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Academic Misconduct Process Flowchart

Suspected academic misconduct identified by academic staff member → Course Director informed. Course Director conducts initial investigation → ACADEMIC MISCONDUCT SUSPECTED? → NO: No further action required → YES: AS-75 form completed (Section A) by Course Director and given to Academic Head or nominee → Ac. Head checks the Register of Academic Misconduct to see if the AI course has been completed and if there have been prior offences. Ac. Head completes Section B of the AS-75 and decides the severity of offence and the penalty. N.B. if the AI course has been completed the incident is generally not considered inadvertent or naïve.

ACADEMIC MISCONDUCT OFFENCE LIKELY after INITIAL ASSESSMENT? → NO: No further action required → YES: INADVERTENT OR NAÏVE? → DELIBERATE AND NON-NAÏVE

INADVERTENT OR NAÏVE?

MAJOR

MINOR

Student informed of decision and shown all documentation. Asked to complete declaration and sign AS-75. *NB process can continue if student does not respond in a reasonable time when given an opportunity to sign the form.

MINOR

• Verbal warning
• Warning letter
• Marks deducted

MAJOR

• Incident uploaded to Register
• Copy of AS-75 and docs sent through to SASM for entering into RAM and filing

MINOR

• Penalties assigned
• AS-75 sent to Faculty Assoc. Dean (Ac) for approval or DoGS for research exercises worth > 30 pts

MAJOR

• Refer to University Discipline Committee:
  • requires sign off by Associate Dean or DoGS

Outcome communicated to student and staff.

No further action required

Interview with student requested via email. Attendees: course director, student, support person for student (if wanted), one other staff member.

* if >1 student involved, interview separately
* process can continue without interview step if student does not respond to invitation after a reasonable length of time.

Note: A case may be referred back to the academic unit by the DVC(A) or the DoGS, downgrading the offence to ‘MINOR’. The Register must be updated accordingly.
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I. Introduction

This guide provides information for academic and professional staff about aspects of academic integrity and misconduct. Detailed information is set out for the identification and investigation of academic misconduct in coursework, in alignment with the processes set out by the University’s Student Academic Conduct Statute.

This guide also includes information about access to and use of the Register of Academic Misconduct.

II. Academic Misconduct Policy Framework

The University expects all students to complete coursework, examinations and theses with integrity and honesty. The University’s rules related to academic misconduct are set out in the Student Academic Conduct Statute. The Statute covers any dishonest practice occurring in the preparation and submission of work which counts towards the attainment of a pass in any subject.

The Use of Third Party Assistance in Undergraduate and Postgraduate Coursework Guidelines provide guidance to staff and students on the limits of third-party assistance in coursework.

III. Resources available to staff and students

- The University’s Academic Integrity Course – an online tutorial on the principles of academic integrity
- Information for students about academic integrity and the policy framework on the University website
- Information for staff about the Register of Academic Misconduct
- Referencite – an online guide to academic referencing
- Write@uni - a set of online modules designed to help first-year students understand the principles and concepts underpinning academic writing at university
- Libraries and Learning Services workshops and courses
- Academic Misconduct Guide (FMHS)
- Other resources and information on faculty websites or publications
IV. Communicating the principles of academic integrity and preventing academic misconduct

Undergraduate and postgraduate students (including doctoral candidates) enrolling in their first qualification at the University are required to complete the online Academic Integrity Course. The Course sets out the principles of academic integrity and includes information about referencing and good academic practice. Undergraduate students are asked to complete the course by the end of their first semester of study.

Non-completion of the Course results in a DNC on the student’s transcript, and automatic re-enrolment in the course. Students are ineligible to graduate unless the Academic Integrity Course has been completed.

University data show that most students complete the module in their first year. However, completion of the course does not always mean that students fully understand or retain the principles of academic integrity, the various types of academic misconduct, or their responsibilities as members of an academic community. Assessment and academic integrity literacy continues to develop over time.

To help this process, teachers may build upon the foundation provided in the Academic Integrity Course by integrating into their courses discussions or exercises about the values and application of academic integrity.

What can we assume students know?

We can assume that students have been given the opportunity to read or hear information about academic integrity, and access and complete the Academic Integrity Course.

However… students may not have:

- completed the Academic Integrity Course
- fully understood information about academic integrity
- learned how to apply the advice about academic integrity (or referencing) to their coursework
- understood the difference between collaborative peer learning and ‘collusion’
- recognise that online services which offer to help edit student assessment tasks are contract cheating sites.

---

1 The requirement extends to all undergraduate, postgraduate (and doctoral) students unless they have already completed the course. Students enrolled in a Certificate of Proficiency or the University of Auckland Certificate of Foundation Studies are exempt.

2 Content adapted from the University of Wollongong’s Academic and Research Integrity Website
V. As a teacher, what can I do?

Seek to understand the reasons behind academic misconduct, including:

- misunderstanding assessment or referencing requirements;
- poor time management;
- lack of confidence in their own ability;
- not being penalised for previous misconduct;
- not understanding the limits of collaborating with others.

Research suggests that students from non-English backgrounds speaking may face additional pressures or challenges.

Some suggested approaches include:

- Include **discussion or activities** in lectures to ensure shared understanding of academic integrity expectations.

- Provide students with **clear, context-specific definitions and examples** of academic misconduct.

- Enable students to **discuss their attitudes** towards academic misconduct.

- Provide support for students that enables them to **develop skills in studying, academic writing, the use of academic sources, paraphrasing and research**.

- Give **clear guidelines for group work** and make clear the **distinction between group work and individual work**.

- **Model good academic citizenship** for your students.

- Clearly signal the **range of penalties for academic misconduct** in the University’s policy framework.

---

3 ibid.
VI. How can I design assessment to deter academic misconduct?

- Ensure that assessment expectations are communicated clearly to all students.
- Ensure that assessment tasks are not recycled without appropriate modification.
- Implement programmatic approaches to assessment by linking assessment tasks to course and programme outcomes.
- Design scaffolded assessment tasks, so that each task sets up the student for the next task.
- Design assignment tasks that are unique, and include local or personal issues or perspectives.
- Assess the process and the product by requiring that a draft is submitted, with your or peer feedback on the draft to be incorporated and acknowledged in the final version.
- Avoid scheduling high-stakes large assessment tasks at the end of session, when students will be under more pressure. Spread out assessment tasks.
- Ask students to submit an annotated list of references as part of the assignment.
- Include an oral presentation on written assignments.⁴

⁴ These suggestions are adapted from guidance available to staff at the University of Curtin and the University of Wollongong and in JISC 'Supporting Academic Integrity' publication.
Resources close to home...

Turnitin may be used on draft assignment exercises, in tandem with formative feedback. Using the Turnitin reports and formative feedback to demonstrate common citation errors may be a good way to help students learn about avoiding plagiarism.

VII. How do I identify academic misconduct?

Identification of academic misconduct always involves the judgement of a teacher or marker, but there are tools that can help.

A recent large-scale survey of staff in Australia found that academics were able to identify “contract cheating” most frequently through their knowledge of the student’s academic or language ability. Text-matching software was also a frequently cited signal.6

Turnitin

Automated tools such as Turnitin may also be used to help identify misconduct. Turnitin is the plagiarism detection software used by the University of Auckland to signal academic misconduct within student internal assessments. Students submit their assessments online via Turnitin and an originality report is generated. This report highlights potential plagiarism within the assessment and can be viewed by staff.

The originality report highlights any similarities between the student's submitted work and the Turnitin database which includes previously submitted assessments from New Zealand and around the world, journal articles, text books, websites etc. The originality report is not a ‘plagiarism report’. It is an indication of potential sources of plagiarism. Interpretation of any similarities found is required to detect plagiarism (i.e. academic judgement).

Wherever possible course work that involves a written component should be submitted via Turnitin as part of the assessment process. In many programmes this is mandatory.

See the Turnitin guide to interpreting the similarity report:

---

5 i.e. where a student pays for a piece of assessed work to be produced by a third party and then submits it as their own.
VIII. What is the process for identifying and investigating academic misconduct in coursework?

Initial assessment and interview step (coursework)

Suspected academic misconduct
1. A suspected case of academic misconduct may be identified by a teacher or tutor marking student work. The suspected case must be reported to the Course Director and any other appropriate person within your school/department e.g. Academic Director.

2. An initial assessment and interview is organised by the Course Director. Preparation for the interview may involve reviewing the student’s transcript or previous work.

3. The student will be invited to an interview by email (see Interview Invitation email template) and are advised they can bring a support person. For international students or other equity groups (e.g. MAPAS, Tuākana) it may be advisable to notify key staff who may also attend the interview.

4. In cases where more than one student is suspected of academic misconduct (e.g. collaboration or copying), the students should be interviewed separately (and ideally, simultaneously).

Interviewing the student(s)
Note - the process may continue without the interview step, on the condition that the student has not responded to an interview request after a reasonable period of time.

5. One other member of staff must be present at the interview. In some faculties this may be the Student and Academic Services Manager, or the Faculty or academic unit Academic Integrity Officer (or equivalent).

6. The interview does not need to be long. Careful notes should be taken, recording observations and facts (not judgements). Students may ask questions about the process and interviewers should endeavor to answer these questions. Interviewers must not speculate to students about outcomes (i.e. the decision that will be made by the Academic Head).

Completing the initial assessment
7. After the interview the Course Director makes an initial assessment as to whether an offence has occurred, and the type of offence (e.g. inadvertent or naïve; or deliberate and non-naïve).

8. After the interview if it is determined that an academic misconduct offence has likely not occurred, the student will be informed and no further action is required. At this point it may also be appropriate to provide some constructive feedback and suggestions, or direct students to appropriate resources.

Note – a record of the interview should be retained. Where more than one student is suspected, and interviewed in a linked case, but only student has confirmed misconduct, all records must be retained (e.g. in situations where one student copies...
from another, and the academic misconduct is confirmed for the copier, but not for the person whose work was copied).

**If an offence is confirmed (coursework)**

Note - If necessary, in cases where an academic misconduct case has not been completed an NAX (Not Available for Misconduct) holding grade can be entered until the outcome is ascertained. You need to let the Examinations Services Manager know the student name, ID and course.

9. If the Course Director determines it is likely that an offence has occurred, they must refer the case to the Academic Head by completing Section A of the **AS-75 Academic Misconduct: Assessment and Report** form and forwarding the form and any other relevant documentation (e.g. copies of the assessment/s, Turnitin report) to the Head.

10. The Academic Head or nominee will consider the initial assessment and make a determination as to whether an offence has occurred.

11. If confirmed, the Head will also decide the type ('inadvertent or naïve' or 'deliberate and non-naïve'), and level (deliberate and non-naïve MINOR; or deliberate and non-naïve MAJOR) of the offence.

Note - the Academic Head may change the initial assessment of the Course Convenor.

12. If it is determined an offence has been committed the Register of Academic Misconduct should be consulted to determine if the student has completed the AI course, or has prior offences.

Note – if the student has a prior incident recorded on the Register a staff member with 'read’ access is able to view the entire record associated with that incident.

Note – if the student has completed the AI Course, or has a prior offence recorded on the Register it should be the exception that the incident is deemed inadvertent or naïve.

**Inadvertent or naïve offences (coursework)**

13. If the Academic Head has determined the incident to be inadvertent or naïve academic misconduct, the student is informed of the Academic Head’s determination, shown all relevant documentation, and is given an opportunity to make a statement in response (Section C of the AS-75 form).

*Note – the Statute allows for marks to be adjusted if necessary to remove any unfair advantage from the misconduct.*

14. When the student has completed their statement in the form (or, if a reasonable length of time has passed and the student has not responded to this request), the completed AS-75 form and supporting materials must be uploaded to the Register of Academic Misconduct.
**Deliberate and non-naïve offences (coursework)**

15. If the Academic Head has determined the incident to be deliberate and non-naïve academic misconduct, the offence must then be classified as ‘MINOR’ or ‘MAJOR’ misconduct.

**Deliberate and non-naïve MINOR misconduct (coursework)**

16. If the misconduct is classified as ‘minor’, the Academic Head recommends a penalty from the options available in the Statute, and the Associate Dean (Academic) approves the penalty. In approving the penalty the Associate Dean is also confirming that the appropriate process was followed in coming to a decision about the penalty; and that the imposed penalty is appropriate to the offence, taking into account all circumstances.

*Note - If the Associate Dean finds that the appropriate process was not followed he or she may refer the matter back to the Academic Head with a request to correct the process in whatever manner is fairest to the student.*

17. The student is informed of the Academic Head’s determination, shown all relevant documentation, and is given an opportunity to make a statement in response (Section C of the AS-75).

18. When the student has completed their statement in the form (or, if a reasonable length of time has passed and the student has not responded to this request), the completed AS-75 form and supporting materials must be uploaded to the Register of Academic Misconduct.

**Deliberate and non-naïve MAJOR misconduct (coursework)**

If the misconduct is classified as ‘major’, the Academic Head refers the case to the Associate Dean, who will approve referral to the Deputy Vice-Chancellor (Academic) with a recommendation that the matter be heard by the Discipline Committee. This referral is done on a standard memorandum available from the Secretary to Discipline Committee.

19. The student is informed of the determination, shown all relevant documentation, and is given an opportunity to make a statement in response (Section C of the AS-75).

20. When the student has completed their statement in the form (or, if a reasonable length of time has passed and the student has not responded to this request), the completed AS-75 form and supporting materials must be uploaded to the Register of Academic Misconduct.

21. Hard-copies of the form, documentation and referral must be forwarded to the Secretary of Discipline Committee.

22. If the matter is heard by Discipline Committee the Secretary of Discipline Committee will inform the Associate Dean (Academic), Academic Head and student
of the Committee’s decision, and update the Discipline Committee section of the Register.

*Note* - *if the case is referred back to the Academic Head by the DVC(A) the status of the incident is changed from MAJOR to MINOR. This must also be changed in the Register of Academic Misconduct (the Register System Administrator must unlock the record), and the penalty added to the record.*

**IX. What is the process for identifying and investigating academic misconduct in research exercises (> 30 points)?**

1. Suspected academic misconduct is brought to the attention of the primary supervisor. The primary supervisor notifies the Academic Head, who is responsible for conducting the interview.

2. The student will be invited to an interview by email (see Interview Invitation email template) and are advised they can bring a support person. For international students or other equity groups (e.g. MAPAS, Tuākana) it may be advisable to notify key staff who may also attend the interview.

3. In cases where more than one student is suspected of academic misconduct (e.g. collaboration or copying), the students should be interviewed separately (and ideally, simultaneously).

   *Note - the process may continue without the interview step, on the condition that the student has not responded to an interview request after a reasonable period of time.*

4. One other member of staff must be present at the interview. In some faculties this may be the Student and Academic Services Manager, or the Faculty or academic unit Academic Integrity Officer (or equivalent). The student must be invited to bring a support person to attend if they wish.

5. The interview does not need to be lengthy. Careful notes should be taken, recording observations and facts (not judgements). Students may ask questions about the process and staff should endeavor to answer their questions. Interviewers must not speculate to students about outcomes (i.e. the decision that will be made by the Academic Head).

6. After the interview the Academic Head makes a determination as to whether an offence has occurred, and the type of offence (e.g. inadvertent or naïve; or deliberate and non-naïve).

7. After the interview if it is determined that an academic misconduct offence has likely not occurred, the student will be informed, and no further action is required. *Note – a record of the interview should be retained. Where more than one student is suspected, and interviewed in a linked case, but only student has confirmed misconduct, all records must be retained.*
If an offence is confirmed (research exercise > 30 points)

8. The Academic Head (or nominee) will decide the type (‘inadvertent or naïve’ or ‘deliberate and non-naïve’) and level (deliberate and non-naïve MINOR; or deliberate and non-naïve MAJOR) of the offence. The Register or the student’s transcript may be consulted to determine if the student has completed the AI course, or has prior offences.  

Note – if the student has a prior incident recorded on the Register a person with ‘read’ access is able to view the entire record associated with that incident.

Inadvertent or naïve offences (research exercise > 30 points)

9. If the Academic Head has determined the incident to be inadvertent or naïve academic misconduct, the student is informed of the Academic Head’s determination, shown all relevant documentation, and is given an opportunity to make a statement in response (Section C of the AS-75).

10. When the student has completed their statement in the form (or if a reasonable length of time has passed and the student has not responded to this request), the completed AS-75 form and supporting materials must be uploaded to the Register of Academic Misconduct.

11. The matter should be resolved at the level of the academic unit.

Deliberate and non-naïve offences (research exercise > 30 points)

12. If the Academic Head has determined the incident to be deliberate and non-naïve academic misconduct, the offence must then be classified as ‘minor’ or ‘major’ misconduct.

Deliberate and non-naïve MINOR misconduct\(^7\) (research exercise > 30 points)

13. If the misconduct is classified as ‘minor’, the Academic Head determines the penalty from the options available in the Statute, and the Dean of Graduate Studies approves the penalty. In approving the penalty the Dean of Graduate Studies is also confirming that the appropriate process was followed in coming to a decision about the penalty; and that the imposed penalty is appropriate to the offence, taking into account all circumstances.  

Note - If the Dean of Graduate Studies finds that the appropriate process was not followed he or she may refer the matter back to the Academic Head with a request to correct the process in whatever manner is fairest to the student.

14. The student is informed of the determination, shown all relevant documentation, and is given an opportunity to make a statement in response (Section C of the AS-75).

\(^7\) The Statute allows for a deliberate and non-naïve MINOR resolution. However the options available for minor misconduct at this level are not always appropriate and should be considered carefully. Typically, these cases are resolved as inadvertent or naïve, or deliberate and non-naïve MAJOR academic misconduct.
15. When the student has completed their statement in the form (or if a reasonable length of time has passed and the student has not responded to this request), the completed AS-75 form and supporting materials must be uploaded to the Register of Academic Misconduct.

**Deliberate and non-naïve MAJOR misconduct (research exercise > 30 points)**

16. If the misconduct is classified as ‘major’, the Academic Head refers the case to the Dean of Graduate Studies, who will approve referral to the Deputy Vice-Chancellor (Academic) with a recommendation that the matter be heard by the Discipline Committee. This referral is done on a standard memorandum available from the Secretary to Discipline Committee.

17. The student is informed of the Academic Head’s determination, shown all relevant documentation, and is given an opportunity to make a statement in response (Section C of the AS-75).

18. When the student has completed their statement in the form (or if a reasonable length of time has passed and the student has not responded to this request), the completed AS-75 form and supporting materials must be uploaded to the Register of Academic Misconduct.

19. **Hard-copies of the form, documentation and referral must be forwarded to the Secretary of Discipline Committee.**

20. If the matter is heard by Discipline Committee the Secretary of Discipline Committee will inform the Dean of Graduate Studies, Academic Head and student of the Committee’s decision, and update the Discipline Committee section of the Register.

*Note* - *if the case is referred back to the Academic Head by the DVC(A) the status of the incident is changed from MAJOR to MINOR. This must also be changed in the Register of Academic Misconduct (the Register System Administrator must unlock the record), and the penalty added to the record.*

**X. Right of review – decisions and/or penalties at academic unit level**

A student may request the DVC(A) to refer a decision or penalty made or imposed at the academic unit level. Any review request must be made in writing to the University Registrar within one month of the penalty or decision being notified to the student. The appeal may be made on the following grounds:

- there was a failure of the University’s process and/or;
- the basis of the decision was manifestly at odds with the evidence

The decision of Discipline Committee in these cases is final.
XI. The Register of Academic Misconduct (RAM)

The Register of Academic Misconduct (RAM) is the University’s central database used to record cases of academic dishonesty in coursework and examinations.

The Register is used in conjunction with the AS-75 form ("Academic Misconduct: Assessment and Report Form") for coursework cases.

By providing a consolidated record of academic misconduct across coursework and examinations, the Register:

- facilitates identification of repeat misconduct across departments, and across faculties
- enables aggregate trend reporting and analysis (e.g. incidence levels, types of cheating, penalties applied) which can be used internally at the University level, and, if necessary, externally
- provides indirect evidence related to the effectiveness of learning support, and student understanding of academic conventions and cultures.

XII. Access to and use of the Register

A limited number of users per faculty have access to the Register of Academic Misconduct. Student Academic Services and Engagement Managers should approve access requests at the faculty level.

The Academic Quality Office reviews and updates the list of faculty users every year.

Student and Academic Services Managers have primary responsibility for oversight of Register processes in their faculty, and communication of roles and responsibilities.

Each faculty will determine the most efficient way to organise the entry of data into the Register from AS-75 forms, and the support provided for Academic Heads and Associate Deans.
**Notes to the table:**
Changes in the identity of the administrative staff responsible for data entry may be made upon request to the Register System Administrator (email: quality@auckland.ac.nz).

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>User Role Name</th>
<th>Type of User</th>
<th>Activity</th>
<th>Access to Data</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| DATA ENTRY     | Designated members of professional staff in faculty administrative positions – as delegated by Student and Academic Services Managers. | **Incident Records:**  
- Search for records  
- Create incidents  
- Upload documents to OWN incidents (ie, created by the user)  
- Edit OWN incidents  
- Save OWN incident records  
- Submit OWN incident records | User can see:  
All submitted records across all faculties;  
User can edit:  
Only records created by the user |
| READ ONLY      | Associate Dean of Faculty, Academic Heads (as necessary, in some faculties)  
Discipline Committee Chair  
Vice-Chancellor  
Deputy Vice-Chancellor (Academic) or nominee | **Incident Records:**  
- Search for records | User can see:  
All submitted records across all faculties  
User can edit:  
No records |
| SUPERVISOR     | Student Academic Services Manager | **Incident Records:**  
- Search for records  
- Create incidents  
- Upload document/s to ALL incident/s  
- Edit ALL incidents  
- Save incident records  
- Submit completed records | User can see:  
All submitted records across all faculties  
User can edit:  
All records (prior to submission) |
| ADMIN          | Register System Administrator  
(Academic Quality Office)  
[quality@auckland.ac.nz](mailto:quality@auckland.ac.nz)  
Manager, Academic Quality Office  
Discipline Committee Secretary | **Users:**  
- Create new user  
- Maintain user access  
- Inactivate current user  

**Incident Records:**  
- Search for records  
- Unlock submitted records  
- Save records  
- Submit completed records  
- Enter DC information and submit approved records | User can see:  
All submitted incident records  
All user records  
User can edit:  
All records |
Information for DATA ENTRY and SUPERVISOR users

There are four main functions for data entry and supervisor users:

- Log in
- Search incidents
- Create new incidents
- Edit Incidents

Log in
When you log into the Register (using your staff username and password) you will be taken directly to the DATA ENTRY or SUPERVISOR home page.

Search incidents
You can search for a record related to a particular student by entering the student’s ID in the search field (‘student ID’). Any records related to that student will then appear and you can click on the appropriate incident number/s.

If there are no records for that student ID number, the following message will appear:

Register New Incident
To create a new record, click on ‘Register new incident’

This takes you to a screen where you are required to enter the basic information about the student and the type of misconduct incident (working from the AS-75 form).

- Fields marked as * are mandatory (i.e. you will not be able to submit an incident record if they are not completed).

Student Name and ID Number:
- Only 7-digit or 9-digit numbers should be entered. If incorrect, the system will be unable to find the student’s details. The Student’s Legal and Preferred Names will appear if the ID is found in the system. Please check the Student Name to make sure you have the right student.
- Click ‘Save’.

At this point the system will automatically generate a new ‘incident number’ for the record.

As a cross-reference, it is suggested that you record the ‘incident number’ on the paper form.
- Fill in the required fields in Incident Details and upload a copy of the completed paper form. The record will not be able to be ‘submitted’ until an attachment has been uploaded.
- Complete the Initial Investigation section.
- Make sure that all marked fields * are completed. Error messages will appear where information is required but not inserted, and you will be unable to save the record.
- Click ‘Save and Next’ to continue, or ‘Save and exit’ if you want to come back to the record later. The system saves data and directs you to the next section or back to the start page if you select ‘Save and exit’. The ‘Save and next’ button will only become active when all compulsory fields have been completed, and all required signature boxes checked.
- Working from the form, complete the ‘Academic Head’ and ‘Student Declaration’ sections. The ‘Save and next’ and ‘Submit’ buttons will only become active when all compulsory fields have been completed. Make sure that all fields in the sections have been entered correctly, and match what is recorded in the completed paper form.
- Click on the ‘Submit’ button when you have completed the data entry. The incident is entered and will now have the status ‘Submitted’ in the system. You must contact the system administrator if you need the record to be unlocked for any additional changes after this point.

Notes:
- Major offences that have the status ‘Submitted’ on the Register are not automatically referred to Discipline Committee by the system. A hard copy of the AS-75 form and any supporting documentation should be forwarded to the DVC(A). Discipline Committee outcomes will be entered in the Register by the Secretary of Discipline Committee, except where the incident is reclassified as deliberate and minor OR inadvertent or naïve by the Committee.
- Once the incident file is saved and submitted, the incident is locked. If there is a need for access (e.g., for further editing), permission must be sought from the Faculty Associate Dean for the incident to be unlocked. If a request is made for an incident record to be unlocked, the Register System Administrator in the Academic Quality Office will advise the academic unit when this has been done.
- Duplicate entries are blocked from being entered into the Register by a combination of student ID, date of incident and course code.
- In Section A of the form, the incident may be checked as ‘Inadvertent or naïve’ in the initial assessment by the Course Director, but this assessment may be revised by the Academic Head in section B.
Incident files should always be submitted when complete. Files left in ‘editing’ mode for a long period will be reviewed by the Register System Administrator.

Edit incident

When you log in to the Register, you will be able to see all the records currently in your responsibility, and yet to be submitted.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Incident date</th>
<th>Status</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>05/08/2014</td>
<td>Editing</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>04/08/2014</td>
<td>Editing</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>04/04/2014</td>
<td>Editing</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Under status you will see the records in ‘Editing’ mode, which means they have not yet been completed.

Data Entry and Supervisor users can continue working on any of these records.

Supervisor users can search for and edit uncompleted records that were created by another user. Supervisor users can also upload documents to records created by another user. Once a record created by someone else has been accessed by the Supervisor, it will also show up with the status of ‘Editing’ when that person logs in to the Register until such point as the incident information has been completed and submitted.

Change Incident Owner

A department or school may wish to change the staff member who has ‘data-entry’ access to the Register. Please contact the system administrator through planning@auckland.ac.nz to make the change.

Information for CONSULTATION/READ ONLY users

https://www.staff.auckland.ac.nz/students/misconduct/welcome

When you log into the Register you will be taken directly to the READ_ONLY Home.

Search Incident(s)

You can search for a record related to a particular student by entering the student’s ID in the search field. Any records related to that student will then appear and you can click on the appropriate incident number to view details.

At the point that academic misconduct has been confirmed, Academic Heads may consult the Register for evidence of previous offences in order to assist in determining whether an offence is inadvertent or naïve, or deliberate; major or minor. The Register may also be consulted to assist in the determination of the appropriate penalty.
### XIII. Roles and responsibilities

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Role</th>
<th>Responsibilities</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Student</strong></td>
<td>• Completing all coursework, examinations and theses with integrity and honesty.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Completing the University’s Academic Integrity course before the end of their first semester of study.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Academic staff member teaching on a course</strong></td>
<td>• Identifying suspected academic misconduct</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Informing Course Director</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Course Director</strong></td>
<td>• Contacting and interviewing student(s)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Making an initial assessment about whether an offence has occurred</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Completing and signing Section A of the AS-75 and forwarding to Academic Head</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Primary supervisor</strong></td>
<td>• Informing the Academic Head of suspected misconduct</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Academic Head</strong></td>
<td>• FOR COURSEWORK INCIDENTS: Reviewing the initial assessment of the Course Director; consulting the Register (in confirmed cases) to determine whether academic misconduct is inadvertent or naïve; deliberate and non-naïve MINOR; or deliberate and non-naïve MAJOR</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• FOR RESEARCH DISSERTATION AND THESIS INCIDENTS: interviewing students to determine whether academic misconduct has taken place</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• For deliberate and non-naïve MINOR cases: determining the penalty; obtaining the approval of the Associate Dean or Dean of Graduate Studies (as appropriate).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• For MAJOR cases: referring the case to the Associate Dean, who is responsible for approving the case to be referred to the DVC(A).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Completing and signing the relevant section of the AS-75.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Determining the penalty applied to MINOR cases referred back down to the Department or School by the DVC(A). Ensuring that the change of status of offence and penalty are recorded correctly on the Register.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Associate Dean</strong></td>
<td>• Approving the penalties and confirming the process undertaken for deliberate and non-naïve MINOR cases.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Approving the referral to the DVC(A) of MAJOR cases.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Completing and signing the relevant section of the AS-75.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Deputy Vice-Chancellor (Academic)</strong></td>
<td>• Reviewing MAJOR cases of academic misconduct in coursework, and determining whether to refer them to Discipline Committee or back to the academic unit</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Dean of Graduate Studies</strong></td>
<td>• Approving the penalties to be applied and confirming the process undertaken for cases of deliberate and non-naïve MINOR offences in research dissertation or thesis cases worth more than 30 points.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Approving the referral to the DVC(A) of MAJOR cases.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Role</td>
<td>Responsibilities</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>--------------------------------------------</td>
<td>----------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Student Academic Services and Engagement Managers</td>
<td>• Completing and signing the relevant section of the AS-75.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Oversight of the process of data entry (whether it is done by the SASM, or delegated to another role in the faculty)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Point of contact with the Academic Quality Office regarding the Register of Academic Misconduct (including faculty-level approval of requests for access)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Storage of documentation related to academic misconduct, where appropriate</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Source of ‘expert’ information on the use of the Register to staff in their faculty.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Group Services Managers or Coordinators</td>
<td>• Supporting the Academic Head where necessary in consulting the Register for previous offences</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Supporting the Academic Head where necessary in obtaining the approval of the Associate Dean for penalties to be applied in the case of minor offences</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Supporting Academic Head where necessary in data entry for some sections of the Register record</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other Faculty professional staff</td>
<td>• Data entry or information review on the Register, where required by Student Academic Services Managers</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Academic Quality Office</td>
<td>• Reviewing and updating access to the Register of Academic Misconduct</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Reviewing and updating guidance on using the Register of Academic Misconduct</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Triaging and referring to ITS issues with the functioning of the Register</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Answering staff service centre enquiries</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Extracting and analyzing data from the Register to inform an annual report on academic misconduct to Teaching and Learning Quality Committee</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Legal Adviser to the General Counsel</td>
<td>• Liaising with academic units and/or obtaining further information to support the DVC(A) in his or her decision as to whether a major academic misconduct case goes to Discipline Committee</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Secretary to Discipline Committee</td>
<td>• Supporting the Chair of Discipline Committee to establish meeting dates, liaising with students as necessary, taking minutes at committee meetings and reporting the outcome of Discipline Committee decisions to relevant parties</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Completing the Discipline Committee section of the Register</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Discipline Committee</td>
<td>• Responsibility to hear charges against a student brought under the Statute for Student Academic Conduct. Power to act with respect to the relevant provisions of Statute.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Reporting annually to Senate</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Reviewing decisions and/or penalties imposed at the level of the academic unit (where requested under the process set out in the Statute).</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
XIV. Definitions

**Academic integrity** means the ethical practices of the academic community, including honest execution of research and study and the acknowledgement of sources.

**Academic misconduct** includes dishonest or inappropriate practices occurring in the preparation and submission of coursework and work produced in the preparation of dissertations, theses or other products of research.

**Contract cheating** means work produced by an external agent or third-party and submitted as the student’s work. In many cases a student commissions or seeks to commission a paid service to produce this work.

‘**Essay mill**’ is a term given to businesses that may be contracted to write a piece of work on a student’s behalf (which is academic misconduct).

**Plagiarism** means using the work of others without explicit acknowledgement and referencing.

**Third parties** are people asked for help, other than lecturers or tutors. Third parties may be fellow students, reading groups, friends, parents, Libraries and Learning Services, or professional editing services.

**Unauthorised collaboration** or collusion is inappropriate collaboration by two or more students in the production and submission of assessment tasks.
XV. FAQs

Once an academic misconduct offence has been confirmed, can I check to see if a student has had a prior offence?
Yes. The Register MAY NOT be consulted to confirm whether an offence has occurred. However, the Register may be used to check if a student has had a prior inadvertent or naïve, or deliberate academic misconduct offence.

Should all incidents be recorded in the Register, even those resolved at the level of the Academic Unit?
Yes. It is important that all confirmed cases of academic misconduct (including inadvertent or naïve) be recorded on the Register. Academic Heads should take responsibility for reminding academic staff to report all confirmed cases.

The Register records whether a student has completed the University’s Academic Integrity course. How does that affect a decision to categorise an incident as inadvertent or naïve, or deliberate and non-naïve?
If a student has completed the Academic Integrity course, this may suggest that the student cannot plead naiveté. However, this judgement must be made by the Academic Head on a case-by-case basis. The Academic Integrity Course is now compulsory for all students starting a new programme. However, it is possible that students could be involved in an academic misconduct case without having completed the Academic Integrity course.

The Register now records exams offences. If, as Academic Head, I consult the Register to determine whether a coursework offence is major and minor and the student concerned had received a written warning for an 'inconclusive’ examinations offence, how should this be interpreted?
Relevance of previous incidents is a decision for the Academic Head. Exams offences cannot be directly compared to previous coursework offences but can inform the Academic Head’s judgement.

When offences are referred back to the Academic Head from the DVC(A) are they considered ‘major’ or ‘minor’?
They are considered to be minor offences and the record on the Register should be amended by the Academic Head to reflect the change in status of the offence and to add any penalty that is to be applied.

How long will information be retained on the Register?
Register of Academic Misconduct files are part of the student record, and as such may be kept by the University indefinitely.

What is a ‘reasonable length of time’ to wait for student response to an invitation to attend an interview?
‘Reasonable’ means reasonable given all known circumstances. For example, a student may be overseas or not able to be contacted for some reason. This is left to the judgement of the academic staff involved.
How do I obtain technical assistance?
Technical assistance is available through the Staff Service Centre.
staffservice@auckland.ac.nz
ext 86000
APPENDIX: template email invitation to student to attend interview

Dear << student name >>

Re: << Assignment or course work the incident relates to >>

It has come to my attention that there may be a potential academic misconduct issue with your << assignment/course work details >> for << course name and number >>.

I would like to make a time to meet with you in person to discuss this matter. Also in attendance at the meeting will be [.....]. You are welcome to bring a support person to the meeting.

Our availability for a meeting in the next week is:
<< insert days of the week and times of day >>.

Please indicate by return email which of these you can attend. The University’s Statute for Student Academic Misconduct may be accessed here.

Regards,

<< your name >>

Course Director << course name and number >>