

# STUDENT ACADEMIC INTEGRITY (DLI) PROCEDURE

## Section 1 - Preamble

- (1) This Procedure is effective from 1 September 2025.
- (2) This Procedure includes the following schedule: Schedule A: Outcomes for Student Breaches of Academic Integrity (DLI).

## Section 2 - Purpose

- (3) This Procedure sets out the processes for maintaining student academic integrity standards at Deakin University Lancaster University Indonesia (DLI).

## Section 3 - Scope

- (4) This Procedure applies to DLI higher education program students and to all other learners or individuals that submit scholarly work for assessment by or through DLI.
- (5) This Procedure applies to staff in relation to the promotion of student academic integrity standards and the detection and management of allegations of breaches of student academic integrity.
- (6) During the establishment of DLI, all policy, procedures and supporting processes will be regularly reviewed. In the establishment phase, defined as the first two years from when students commence DLI programs, any issues arising from the implementation of current policy, procedure or process will be referred to a jointly-convened Policy & Procedure Review Panel (PPRP). The PPRP will comprise designated academic and professional service representatives from the University Partners and the Office of the Rector. The PPRP will recommend an outcome best aligned with relevant principles and the best interests of any student(s) concerned, and will advise DLI on the future development of policy, procedure and supporting processes. During the establishment phase, the PPRP may make recommendations to vary any given policy only with endorsement from relevant University Partner governance processes. All academic policy and procedure will be subject to a full review at the end of the two-year establishment phase.

## Section 4 - Policy

- (7) This Procedure is pursuant to the Student Academic Integrity (DLI) Policy.

## Section 5 - Procedure

### Student education and support

- (8) DLI provides education to students on:
  - a) the importance of academic integrity
  - b) student responsibilities under the Policy
  - c) how students can meet these responsibilities.
- (9) Students complete a compulsory Academic Integrity and Respect module at the beginning of their enrolment, and teaching staff reinforce and further develop students' understanding and skills in academic integrity within the context of module learning.

- (10) Additional information and resources supporting student academic integrity approved by the Rector, is available on the DLI website and is referenced in module sites. This information includes a statement on academic integrity standards, sources of support and outcomes that may apply if student academic integrity standards are breached.

### **Staff education and support**

- (11) All staff, including sessional academic staff, complete academic integrity training on appointment, and every two years subsequently.
- (12) The Rector or delegate ensures that new teaching staff are supported in the application of their student academic integrity training, and all staff are reminded at least annually about policy requirements regarding academic integrity standards including in assessment design.

### **Detection of student academic integrity breaches**

- (13) All staff have responsibility for detecting potential breaches of student academic integrity standards.
- (14) The Office of the Rector maintains a repository of information that supports staff in understanding and maintaining currency of their knowledge of detection techniques.
- (15) DLI also uses software to aid in the detection of possible breaches of student academic integrity standards, including but not limited to text-matching software, language analysis software, metadata investigation software and remote supervision software.

### **Academic Integrity Committees**

- (16) DLI establishes an Academic Integrity Committee to receive and determine allegations of breaches of academic integrity standards for students enrolled in modules offered by DLI. Investigations and reviews of allegations of breaches of academic integrity standards will be conducted in line with the principles set out in clause 6 of the Student Appeals (DLI) Policy.
- (17) The members of an Academic Integrity Committee are members of staff identified by the Rector as suitable for that committee, with a senior academic staff member as Chair. Members must include adequate representation from both University Partners, with both University Partners to nominate standing members (one from each discipline) to ensure adequate representation.
- (18) Academic Integrity Committee members are provided with relevant training by the Office of the Rector, with support from the University Partners as appropriate.
- (19) Staff within the Office of the Rector support the work of Academic Integrity Committees, including providing Committee secretariat. The secretariat is not a member of the Committee, but may provide policy interpretation and advice for the Committee's consideration.

### **Early intervention for poor academic practice**

- (20) An early intervention offers the student, in activities other than online quizzes, end of module assessments and examinations, an opportunity to correct areas of poor academic practice, such as poor paraphrasing, without receiving an allegation of a breach of academic integrity.
- (21) To be eligible for an early intervention, a student must meet the following criteria:
- a) has received no more than one prior early intervention in a particular module in the same trimester
  - b) has not received an early intervention(s) in any module in a previous trimester
  - c) has not used another student's work
  - d) has not drawn substantially on only one or two sources

- e) has not attempted to hide or disguise the poor academic practice.
- (22) Student academic practice suitable for early intervention is determined by the Module Chair, with the support of the Academic Integrity Committee Chair or their delegate where required.
- (23) Students eligible for an early intervention are offered the opportunity to correct areas of poor academic practice only and resubmit their assessment within seven calendar days. The following conditions will apply to the resubmission:
  - a) For first year modules (Level 1) in an undergraduate program, the student may resubmit for the full range of marks available
  - b) For all other modules, the student may resubmit for a maximum mark of 50.0% for the assessment task.
- (24) Module Chairs log attempts at early intervention in a system maintained by the Office of the Rector.
- (25) Once determined to be eligible, the student receives timely notice of the early intervention by the Module Chair. The notice includes:
  - a) details of the areas of concern in the submission (this may include a software similarity report)
  - b) the conditions applying to the resubmission as outlined in clause (23)
  - c) the timeline and details associated with resubmission
  - d) information on DLI services, particularly language and learning advisors, that may support the students in understanding the early intervention process and academic writing skills
  - e) the option to refer the matter to the Academic Integrity Committee if the student does not accept the early intervention.
- (26) After receiving the resubmission, the Module Chair or their delegate determines whether the areas of poor academic practice have been sufficiently addressed and, if so, remarks the task.
- (27) If the student does not accept an early intervention, does not correct and resubmit, or resubmits without sufficiently addressing the areas of poor academic practice, the Module Chair reports the poor academic practice to the relevant Academic Integrity Committee (via the Office of the Rector) for consideration as a suspected breach of student academic integrity standards.

### **Reporting a suspected breach of student academic integrity standards**

- (28) Where a staff member develops a reasonable suspicion that a student has breached academic integrity standards, that suspicion must be investigated.
- (29) Students and the general public may make confidential and/or anonymous reports of potential breaches of academic integrity standards by completing a reporting form available from the Office of the Rector. All reports are investigated.
- (30) Investigations are conducted by the Module Chair and/or by the Office of the Rector where a suspected breach relates to a supervised online exam.
- (31) After investigation, a report of a suspected academic integrity breach may be submitted to the Academic Integrity Committee for its consideration.

### **Academic Integrity Committee interventions**

- (32) The Academic Integrity Committee Chair or their delegate reviews the report of a suspected academic integrity breach and determines whether there is sufficient evidence to proceed with an allegation.
- (33) Where sufficient evidence is not identified, the Academic Integrity Committee Chair informs the Module Chair that the assessment should be marked on its merits.

- (34) Where the student has demonstrated poor academic practice and is eligible for an early intervention, the Chair redirects the matter to the Module Chair.
- (35) Where sufficient evidence is identified and the student is not eligible for an early intervention process, the Academic Integrity Committee Chair or their delegate determines the level (tier) of the alleged breach:
- a) **Tier 1:** allegations of breaches that typically would breach professional codes of ethics/conduct, such as plagiarism (including repeated instances of poor academic practice where the student has already received an early intervention), collusion, or other activities that would undermine academic integrity standards, but do not meet the requirements of a Tier 2 breach
  - b) **Tier 2:** allegations of more severe and complex breaches, including, but not limited to, contract cheating and cases related to research conduct, as well as breaches that span across faculties.
- (36) Where the Academic Integrity Committee Chair or their delegate decides to proceed with an allegation, the student is notified in writing.
- (37) The student notification includes:
- a) the nature of the allegation
  - b) all evidence used as part of the allegation
  - c) a proposal for an academic intervention determined by the standard outcome associated with the breach (documented in Schedule A)
  - d) how the student can respond and the time in which this must occur
  - e) reference to support services and student advocacy that the student can choose to access.
- (38) The student may provide a written response within 5 working days which includes:
- a) whether they admit to the breach(es) and, if so:
    - i whether they accept the proposal for the standard outcome
    - ii whether there are any mitigating circumstances that should be considered before imposing an outcome
    - iii evidence support any mitigating circumstances disclosed
  - b) where they do not admit to the allegation, information that evidences that they have not breached the relevant academic integrity standards
  - c) whether they request to attend a review meeting.
- (39) The Academic Integrity Committee Chair may accept a late response, up to 10 working days after the allegation was sent, where the student can provide supporting material or documents to show how exceptional circumstances prevented them from responding by the deadline. Failure to check email is not an exceptional circumstance.
- (40) Where necessary, the Academic Integrity Committee Chair or their delegate may dismiss an allegation prior to a review meeting.
- (41) Where the alleged breach involves multiple students, if any student requests a review, the allegations against all students are reviewed by the Academic Integrity Committee.
- (42) Where a student admits to the breach and accepts the standard outcome, the allegation is substantiated and the standard outcome applied, excepting allegations involving multiple students (clause 41). This outcome may not be appealed.
- (43) If a student does not respond to the allegation, the allegation is considered substantiated and the standard outcome applied, excepting allegations involving multiple students (clause 41).

- (44) Where a student does not admit to a breach and/or does not accept the standard outcome, a review meeting is scheduled.

### **Academic Integrity Review Meeting**

- (45) Reviews of Tier 1 allegations are considered by a single member Academic Integrity Committee consisting of a member of academic staff with relevant discipline knowledge.
- (46) Reviews of Tier 2 allegations are considered by a four-member Academic Integrity Committee and, where practical, will include one representative from each University Partner, chaired by a member of academic staff with relevant discipline knowledge.
- (47) Where a student requests to attend a review meeting, that meeting occurs no earlier than 5 working days after the student's response is received.
- (48) The review meeting is attended by the Academic Integrity Committee and the secretariat and, where the student requested to attend under clause (38 c), may be attended by the student and their support person if applicable. The Committee may invite the support person to speak on the student's behalf if the student so requests.
- (49) Students that elect to attend the review meeting may:
- a) Verbally add to the information they have they have provided evidencing that a breach has not occurred, or that there were mitigating circumstances that impacted their decision-making
  - b) Be asked questions by the committee in order to gather further information on the nature of the alleged breach, the circumstances around it and any other relevant information
- (50) At any point during the review meeting, the Committee may request an adjournment to investigate new information that has been presented. The Committee reconvenes within 5 working days of the adjournment.
- (51) Once the student has been provided an opportunity to present their evidence and the Committee has determined they have enough information to make a decision, the Committee adjourns to deliberate.
- (52) The Committee decides whether a breach is substantiated based on the balance of probabilities (whether it is more likely than not). For multiple member Committees, the decision is a majority decision with the Chair having the deciding vote.
- (53) Where a breach is not substantiated, it is considered dismissed by the Committee.

### **Outcomes for breaches of student academic integrity standards**

- (54) Where a student admits to the breach and accepts the standard outcome, the outcome is applied within 5 working days of the student's response being received.
- (55) Where a review meeting is held and a breach is substantiated, the Academic Integrity Committee determines:
- a) the nature of the breach following breach definitions using the Student Academic Integrity policy (this may be a variation on the original allegation)
  - b) any mitigating or exacerbating circumstances
  - c) the outcome defined by Schedule A.
- (56) The Academic Integrity Committee may, where practical, verbally provide the student with the outcome at the end of the review meeting.
- (57) The Office of Rector notifies the student within 5 working days, in writing, of:

- a) the Academic Integrity Committee's decision, the outcome/s imposed and any other recommendations
  - b) the reasons for the decision, including the findings on material facts
  - c) their right to appeal to the DLI Appeals Committee and how to do so.
- (58) Records of allegations, including determination and outcomes, will be maintained by the Office of the Rector, in accordance with the Student Academic Integrity (DLI) Policy.

### **Student self-reports**

- (59) Students may self-report to the Office of the Rector that they may have breached academic integrity standards, unless a staff member has already raised concerns with the student about the potential breach.
- (60) A student who self-reports that they have breached academic integrity standards is invited to an interview with an Office of the Rector staff member to discuss details of the self-reported breach. The student may bring a support person to this meeting.
- (61) After the meeting, a report of the alleged breach of academic integrity standards is forwarded to the Academic Integrity Committee Chair for consideration.
- (62) The Academic Integrity Committee Chair considers the nature of the breach and proposes an outcome based on:
- a) the standard outcome with mitigating circumstances applied for the first instance of self-reporting
  - b) the standard outcome for any subsequent self-reports.
- (63) The student is notified in writing of:
- a) the nature of the allegation
  - b) the evidence collected as part of the self-report interview
  - c) the proposal for the standard outcome determined by the Academic Integrity Committee Chair
  - d) how the student can respond and the time in which this must occur
  - e) reference to student support and advocacy services.
- (64) The process follows the procedure outlined from clause (38).

### **Appeals**

- (65) If a student has admitted the breach and accepted a standard outcome without review they may not appeal the decision.
- (66) If a student does not admit the breach, or admits the breach but does not agree with the standard outcome, they may appeal an Academic Integrity Committee decision to the DLI Appeals Panel in accordance with the Student Appeals (DLI) Procedure.
- (67) The student lodges the appeal online within 20 working days of being notified of the outcome, in accordance with the Student Appeals (DLI) Procedure.
- (68) If the student admits to a breach considered at an academic integrity review meeting, they may only appeal the outcome imposed.

### **Continuing study and enrolment**

- (69) A student alleged to have breached academic integrity standards may continue their academic studies during the management of the allegation and, if the allegation is substantiated, until the end of the DLI Appeals process.

- (70) Allegations are considered and, if substantiated, outcomes recorded regardless of whether the student has graduated or withdraws from the module or program.

## Section 6 - Definitions

(71) For the purpose of this Procedure:

- a) **Mitigating circumstances:** exceptional circumstances beyond the control of the student that impaired their decision-making. These include, but are not limited to, severe and acute mental distress or being the subject of blackmail or other coercion.
- b) **Exacerbating circumstances:** circumstances where a student's actions are determined to be unethical beyond the nature of the breach in student academic integrity standards. These include, but are not limited to, the theft of information or devices from another person or student, repeatedly breaching academic integrity, blackmail or coercion, or managing or leading a business or organisation with the purpose to help others breach academic integrity.
- c) **DLI working day:** any day on which the DLI is open for business and excludes all Saturdays, Sundays, public holidays that are observed by the DLI and DLI holidays declared on an annual basis.
- d) **Student** includes:
  - i a person enrolled in a program of study at DLI;
  - ii a candidate for an award of DLI whose work has been examined or assessed but on whom the award has not been conferred;
  - iii a person who was a DLI student at the time the relevant conduct occurred;
  - iv a person who is on leave of absence from or who has intermitted or deferred enrolment in a DLI program or module; and
  - v a person designated as a student by the Yayasan Governing Board.
- e) **Level:** describes the intellectual demands of modules and programs of study. A DLI module will be assigned a level as follows: 0 corresponding to the typical demands of a foundation year; and 1, 2 or 3 corresponding to the typical demands of successive years of a Bachelor's Degree program. Alongside the levels of study used by DLI, the QAA's [Framework for Higher Education Qualification](#) (FHEQ) and [Australian Qualifications Framework](#) (AQF) assigns levels on the basis of achievement of outcomes and attainment rather than years of study.

## ASSOCIATED DOCUMENTS

These associated documents are available on the DLI Policy page:

- Academic Integrity (DLI) Policy
- Student Academic Integrity (DLI) Policy
- Student Appeals (DLI) Procedure
- Schedule A: Outcomes for Student Breaches of Academic Integrity (DLI)

DOCUMENT DETAIL	
Name of document	Academic Integrity (DLI) Procedure
Overarching legislation	<b>Australia</b> Deakin University <a href="#">Academic Board Regulations</a> <a href="#">Higher Education Standards Framework (Threshold Standards) 2021</a>
	<b>United Kingdom</b> Lancaster University <a href="#">Academic Integrity Regulations and Procedures</a>



	The English higher education regulator, the <a href="#">Office for Students</a> and its conditions of registration, and other relevant government bodies and agencies.
<b>Approved by</b>	Yayasan Governing Board
<b>Approval date</b>	18 June 2025
<b>Date of effect</b>	Upon promulgation
<b>Version</b>	Version 1.0
<b>Date of review</b>	Within 12 months of approval
<b>DLI Approval</b>	Joint Management Committee 13 June 2025
<b>Deakin University Approval</b>	International Branch Campus Working Group under the delegated authority of the Academic Board 2 June 2025
<b>Lancaster University Approval</b>	Policy Approval Sub-Group of Senate 8th April 2025 Meeting Number 1 / Agenda Item 7
<b>Responsible Executive</b>	DLI Rector
<b>Implementation Officer</b>	DLI Rector or nominee (when appointed)
<b>Policy superseded</b>	N/A
<b>Associated documents</b>	
<b>Summary</b>	This procedure sets out processes for maintaining student academic integrity standards at Deakin University Lancaster University Indonesia (DLI).
<b>Key words for online searching</b>	Academic integrity, breach, review, outcome
<b>Category</b>	Academic
<b>Target audience</b>	Students, staff

Version	Authored by	Brief Description of the changes	Date Approved	Effective Date
1.0	University Partners and Navitas	<b>Academic Integrity (DLI) Procedure</b> New procedure.	June 2025	Sept 2025