Detail: Adequate but not excessive detail is provided in relation to reporting, recording, confidentiality and the appeals process.

The policy provides a detailed description of a range of academic integrity breaches and explains those breaches using easy to understand classifications or levels of severity.

Example: The University of Western Australia’s “Academic Conduct: Ethical Scholarship, Academic Literacy and Academic Misconduct” outlines proposed levels of academic misconduct with examples.

**The University of Western Australia**

4 Proposed Levels of Academic Misconduct

Academic misconduct at UWA, for both undergraduate and postgraduate students, must be defined according to a system of three levels, as follows:

4.1 Level 1: Minor Academic Misconduct

4.1.1 Instances of academic misconduct are deemed MINOR where the misconduct may be reasonably judged to result from careless practices and/or neglect of specific guidelines relating to assessment requirements by students, whose outcome compromises the purpose of an assessment to a limited extent only.

4.1.2 Misconduct does not include relatively trivial breaches by an entry level student in their first 24 points of study in a course, which in the opinion of the relevant unit coordinator may routinely occur in the course of learning the techniques, methodologies and presentation conventions within an area or discipline.

4.1.3 Instances of Level 1 minor academic misconduct may arise most often, although not exclusively, in relation to first year undergraduate student assessment items. Examples of minor academic misconduct may include but are not limited to:

(i) minor plagiarism (refer Section 6) such as inadequate or inconsistent referencing, paraphrasing too close to the original;

(ii) minor copying of material, such as copying one or two sentences including copying where a student utilises a verbatim transcription in their notes and presents it as their own words;

(iii) copying of answers to questions at the end of laboratory practicals.

4.2 Level 2: Moderate Academic Misconduct

4.2.1 Instances of academic misconduct are deemed MODERATE where the misconduct may be reasonably judged to be a moderate breach of ethical scholarship and includes (but is not limited to):

(i) moderate plagiarism (refer Section 6), in an assessment item other than a thesis or dissertation;
(ii) recycling an item of assessment from one unit and re-submitting it in complete or substantial form for another assessment;

(iii) fabricating or falsifying data, experimental results or sources of information in an assessment item other than a thesis or dissertation;

(iv) colluding with another student about assessable work and representing that as individual work when such collusion has not been specified as acceptable within unit outlines or other assessment requirements.

4.3 Level 3: Major Academic Misconduct

4.3.1 Instances of academic misconduct are deemed MAJOR where the misconduct may be reasonably judged to be a serious and substantial breach of ethical scholarship and includes (but is not limited to):

(i) cheating in examinations, including:

(a) bringing in and/or referring to unauthorised material in an examination, including (but not limited to) written notes, formulae or other prompts whether stored on or within some object or device, or on paper or on the student’s body;

(b) communicating (or attempting to communicate) in an unauthorised manner with others during examinations (whether by speaking or other means);

(c) reading (or attempting to read) the work of other examinees during the exam;

(d) engaging in or agreeing to any act of imposture whereby an enrolled examinee’s examination is undertaken by another who assumes their identity.

(ii) Major plagiarism (refer Section 6), particularly in a thesis or dissertation;

(iii) Fabricating or falsifying data, experimental results or sources of information in a thesis or dissertation
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