

Academic Misconduct Policy - Higher Degree Research Candidates

Approving authority	University Council
Approval date	8 April 2019 (revised)
Advisor	Registrar Student Life registrar@griffith.edu.au (07) 373 57334
Next scheduled review	2024
Document URL	http://policies.griffith.edu.au/pdf/Academic Misconduct Policy - Higher Degree Research Candidates.pdf
Document number	2020/2001086
Description	This policy outlines the core values of academic integrity (honesty, trust, fairness, respect and responsibility) and identifies conduct that is contrary to these standards, and defines that conduct as "academic misconduct". This policy sets out the principles and procedures for dealing with academic misconduct in relation to candidates enrolled in the research component of HDR programs.

Related documents

[Assessment Policy](#)

[Assessment Procedure for Staff](#)

[Assessment Procedure for Students](#)

[The Responsible Conduct of Research](#)

[Griffith University Research Ethics Manual Booklet 07](#)

[Griffith University Animal Ethics Manual Booklet 01](#)

[Griffith University Academic Staff Enterprise Agreement](#)

[Griffith University Professional and Support Staff Enterprise Agreement](#)

[Code of Practice for the Supervision of Higher Degree Research Candidates](#)

[Student Review and Appeals Policy](#)

[Student Review and Appeals Procedures](#)

[Staff Guidelines on Decision-Making in Student Cases](#)

[Review of Decision Form](#)

[Academic Transcripts](#)

[Student Misconduct Policy](#)

[Student Communication Policy](#)

[Student Communication Policy Schedule A: SMS for Current Students Guidelines](#)

[Student Charter](#)

[Institutional Framework for Promoting Academic Integrity Among Students](#)

Related external codes and guidelines

[Australian Code for the Responsible Conduct of Research \(2018\)](#)

[Guide to Managing and Investigating Potential Breaches of the Australian Code for the Responsible Conduct of Research \(2018\)](#)

[Guidelines for Editing Research Theses \(ACGR and the Institute of Professional Editors \(IPEd\)\)](#)

[\[Scope\]](#) [\[Definitions\]](#) [\[HDR Candidate Academic Integrity\]](#) [\[HDR Candidate Academic Misconduct\]](#)
[\[Procedures\]](#) [\[Outcomes\]](#) [\[Confidentiality and Procedural Fairness\]](#)

1. SCOPE

This *Academic Misconduct Policy – Higher Degree Research Candidates* sets out the principles and procedures for dealing with academic misconduct by higher degree by research (HDR) candidates in the research component of a higher degree by research program. This policy also applies to candidates enrolled in the PhD by Prior Publication program. Academic misconduct in the research component includes doing as well as attempting to do any activity consistent with the definitions in [Section 4](#) in proposing, carrying out or reporting the results of the research during any stage of candidature, including draft work submitted for review, milestone documents or the thesis in draft or final form.

This policy is informed by Griffith University's *The Responsible Conduct of Research policy*. Where an allegation of misconduct is investigated according to the procedures as outlined in this academic misconduct policy, the procedure for consideration of an allegation of a breach or research misconduct as referred to in section 8 of *The Responsible Conduct of Research policy* need not proceed.

When a HDR candidate is also a staff member an allegation may constitute misconduct or serious misconduct as defined in *Griffith University Academic Staff Enterprise Agreement* and the *Griffith University Professional and Support Staff Enterprise Agreement*, and the allegation may be managed in accordance with the provisions in the relevant agreement.

The principles and procedures for dealing with academic misconduct in relation to the coursework component of a higher degree by research program are set out in the *Student Academic Misconduct Policy*.

This policy does not apply to the behaviour and conduct of HDR candidates that are construed as misconduct, as defined in the *Student Misconduct Policy*. In such cases the procedures for dealing with student misconduct are set out in the *Student Misconduct Procedures*.

2. DEFINITIONS

Academic Misconduct is defined in [section 4.0](#).

Components of a qualification refer to units of academic work or courses, the completion of which leads to an AQF qualification.

Coursework is a method of teaching and learning that leads to the acquisition of skills and knowledge that does not include a major research component. For the purpose of this policy, the inclusion of coursework in a program is also referred to as the Coursework Component or Structured Learning.

Educational Response is an outcome to a finding of academic misconduct that is imposed on a candidate to address the misconduct and to rectify the situation.

Exclusion from the University is when the University terminates a candidate's enrolment on disciplinary grounds. A candidate who is excluded from the University may not be readmitted to their program, or any other program, except by permission of the Senior Deputy Vice Chancellor.

Higher Degree by Research (HDR) refers to a Research Masters or Research Doctorate where a;

- Research Masters means a Level 9 qualification as described in the AQF and where a minimum of two-thirds of the program of learning is for research, research training and independent study;
- Research Doctorate means a Level 10 qualification as described in the AQF and where a minimum of two years of the program of learning, and typically two-thirds of the qualification, is research.

Penalty is an outcome to a finding of academic misconduct where the seriousness of the misconduct warrants or requires that a penalty be imposed. A candidate may appeal a decision of a penalty under the provisions of the *Student Review and Appeals Procedures*.

Prima Facie Case is a case that appears to be self-evident, where sufficient supporting evidence exists to support the case.

Research comprises *systematic experimental and theoretical work, application and/or development that results in an increase in the dimensions of knowledge, culminating in a thesis, dissertation, exegesis or equivalent that is formally examined*. The term **research** includes original, exploratory,

experimental, applied, clinically or work-based and other forms of creative work undertaken systematically to increase knowledge and understanding, deploying a range of research principles and methodologies. Research is specified in the AQF learning outcomes for the Masters Degree (Research) and Doctoral Degree. The inclusion of research in a program is also referred to as the *Research Component* or *Research Outcome*.

Termination of candidature is where a candidate's enrolment in a HDR program is terminated, Readmission to the HDR program, or another HDR program, cannot be sought for a defined period and will require approval of the Dean, Griffith Graduate Research School. Refer to the *Higher Degree Research Policy*.

3. HDR CANDIDATE ACADEMIC INTEGRITY

As research trainees, higher degree by research (HDR) candidates are subject to the standards of academic and research conduct set out in the *Australian Code for the Responsible Conduct of Research (2018)* (*Australian Code 2018*) and supported by Griffith University's *Responsible Conduct of Research* policy. It is important for candidates to follow the principles of research conduct set out in the *Australian Code 2018* and to be aware of how the Code informs the core values of academic integrity in the context of higher degrees by research. The responsibility of candidates to become familiar with, and abide by, policies pertaining to their higher degree research program are set out in the *Code of Practice for the Supervision of HDR Candidates*.

HDR candidate academic integrity means acting with the values of honesty, trust, fairness, respect and responsibility in learning and in the conduct of research.

The core values of academic integrity, which are honesty, trust, fairness, respect and responsibility, lie at the heart of all the University's activities.

Academic integrity is important because, without its core values, true academic discourse becomes impossible, the value of the research is undermined, learning is distorted and the evaluation of candidate's progress and academic quality is seriously compromised. Consequently, the University is committed to:

- defending the academic credibility and reputation of the University;
- protecting candidate achievement standards and the standards of its awards;
- ensuring that candidates receive due credit for their work;
- protecting the interests of those candidates who conduct their research responsibly and ethically;
- advising its candidates of the need for academic integrity, and providing them with guidance on best practice in the design, conduct and reporting of research; and
- educating candidates about what is intellectual property, why it matters, how to protect their own, and how to legitimately access other people's work,

The University discharges this commitment by focusing on preventing academic misconduct by HDR candidates. Prevention of misconduct takes many forms including the education of candidates, the professional development of staff, and the ongoing development of procedures to detect academic misconduct and to deal appropriately and fairly with those found guilty of it.

4. DEFINITION OF HDR CANDIDATE ACADEMIC MISCONDUCT

HDR candidate academic misconduct encompasses all behaviour:

- involving the misrepresentation of academic and/or research achievement; or
- undermining the core values (honesty, trust, fairness, respect and responsibility) of academic integrity; or
- breaching academic integrity;

This does not include the behaviour and conduct of HDR candidates that are construed as student misconduct, as defined in the *Student Misconduct Policy*.

Whether intentional or unintentional, HDR candidate academic misconduct includes doing, as well as attempting to do, any of the acts or omissions as described in this section. However, there are some matters that fall under the definition of academic misconduct within this policy that may be rectified at the local level and resolved prior to the need to follow the procedures set out in [section 5](#), for example, where there is a genuine error that is minor in nature, such as a minor referencing error or an honest error in the interpretation of research results. It is an expectation that HDR supervisors will provide constructive and detailed feedback on a candidate's work and correct any minor errors throughout their candidature.

HDR candidate academic misconduct comprises:

- 4.1** Any behaviours that constitute a breach of the *Australian Code (2018)*, as set out in section 2.1 of the *Guide to Managing and Investigating Potential Breaches of the Australian Code for the Responsible Conduct of Research* (the '*Investigation Guide*'). These behaviours include, but are not limited to:
- 4.1.1 **Fabrication:** the intentional act of making up data or results and recording or reporting them.
 - 4.1.2 **Falsification:** manipulating research material, equipment or processes, or changing or omitting/suppressing data or results without scientific or statistical justification, such that the research is not accurately represented in the research record. This would include the 'misrepresentation of uncertainty' during statistical analysis of the data. plagiarism or deception in proposing, carrying out or reporting the results of research.
 - 4.1.3 **Plagiarism:** when the work of another is represented, intentionally or unintentionally, as one's own original work, without appropriate acknowledgement of the author or the source. As a conscious, premeditated form of academic misconduct, intentional plagiarism is a particularly serious breach of the core values of academic integrity and one of the worst forms of fraudulent academic behaviour. It is acknowledged that plagiarism can occur unintentionally (for example, as a result of a lack of familiarity with the requirements of academic writing). However, the University's expectation is that HDR candidates – through their previous experience in tertiary research as well as the compulsory induction requirements of the HDR program – will be familiar with the definition of plagiarism as it relates to research activity. This category of academic misconduct includes but is not limited to the following:
 - 1) paraphrasing a paper from a source text, whether in manuscript, printed or electronic form, without appropriate acknowledgement;
 - 2) word for word copying, cutting or pasting statements from a single source or multiple sources or piecing together work of others and representing them as original work;
 - 3) copying ideas, concepts, research data, images, sounds or text.
 - 4.1.4 **Breach of ethical standards:** such as conducting research without the required ethical clearance or failing to comply with the terms of a project's ethical clearance.
- 4.2** HDR academic misconduct also includes:
- 4.2.1 Solicitation, when a candidate requests, offers, encourages, induces or advertises for another individual/student to contract, commission, pay, procure, or complete on their behalf research activities (including for example the drafting of thesis chapters and milestone documents), that are likely to result in their use for the purpose of misrepresentation and/or plagiarism.

Care must be taken by candidates who engage the services of a professional editor in preparing the thesis for submission that the editorial intervention provided is restricted to copyediting and proofreading as per the Guidelines for Editing Research Theses published by Institute of Professional Editors (IPEd) and approved by the Australian Council of Graduate Research (ACGR).
 - 4.2.2 A breach of the examination procedures, such as contacting an examiner.
 - 4.2.3 Attempting to inappropriately influence a peer review process,
 - 4.2.4 A candidate who willingly conceals or assists the academic misconduct of another.

The University pursues cases of academic misconduct seriously and ensures any findings of academic misconduct are dealt with through appropriate educational responses and/or penalties.

5. PROCEDURES

5.1 Principles

A decision about the consequences to be imposed on a HDR candidate as a result of having a case of academic misconduct found against him/her needs to take account of the following considerations, balanced with any mitigating circumstances which may have a bearing on the decision:

- the intent of the candidate;
- the seriousness of the academic misconduct including the type and extent of misconduct engaged in by the candidate as well as its impact on others (refer [section 5.2](#));
- the candidate's explanation of the situation;
- the extent of the affected work and its importance in the context of the research project;
- the stage of the candidate in their program; and
- the extent of the candidate's knowledge of the concept of academic misconduct (experience of the candidate).

5.2 Seriousness of HDR Candidate Academic Misconduct

For the purpose of this policy, cases of academic misconduct are classified as either less serious or more serious. The distinction between less serious and more serious HDR academic misconduct are broadly defined below. As the distinction is not sharp, the decision maker should take into account the educational response or penalty that might need to be applied for a particular case to assist in determining the seriousness of the academic misconduct.

5.2.1 Less serious HDR academic misconduct may be:

- minor or unintentional; and/or
- due to poor judgment or inexperience; and/or
- a first offence, that is limited in its extent; and/or
- where there are no serious consequences arising from the misconduct; and/or
- where remedial action can easily be taken by the candidate to rectify the situation.

This may include, for example, a draft thesis chapter where a small section paraphrases the work of another without appropriate acknowledgement.

For less serious misconduct the University may impose an Educational Response (refer to [section 6.1](#)).

5.2.2 More serious HDR academic misconduct may be:

- deliberate with an intent to deceive; and/or
- where the misconduct is considered extensive; and/or
- where it is not a first offence; and/or
- where there are serious consequences arising from the misconduct such as adverse effects on research participants.

This may include, for example, conducting research without the required ethics clearance; claiming results when none have been obtained; incorrectly interpreting research data resulting in research that is not accurately represented in a thesis that has been submitted for examination; or extensive word-for-word copying of another person's work without appropriate acknowledgement.

For more serious misconduct the University may impose an Educational Response or a Penalty (refer to sections [6.2](#) and [6.3](#)). Where there is evidence of a clear intent to

deceive and the involvement in academic misconduct is considered extensive and serious, any penalty as detailed in the [Penalties section](#) may be applied to a first offence.

5.2.3 Intent is assessed by the decision maker after investigation in which the candidate has been given the opportunity to respond to an allegation of academic misconduct. Intent is determined on the basis of the evidence that is available to the decision maker. The decision maker will determine whether, on the balance of probabilities the candidate has acted intentionally or whether the candidate's academic misconduct is the result of ignorance, inadvertence or lack of attention.

5.2.4 The seriousness of the consequence is assessed by the decision maker after considering the likely affect/s of the candidate's academic misconduct on other candidates, research participants, animals or the environment, and/or the University community and its institutional culture of academic integrity.

5.3 Making an Allegation of Academic Misconduct

A staff member or student who has reason to believe that a HDR Candidate has engaged in some form of academic misconduct should refer the matter in writing to the Dean (Research) of the candidate's academic Group in a timely manner.

The University has appointed a network of experienced researchers to act as Research Integrity Advisers (refer to section 7 of the *The Responsible Conduct of Research policy*) who are able to provide advice to staff and students regarding the responsible conduct of research.

If a member of the thesis examination panel, or any other person external to the University, makes an allegation of academic misconduct, the allegation will be referred to the Dean, Griffith Graduate Research School, refer [section 5.5](#).

5.3.1 Alleged breaches of ethical standards

Where there is a complaint made or expression of concern raised regarding the ethical conduct of human research, the matter should be referred immediately to the Manager, Research Ethics and Integrity as per the process detailed in the Griffith University Research Ethics Manual Booklet 07. The Manager, Research Ethics and Integrity will determine whether the matter should be handled as a formal complaint and subject to investigation, or whether it is possible to resolve the matter informally. In the case of escalation to a formal investigation, findings of research misconduct and associated outcomes will be reported to the Dean, Griffith Graduate Research School via the Deputy Vice Chancellor (Research). The Dean, Griffith Graduate Research School may also impose one or more educational responses and/or penalties on the candidate as set out in [section 6](#).

Where there is a complaint made or expression of concern raised regarding the ethical conduct of animal research, the matter should be referred immediately to the Animal Ethics Committee (AEC) Secretary as per the process detailed in the Griffith University Animal Ethics Manual Booklet 01. The AEC Secretary will determine whether the matter should be handled as a formal complaint and subject to investigation, or whether it is possible to resolve the matter informally. In the case of escalation to a formal investigation, findings of research misconduct and associated outcomes will be reported to the Dean, Griffith Graduate Research School via the Deputy Vice Chancellor (Research). The Dean, Griffith Graduate Research School may also impose one or more educational responses and/or penalties on the candidate as set out in [section 6](#).

5.4 Dealing with an Allegation of Academic Misconduct – Dean (Research) Investigation and Findings

5.4.1 Investigation

On receiving an allegation of academic misconduct in relation to a candidate the Dean (Research) will conduct a preliminary investigation to determine if the concern appears to be justified and whether a prima facie case exists. The Dean, (Research) may seek evidence concerning the matter from other sources. Where there is an allegation regarding the ethical conduct of human research or animal research, the Dean (Research) will consult with the Manager, Research Ethics and Integrity or the Animal Ethics Committee (AEC) Secretary.

The Dean (Research) shall advise the candidate of the allegation, in writing, including a description of the grounds for the allegation, a copy of all the evidence relevant to the

matter, and copies of relevant codes, policies and procedures. The candidate will be provided with an opportunity to respond to the allegation of academic misconduct. The response must be received within ten working days of the receipt of notification of the allegation.

The Dean (Research) may request the candidate to attend an interview to discuss the allegation of academic misconduct. The candidate may be accompanied by a support person who is not a legal representative or a currently practicing solicitor or barrister. The Dean (Research) may include (but is not obliged) in the meeting: the supervisory team and/or the HDR Convenor of the candidate's host Element. The Dean (Research) is to make a record of the conversation with the candidate. The Dean (Research) may have another staff member present at the interview for the purpose of producing a draft of the record.

5.4.2 Findings

Having considered the allegation of academic misconduct in the light of the available documentary evidence, the candidate's response and/or the interview record (if held) the Dean (Research) may:

- determine that the candidate has not engaged in academic misconduct and take no further action. The Dean (Research) will inform the candidate in writing that the allegation has been dismissed; or
- determine that the candidate has engaged in less serious academic misconduct (as defined in [section 5.2](#)) and, taking into account the principles as set out in [section 5.1](#), decide on one or more educational responses set out in [section 6](#). The Dean (Research) will inform the candidate of the decision in writing, including reasons for the decision and the educational response to the finding of academic misconduct; or
- determine that the candidate has engaged in more serious academic misconduct (as defined in [section 5.2](#)) and refer the allegation to the Dean, Griffith Graduate Research School by setting out in writing the nature of the alleged misconduct and the evidence in support of the charge.

5.4.3 There is normally a four week (20 working days) timeframe to complete the investigation, from the date of receipt of an allegation of academic misconduct by the Dean (Research) to the date of notification of the findings to the candidate.

5.5 Dealing with an Allegation of Academic Misconduct – Dean, Griffith Graduate Research School Investigation and Findings

5.5.1 Investigation

On receiving an allegation of academic misconduct in relation to a candidate, the Dean, Griffith Graduate Research School will conduct an investigation and may seek evidence concerning the matter from other sources. Where there is an allegation regarding the ethical conduct of human research or animal research, the Dean, Griffith Graduate Research School will consult with the Manager, Research Ethics and Integrity or the Animal Ethics Committee (AEC) Secretary.

The Dean, Griffith Graduate Research School shall advise the candidate of the allegation, including a description of the grounds for the allegation of serious misconduct (as defined in [section 5.2](#)) from the Dean (Research), a copy of all the evidence relevant to the matter, and copies of relevant codes, policies and procedures.

In the case of an allegation of academic misconduct being made by an examiner, the Dean, Griffith Graduate Research School may also request that the examination panel cease examination pending the outcome of the allegation. The candidate shall be advised that the examination process has been suspended whilst the complaint is investigated.

The candidate will be provided with an opportunity to respond to the allegation of academic misconduct. The response must be received within ten working days of the receipt of notification of the allegation.

The Dean, Griffith Graduate Research School may request the candidate to attend an interview to discuss the concern of academic misconduct. The candidate may be

accompanied by a support person who is not a legal representative or a currently practicing solicitor or barrister. The Dean, Griffith Graduate Research School is to make a record of the conversation with the candidate. The Dean, Griffith Graduate Research School may have another staff member present at the interview for the purpose of producing a draft of the record.

5.5.2 Findings

Having considered the concern of academic misconduct in the light of the available documentary evidence, the candidate's response and/or the interview record (if held) the Dean, Griffith Graduate Research School may:

- determine that the candidate has not engaged in academic misconduct and take no further action. The Dean, Griffith Graduate Research School will inform the candidate in writing that the allegation has been dismissed; or
- determine that the candidate has engaged in less serious academic misconduct (as defined in [section 5.2](#)) and, taking into account the principles as set out in [section 5.1](#), decide on one or more educational responses set out in [section 6](#). The Dean, Griffith Graduate Research School will inform the candidate of the decision in writing, including reasons for the decision and the educational response to the finding of academic misconduct; or
- determine that the candidate has engaged in more serious academic misconduct (as defined in [section 5.2](#)) and, taking into account the principles as set out in [section 5.1](#), decide on one or more educational responses and/or penalties as set out in [section 6](#). The Dean, Griffith Graduate Research School will inform the candidate of the decision in writing, including reasons for the decision and the educational response and/or penalty to the finding of academic misconduct; or
- where further investigation is needed to establish the facts of the case, the Dean, Griffith Graduate Research School may refer the matter to the Manager, Research Ethics and Integrity for the purpose of a formal hearing. Further investigation will normally be required where the alleged misconduct is so substantial and serious that it is not possible or appropriate for the allegation to be resolved by the Dean, Griffith Graduate Research School

5.5.3 Where an educational response is imposed by the Dean, Griffith Graduate Research School, the matter will be referred to the relevant Group Dean (Research) to implement the educational response and to ensure appropriate steps are taken to prevent recurrence of the misconduct.

5.5.4 There is normally a four week (20 working days) timeframe to complete the investigation, from the date of receipt of an allegation of academic misconduct by the Dean, Griffith Graduate Research School to the date of notification of the findings to the candidate.

5.6 Dealing with Additional Allegations of Academic Misconduct

During the courses of consideration of an allegation of academic misconduct, if an additional allegation is received, it shall be dealt with independently and fully in terms of [paragraph 5.3](#) above.

5.7 Dealing with Academic Misconduct as an Emergency

Notwithstanding the process outlined in [5.3](#) - [5.5](#) information may be received about the alleged misconduct of a HDR candidate, and a view may be formed that there are reasonable grounds that:

- people, including the community, other students, University staff, professionals and other colleagues may be at risk; or
- the actions of the candidate are of such seriousness as to present a risk to the reputation of the University.

In these circumstances, a staff member may assume the role of Emergency Action Decision Maker, and may:

- Where reasonably possible, notify and receive advice from the Dean (Research); and

- Recommend that a candidate be immediately removed from further conduct of the research.
 - Take all reasonable steps to ensure that the candidate is immediately removed from the research setting and ongoing access to the research location is restricted.
-

6. OUTCOMES

6.1 Educational Responses – Less Serious HDR Academic Misconduct

On determination that less serious academic misconduct has taken place, the educational response which may be imposed on the candidate is one or more of the following:

- a) Provide the candidate with a warning together with advice about what is acceptable academic conduct.
- b) Instruct the candidate to undertake any remedial action to rectify the situation. This may include the need to revise the research work.
- c) Instruct the candidate to undertake additional training or counselling to prevent further occurrences.

6.2 Educational Responses – More Serious HDR Academic Misconduct

On determination that more serious academic misconduct has taken place, the educational response which may be imposed on the candidate is one or more of the following:

- a) Rectify the situation by redoing or revising, and resubmitting the research work, or carrying out the research. This may include the need for additional data collection.
- b) If an allegation of academic misconduct is upheld against a candidate who has submitted a thesis for examination, the candidate will be required to revise and resubmit the thesis.
- c) Another educational response appropriate to the case.

6.3 Penalties

On determination that more serious academic misconduct has taken place, the penalty which may be imposed on the candidate is one or more of the following:

- a) If an allegation of academic misconduct is upheld against a candidate who has submitted a thesis for examination, a fail result shall be recorded,
- b) Suspension or termination of a University scholarship.
- c) Restrict the candidate's access to specified research facilities for a specified period.
- d) Termination of candidature.
- e) Exclusion from the University.

Where a candidate has been found guilty of academic misconduct on more than one occasion and has previously been penalised, the penalty shall normally be exclusion from the University unless in the opinion of the Dean, Griffith Graduate Research School there are mitigating circumstances.

6.4 Recording of Penalty

The fact that the University has imposed a Penalty, based on a finding of academic misconduct, shall not be recorded on a candidate's academic transcript, with the exception of the penalties of termination of candidature and exclusion from the University.

Where a penalty of exclusion, as provided for in the [Penalties section](#), is applied, the Dean, Griffith Graduate Research School shall advise the Registrar for the purpose of recording the decision on the candidate's academic record. The academic record will bear the annotation "excluded from the University on (date) for disciplinary reasons".

A penalty of exclusion under this policy is to be recorded on the candidate's Official Academic Transcript for a period of 10 years after the candidate has been excluded unless a candidate is re-admitted by the Senior Deputy Vice Chancellor or successfully applies to the Senior Deputy

Vice Chancellor to have the noting removed. Additional information is provided in the *Academic Transcript* policy.

Where a penalty of termination of candidature, as provided for in the [Penalties section](#), is applied, a record of candidature having been terminated will be retained on the Student System in perpetuity and a noting of 'Candidature Terminated on (date)' will be recorded on the candidates Unofficial Academic Transcript for a period of five years from the date of termination. Additional information is provided in the *Higher Degree Research Policy*.

6.5 Review and Appeal

Where any penalty for academic misconduct is imposed as provided for in [Penalties section](#), a candidate may seek a review of the decision under the provisions of the *Student Review and Appeals Policy* and *Student Review and Appeals Procedures*.

The candidate shall be informed of the right to review and of appeal in the correspondence advising of the imposition of a penalty.

7. CONFIDENTIALITY AND PROCEDURAL FAIRNESS

7.1 Confidentiality

All documentation relating to HDR candidate academic misconduct is kept confidential and only disclosed to those persons who have a role in the HDR Candidate Academic Misconduct Process, or as required by law.

Where it is determined that a candidate has engaged in academic misconduct, all documentation relating to the matter will be placed on the candidate's central file as a confidential record.

7.2 Procedural Fairness

The University's Academic Misconduct Process ensures a candidate alleged to have engaged in academic misconduct is afforded procedural fairness. Procedural fairness involves:

- the candidate's right to know the details of any allegation against them
- the opportunity to present their case
- the right to be treated without bias
- a decision made on an objective and unbiased assessment of the evidence.

Candidates are given the opportunity to respond to any concerns raised, to be advised of any information or material available to the decision maker upon which they propose to rely, and to be made aware of the appeals processes.