning and Review of Higher Degree by Research Students Policy 2015 Thesis and Examination of Higher Degrees by Research Policy 2015 Assessment Procedures 2011

AMENDMENT HISTORY

Provision	Amendment	Commencing
3	Insert new definition for 'inappropriate academic practice'	16 March 2023
12(2)	Delete 'Case Management System and the' between 'the' and 'University's Record Management System'	16 March 2023

Provision	Amendment	Commencing
15(7) note; 15(9) note	replace 'Academic Board' with 'University Executive Research Committee'	24 April 2023
1(1); 3; 10(8)(d) note; 14(4); 15(3) note; 15(8)(c); 15(10); related records	Replaced 'Research Code of Conduct 2019' with 'Research Code of Conduct 2023'	2 February 2024