



ADVOCACY

Service Report April - June 2019

UMSU
UNIVERSITY OF MELBOURNE
STUDENT UNION

Introduction

Between 2012 and 2017 the Advocacy Service was funded by the University subject to a service contract. As part of the contractual reporting requirements, the Service produced a quarterly report to the University's Advocacy Service Reference Group (ASRG). Subsequent to the discontinuation of the separate Advocacy service contract with the University, after funding for the service was subsumed into the UMSU whole of organisation funding under the 2017 SSAF funding model, the ASRG was formally disbanded on 17 April 2018 at its final meeting.

Nevertheless, although the Quarterly Service Report was originally commissioned by the ASRG as an accountability measure, it has also served to ventilate student experiences of processes within the relevant parts of the University. Over time, the circulation of the Report grew to encompass a good cross section of the University Community, establishing strong communication channels for feedback and issues management between relevant stakeholders. We hope to continue to expand and consolidate these channels and invite interested University staff to contact the Service directly to collaborate on responses to the issues identified in the Report.

Data and 'Anecdota'

The data presented in this report is drawn from the statistics recorded in the Advocacy Service Case management database. It is not drawn from, nor is it correlated with University collected service data, to which we have no access. For this reason, it is important to interpret the data and analysis as pertaining solely to activities of the Advocacy Service. The Report statistics cannot be extrapolated to provide commentary on the performance of Faculties or Schools, unless specifically indicated in the commentary.

The 'Trends and Issues' identified in the report are based on both service statistics, and anecdotal observations and case studies. They are provided as insights into the student experience of University processes, or as potential indicators of systemic problems with administrative decision making and procedural fairness. These issues are not intended to reflect the totality of student experience, but rather those areas where the University needs to address potentially serious issues and risks.

The Service can generate drill down or other statistics on its activities, where these may be of interest to the University community, however due to relatively few resources, such requests need to be made with due notice.

Trends and Issues

Our casework focused on special consideration matters, assessment disputes, and academic misconduct allegations. These are the usual sorts of issues presenting at this time of year.

Additionally, during this quarter the Service identified problems with misconduct processes at one of the private colleges on campus, complex special consideration matters which were resolved in rather ad hoc ways, and concerns about the way terminated student placements are dealt with in one faculty.

Private Colleges and Deficient Misconduct Processes

A student who had been expelled from a private college on campus approached the Service this quarter requesting assistance to appeal the outcome. What we discovered was that the private colleges share a single misconduct process which operates outside of the University's jurisdiction. We are also of the view that that these processes are both deficient and not appealable. There is also a potential for a student to be subject to disciplinary action by both the University and the college for the same alleged conduct.

In this matter, the student had been invited to a meeting with the Head of College via a phone SMS message – an inauspicious start to formal proceedings. The College advised the student that they had been the subject of unspecified complaints from other college residents which, if proven, would be of a very serious nature. However, these complaints were not articulated, let alone particularised, and consequently the student was unable to understand the substantive complaints nor the case to be met. Notwithstanding this flagrant breach of procedural fairness, neither was there any path to appeal the College's decision to expel the student.

There are potentially serious consequences for both the College and the University where formal processes lack integrity to this degree. Firstly, both the colleges and the University owe a duty of care their students. Colleges, by virtue of their pastoral/wellbeing functions arguably owe a positive duty to protect their students, and the University owes its students a duty of care to prevent them being exposed to harm and unfairness. Additionally, we understand there are a number of unresolved issues, including allegations that the expelled student was themselves the victim of concerted bullying.

After we contacted the Academic Registrar's office to voice our concerns with the College's procedures, the University approached the College to request it address the deficiencies with its process. However, the College declined. We remain concerned in this context that the University remains exposed to risk around its duty of care to students while the College process remains unchanged. There is also a risk that these processes will be legally challenged as they have been in the United States, resulting in the voiding of penalties for serious misconduct – and thereby creating safety risks for fellow students. Accordingly, we hope that the University will engage with the colleges to make sure that their disciplinary processes are fit for purpose and correspond with relevant authority in relation to students.

The student has been referred to the UMSU Legal Service for assistance.

Ongoing – unexpected – ongoing – unexpected: Special Considerations Pinball

The Service recently assisted several students with Special Consideration matters which we believe epitomise the experience of students with complex needs trying to navigate the current processes. One student, despite their best efforts, was unable to access the correct type of special consideration application and relevant documentation, and consequently, eventually found themselves effectively blocked from receiving any accommodation of their circumstances despite experiencing significant mental health issues. Essentially, the student had bounced between applications for ongoing circumstances and short-term special consideration, and eventually found themselves deemed ineligible for both. Their case reveals how students and health professionals alike are often confused about what information is required, and when.

Having taken a leave of absence due to their illness, the student applied on their return for *ongoing* special consideration, which was deemed ineligible despite being supported by documentation from the University Health service verifying an ongoing mental health issue. The student subsequently met with a Wellbeing staff member at Stop 1, where they were advised that their circumstances did not meet criteria for special consideration, and so they were not advised about the 26 April deadline for implementation of Alternative Examination Arrangements (AEAs). After an appointment with their psychiatrist in May, the specialist advised them to apply for short-term special consideration (unexpected circumstances) in respect of their upcoming examinations. However, this application was also deemed ineligible as the documentation was obtained too far in advance of the scheduled exams, and the student was referred again to apply for *ongoing* special consideration.

Subsequently in early May, the student obtained two further letters from health professionals (one of them a second letter from the psychiatrist) supporting their need for adjustments for their upcoming exams, however these applications were again deemed ineligible. At this point the student was also informed that 26 April was a “hard deadline” which meant that no exam adjustments could be implemented in any case. After this, the student's psychiatrist wrote a third letter, almost pleading with the University to approve exam adjustments, and noting that the process of engaging with this process had led to the student's condition deteriorating further.

We then assisted this student to draft a formal grievance, however given the time sensitivity of the matter by this point in semester, we elected to first contact SEDS on the student's behalf to request urgent intervention. Fortunately, at that stage, the matter was finally resolved in a way that allowed the student the adjustments they required, however it was disheartening that it required a direct intervention on the student's behalf to effect this.

Depressingly, this also represents a back slide to a situation we understood the University was committed to changing - where students are required to understand how their condition fits into the University's policy scheme in order to get appropriate assistance.

Currently the University operates a model that creates a procedural barrier to students' requests for help being assessed before the application even gets to substantive decision making.

In another example of the challenges facing students with complex needs under the current system, a student with a documented cognitive disability was only able to obtain proper case managed support from SEDS as a result of a successful Academic Board Appeal. In this case, the student's problems began with a fundamental misunderstanding of the student's disabilities – where they were erroneously referred to the Academic Skills Unit for assistance, as though their problem was that they hadn't learnt the relevant academic skills, rather than suffering an organic brain disorder.

Eventually, after the semester was over, the student was finally deemed eligible for special consideration, but by that point the outcome was to grant late withdrawals for all of their subjects for the previous semester. They were advised that the reason for this determination was that the extensions previous provided had been sufficient to allow them to complete the units, despite the support of the respective subject coordinators to accept and mark work after a further extension. The Faculty decision-maker additionally noted that they had rejected requests for further extensions on the grounds of “equity with other students”- an astonishing misapprehension of substantive equity. The decision was appealed on the basis that this outcome ignored the belated and ultimately inadequate response by the University to the student's documented support needs and failed to address itself to the manner in which these failures themselves created further obstacles to their successful completion of the subjects.

The Academic Board upheld the student's appeal, directing that SEDS nominate a case worker to the student available to meet on a weekly basis to assist in tracking progress through their studies until completion of enrolment in their course.

Recommendations

UMSU supports a model where students need only to set out their circumstances to the University and request support, and then a determination about which policy might apply (and associated actions/outcomes) are made on assessing that information; students have an obligation to let the University know what is going on, and the University has an obligation to help in the most appropriate way.

We also recommend that decisions of the Academic Board flow directly into informing the relevant decision making guidelines in SEDS, rather than having the effect of resolving only the specific case determined.

Divine Governmental Intervention

In a further example highlighting the need for a comprehensive overhaul of the current special consideration decision-making processes, we assisted a student who had to resort to requesting intervention from the Federal Department of Education to obtain equitable accommodation. This case, and the other two discussed above all point to the need for a shift to a more rigorously principled approach to decision making in this area – to ensure that future decisions are made having regard to principles identified in these recent individualised decisions.

In this case, the student had a condition which is recognised by the National Disability Insurance Scheme, but was not accepted as a basis for equitable adjustments by the University. The student had previously studied their undergraduate degree at another Australian university, and after complaining successfully to the Australian Human Rights Commission, that University had provided the required accommodations. **However, this had no influence on the University's decision that it would not make the requested accommodations.**

The student had effectively exhausted all reviews and was on the way to an Academic Board Appeal, when the Minister for Education was contacted directly for assistance. Subsequently a meeting was held with faculty staff, SEDS, the student and his advocate, where it was agreed to provide the accommodation requested. In the course of this meeting it was also made clear to the student, by University staff, that the provision of the accommodation should not be shared with other students. This is a reflection of an attitude within the University that students primarily seek accommodations in a way this is dishonest or to obtain an unfair advantage.

We applaud this outcome – but note that these piecemeal approaches to equity are undesirable.

Recommendation

As with the case studies above, we hope to see the principles informing these recent decisions flow on to other similar fact situations in the future.

Placements, Terminations and no Procedural Fairness...oh my

A potentially concerning issue arose this quarter in the context of terminated student placements. When student placements go south, it is obviously both stressful and distressing for the affected student. Students in this situation frequently present to the Service concerned that the breakdown of the placement was not their fault, and consequently of the view that they should not record a fail, but rather be offered a further placement to complete.

In one faculty, we discovered some potential issues with the process for reviewing such terminated placements. Fundamentally, although there was a reasonably clear process to resolve decisions in respect of terminated placements, we were concerned that the procedures were flawed, and there was a lack of clear communication to students about the process which would enable them to maximise the opportunity to be heard in relation to a final decision.

The steps set out by the faculty state:

*“Once a placement has been terminated, the Subject Coordinator is notified and arranges a time to meet with the student to **discuss the nature and circumstances regarding the placement termination.** If the placement termination is upheld **after the student has had an opportunity to express own views** [sic], the student is informed that they have failed the subject and that their case will be presented to the Board of Examiners where the final mark will be recorded as a fail.”*

However, none of the students who presented to the Service had been provided with information about the meeting to which they had been invited. Consequently, the students were not adequately prepared to express their own views, as they had not been made aware that what they present in these meetings could have a bearing on the result of their placement.

Additionally, there appears no provision for a situation where the subject coordinator decides in the meeting that the

termination was unfair/inappropriate and approves a replacement opportunity. This, combined with the lack of information about the content of the meeting, suggests that the purpose of the meeting is not, in fact, to review a proposed termination, but simply to uphold the termination.

Ultimately our concern is the lack of clear communication to students about the process. The Faculty needs to coherently advise the student that the meeting following the placement termination will be an opportunity to state their case, and that the subject coordinator might approve a re-placement. The students also need to be properly advised on how to pursue the assessment dispute step after the meeting (if the termination stands). Finally, they need to be told about the CAPC process and what authority the CAPC might have to approve a re-placement.

This feedback about the process has been provided to the Faculty, and we hope to see an improved approach this Semester.

Programmes this Quarter

Exam Support Stall

Training was provided to 26 volunteers who staffed the Exam Support Stall during the examination period. A total of 2228 students received a service from the stall over the three weeks of exams. Volunteers complete two hour shifts and set up and put away the marquee and table every day. Equipment is stored in the Royal Exhibition Building.

Volunteers answer a range of questions; provide directions on the location of facilities, and referral to discuss issues such as special consideration and academic misconduct. Those involved report that students appreciate the programme- at a time when many students need extra support because they are stressed and anxious.

The volunteers at the stall provide on-site information, advice, referral and support to students who sit exams at the Royal Exhibition Building in Carlton during the exam period (2-3 weeks in both June and November). The stall gives away water and clear plastic bags for pens and pencils, and sells assorted stationary, tissues and lollies for a nominal fee. Given the water is the single most requested item at the stall, we have been working on a way to provide water in reusable clear containers; however, negotiations with the Royal Exhibition Building to allow a water cart on site have not been fruitful so far. Signs are displayed reminding students not to inadvertently take their study notes or any unauthorised materials into the venue with them. The stall also has information about the Advocacy Service; an exam tips information card and information on other University services.

While the stall undoubtedly improves the experience of examinations for the students who make use of it – it also adds value to the experience of the volunteers who staff it.

Below are some feedback quotes from a number of this semester’s volunteers:

“Thank you for coordinating this. It was an interesting experience for me. And thank you for letting me take the empty can of Chupa Chups. You guys do an amazing job.”

“The exam support stall was great, and you guys honestly take care of the volunteers so much. It was such an awesome experience.”

“I really enjoy volunteering for Exam Support Stall. I will definitely sign up for next semester!”

“Thank you for the opportunity to join the team! It was such a new amazing experience for me in the end of my time in Melbourne Uni.”

“It has been great fun being able to volunteer at the exam stall!”

“Thanks so much, I really enjoyed having the chance to volunteer again this semester.”

“Thanks for letting me take part! It was a wonderful experience.”

New Staff Member in Advocacy & Legal Division

We are delighted to announce that Advocacy & Legal will soon be welcoming a new staff member.

In 2017 the Australian Human Rights Commission (AHRC) published the results of a very large-scale survey of Australian tertiary students in *Change the Course: National Report on Sexual Assault and Sexual Harassment at Australian Universities*. The report was unenthusiastic in relation to this University’s situation, finding that only 3% of survivors from the University of Melbourne sought support, for reasons including a fear of the process due to a lack of independent support. The Report stated: “It is clear from the results of the survey that students face a range of barriers, both structural and attitudinal, to reporting or seeking support following sexual assault or sexual harassment. In addition, students who did report were often unsatisfied with the response of their university.”

Other key findings from the survey relating specifically to the University of Melbourne include:

- 28.9% of students said that they knew nothing about how to seek support/assistance within the University
- regarding sexual assault

- 33.4% of students knew nothing about how to make a complaint about sexual assault
- 30.8% knew nothing about University policy in relation to sexual assault.

These findings are echoed in End Rape on Campus' *Connecting the Dots report* (2017), and the National Union of Students' *Talk About It survey* (2015).

In August 2018, after a well-attended Day of Action at the University on the first anniversary of the release of the AHRC Report, UMSU applied for a SSAF grant to run a two-year pilot project to explore the experience of students who had experienced sexual harassment and/or assault and determine ways to improve that experience. Almost a year later, we have secured funding for the pilot and have now recruited an exceptional candidate to take carriage of the project.

Dr Patrick Tidmarsh has worked in the field of sexual crime, in a variety of therapeutic, training, and leadership roles, for over thirty years. He is committed to victim-centric practices and prevention initiatives. He comes from a research/training role at Victoria Police where he was responsible for cultural and practice change in the field of sexual crime investigation and attitudes towards victim/survivors. Patrick has positive relationships with many of the relevant community-based organisations and professional groups, particularly the Centres Against Sexual Assault, and of course VicPol, and has delivered training to the Judicial College of Victoria and Supreme Court: for Magistrates, County Court, and Appeals Court judges.

Patrick starts in the week of 29th July, and we look forward to introducing Patrick to the University community when he commences.

Advocacy Conference

The Service is excited to be presenting several papers at the upcoming **Australasian Dean of Students, Ombuds, Complaints Managers and Student Advocates Conference** at the ANU, Canberra in September 2019. We will provide a full report and abstract of the papers in the next Quarterly Report.

Advocacy Service Statistics

Comparative data – April - June 2019

This quarter 298 students were provided a service resulting in 871 contacts. In the same quarter last year, the service saw 305 students resulting in 952 contacts.

Additionally, the Advocacy website received over 10000 page views this quarter, with the most popular pages featuring information on assessment disputes, special consideration and academic misconduct.

Distribution by primary issue

The primary issue is generally identified as the university process to which the student's main concern or problem relates. Data is classified in this way because it provides a standardised and more meaningful breakdown which may be useful for tracking policy trends amongst other things.

April- June 2019

All Students			Graduate Coursework students			RHD students		
Special Consideration	75	25.17%	Special Consideration	22	17.89%	Progress- HDR	7	35.00%
Assessment Dispute	40	13.42%	Assessment Dispute	19	15.45%	Supervision Problems	4	20.00%
Academic Misconduct- Plagiarism	26	8.72%	Academic Misconduct- Plagiarism	18	14.63%	Special Consideration	3	15.00%
Course Academic Progress Committee	15	5.03%	Academic Misconduct- Collusion	11	8.94%	Scholarship Issues	2	10.00%
Other	14	4.70%	Course Academic Progress Committee	9	7.32%	Incorrect Advice	2	10.00%
Academic Misconduct- Collusion	14	4.70%	Vocational Placement Problems	5	4.07%	Assessment Dispute	1	5.00%
Incorrect Advice	12	4.03%	General Misconduct	4	3.25%	Not Specified	1	5.00%
Student Admin- Remission of Fees	10	3.36%	Academic Misconduct- Exam	4	3.25%			
General Misconduct	9	3.02%	Other	4	3.25%			
Academic Misconduct- Exam	8	2.68%	Incorrect Advice	4	3.25%			
Student complaint about uni staff	8	2.68%	Student complaint about uni staff	3	2.44%			
Student Admin- Enrolment problems	7	2.35%	Student Admin- Remission of Fees	3	2.44%			
Student complaint about another student	7	2.35%	Student Admin- Enrolment problems	3	2.44%			
Progress- HDR	7	2.35%	Academic Misconduct- Falsified docs	2	1.63%			
Academic Misconduct- Falsified docs	6	2.01%	Not Specified	2	1.63%			
Vocational Placement Problems	6	2.01%	Equitable Accommodation (SC Rego)	2	1.63%			
Selection Appeal	6	2.01%	Course structure/changes	1	0.81%			
Not Specified	6	2.01%	Bullying	1	0.81%			
Advance Standing Credit/RPL	4	1.34%	Advance Standing Credit/RPL	1	0.81%			
Supervision Problems	4	1.34%	Selection Appeal	1	0.81%			
Equitable Accommodation (SC Rego)	3	1.01%	Sexual Harassment	1	0.81%			
Scholarship Issues	3	1.01%	Student Admin- Graduation	1	0.81%			
Bullying	3	1.01%	Student complaint about another student	1	0.81%			
Discrimination	1	0.34%	Discrimination	1	0.81%			
Student Admin- Graduation	1	0.34%						
Sexual Harassment	1	0.34%						
Student Admin- Exchange	1	0.34%						
Course structure/changes	1	0.34%						

April- June 2018

All Students			Graduate Coursework students			RHD students		
Special Consideration	65	21.31%	Special Consideration	22	18.80%	Progress- HDR	14	56.00%
Assessment Dispute	39	12.79%	Assessment Dispute	15	12.82%	Supervision Problems	2	8.00%
Academic Misconduct- Plagiarism	33	10.82%	Academic Misconduct- Plagiarism	13	11.11%	Student complaint about uni staff	2	8.00%
Academic Misconduct- Exam	31	10.16%	Course Unsatisfactory Progress Committee	13	11.11%	Not Specified	2	8.00%
Academic Misconduct- Falsified docs	22	7.21%	Academic Misconduct- Exam	11	9.40%	Selection Appeal	1	4.00%
Course Unsatisfactory Progress Committee	20	6.56%	Academic Misconduct- Falsified docs	9	7.69%	Scholarship Issues	1	4.00%
Progress- HDR	14	4.59%	Student Admin- Remission of Fees	5	4.27%	Research Ethics	1	4.00%
Incorrect Advice	10	3.28%	Other	5	4.27%	General Misconduct	1	4.00%
Other	9	2.95%	Academic Misconduct- Collusion	4	3.42%	Assessment Dispute	1	4.00%
Student complaint about uni staff	8	2.62%	Vocational Placement Problems	4	3.42%			
Academic Misconduct- Collusion	7	2.30%	Incorrect Advice	3	2.56%			
Not Specified	7	2.30%	Student complaint about uni staff	3	2.56%			
Selection Appeal	6	1.97%	Course structure/changes	2	1.71%			
Student Admin- Remission of Fees	6	1.97%	General Misconduct	2	1.71%			
General Misconduct	6	1.97%	Not Specified	1	0.85%			
Vocational Placement Problems	4	1.31%	Selection Appeal	1	0.85%			
Student Admin- Enrolment problems	3	0.98%	Student Admin- Enrolment problems	1	0.85%			
Supervision Problems	3	0.98%	Student Admin- Exchange	1	0.85%			
Student Admin- Exchange	2	0.66%	Supervision Problems	1	0.85%			
Course structure/changes	2	0.66%	Discrimination	1	0.85%			
Equitable Accommodation (SC Rego)	2	0.66%						
Scholarship Issues	2	0.66%						
Bullying	2	0.66%						
Research Ethics	1	0.33%						
Discrimination	1	0.33%						

Distribution by graduate/undergraduate status

April- June 2019

Graduate	160	53.69%
Undergraduate	138	46.31%

April- June 2018

Graduate	161	52.79%
Undergraduate	144	47.21%

Distribution by International/Domestic Status

April- June 2019

Domestic	187	62.75%
International	111	37.25%

April- June 2018

Domestic	186	60.98%
International	119	39.02%

Commentary

The proportion of graduate to undergraduate students was 53.69% to 46.31% (compared with 52.79% to 47.21% for the same period last year). This very consistent figure shows graduate students are slightly over-represented proportionate to their enrolment load which shows graduate students presented to the service, last year in the equivalent quarter we saw 60.98% domestic students to 39.02% international students. This is a slight decrease in the proportion of international students assisted by the Service, however it is in line with the proportion of international students at the University – which is around 40%, suggesting international students are not disproportionately seeking assistance.

The primary presenting issue this quarter was special consideration, as is usual for a quarter featuring final assessment. The proportion of special consideration related contacts has increased by 4 % to comprise a quarter of all contacts in this period. Our data includes all processes related to special consideration, from advice on applications, through reviews and formal grievances to Academic Board Appeals.

After special consideration matters, assessment disputes, plagiarism, collusion, and significantly – incorrect advice were the next most common issues.

Special Consideration matters predominantly involved assistance with drafting and lodging formal grievances disputing the initial determination, with over half involving initial applications. The reasons for applications, comprised both physical and mental health problems, and disputes over outcomes concerned late applications, insufficient evidence or where no appropriate action was deemed. We have also seen an increasing number of presentations where students have been given granted eligibility, but where they remain dissatisfied with the outcome offered. The majority of Special Consideration related matters involved students enrolled in the Faculties of Science and Arts.

Two thirds of assessment disputes involved informal assessment reviews with the examiner for reasons including allegations of examiner bias, administrative errors to do with lost assessment submissions, and cases where the student simply could not reconcile their result with the effort they had put in. Most notable was an increase in the numbers of students presenting citing deficiencies with the conduct of assessment. The majority of these matters concerned complaints that there had been insufficient assessment criteria provided to undertake assessment successfully, or that there had been a failure to provide summative feedback across the semester. There were also a number of presentations related to formal requests to the Head of Department for re-marking on similar bases, and procedural grievances regarding conduct of assessment and alleged examiner bias. The majority of Assessment Disputes arose in the Faculties of Science and Arts, followed by ABP and MDHS. The disputes were evenly spread between graduate and undergraduate students, however domestic students were represented three times more than international students.

Finally, plagiarism related matters related to allegations of contract cheating, educative responses to inadvertent plagiarism, and appeals regarding excessive penalties. These matters came predominantly from Engineering, MBS and Arts.

Special Consideration - By Stage of Process

STAGE	REASON	Total
Application	Late Application	2
	Physical Health	15
	Mental Health	24
		41
Internal Review	Unhappy with outcome provided	1
	Deemed No Appropriate Action	2
	Deemed Insufficient Grounds	4
	Late Application	5
	12	
Formal Grievance	Deemed Insufficient Grounds	10
	Unhappy with outcome provided	8
	18	
Appeal	Unhappy with outcome provided	4
Total Special Consideration Matters		75

Special Consideration – by Faculty

Faculty of Science	22	29.33%
Faculty of Arts	21	28.00%
Faculty of Business and Economics	10	13.33%
Faculty of MDHS	8	10.67%
Melbourne School of Engineering	4	5.33%
Melbourne Graduate School of Education	3	4.00%
Not Disclosed	2	2.67%
VCA & Music	1	1.33%
Melbourne School of Design (AB&P)	1	1.33%
Melbourne Law School	1	1.33%
Melbourne Business School (MBS)	1	1.33%
Faculty of Veterinary and Agricultural Sciences	1	1.33%

Special Consideration – by Graduate/Undergraduate

Undergraduate	49	65.33%
Graduate	26	34.67%

Special Consideration – by International/Domestic

Domestic	54	72.00%
International	21	28.00%

Assessment Disputes- By Stage of Process

STAGE	REASON	Total
Informal/assessment review with examiner	Allegation of Examiner Bias	2
	Admin Error	4
	Unsure	4
	Conduct of Assessment	17
		27
Formal request for remark	Allegation of Examiner Bias	1
	Admin Error	4
	Conduct of Assessment	5
	10	
Formal Grievance	Conduct of Assessment	2
	Allegation of Examiner Bias	1
	3	
Total Assessment Dispute Related Matters		40

Assessment Disputes – by Faculty

Faculty of Science	7	17.50%
Faculty of Arts	6	15.00%
Melbourne School of Design (AB&P)	5	12.50%
Faculty of MDHS	5	12.50%
Faculty of Business and Economics	5	12.50%
Melbourne School of Engineering	3	7.50%
Melbourne Graduate School of Education	3	7.50%
Melbourne Law School	2	5.00%
VCA & Music	1	2.50%
Melbourne Business School (MBS)	1	2.50%
Faculty of Veterinary and Agricultural Sciences	1	2.50%
Not Disclosed	1	2.50%

Assessment Disputes – by Graduate/Undergraduate

Graduate	21	52.50%
Undergraduate	19	47.50%

Assessment Disputes – by International/Domestic

Domestic	30	75.00%
International	10	25.00%

Plagiarism - By Stage of process

STAGE	REASON	Total
Formal/Committee Hearing	Contract Cheating	5
	Inadvertent	12
		17
Informal/Educative	Inadvertent	6
		6
Academic Board Appeal	Excessive Penalty	3
Total Plagiarism Related Matters		26

Plagiarism – by Faculty

Melbourne School of Engineering	7	26.92%
Melbourne Business School (MBS)	5	19.23%
Faculty of Arts	5	19.23%
Melbourne School of Design (AB&P)	2	7.69%
Faculty of Science	2	7.69%
Faculty of Business and Economics	2	7.69%
Melbourne Graduate School of Education	1	3.85%
Faculty of MDHS	1	3.85%
Undisclosed	1	3.85%

Plagiarism – by Graduate/Undergraduate

Undergraduate	8	69.23%
Graduate	18	30.77%

Plagiarism – by International/Domestic

Domestic	10	38.46%
International	16	61.54%

The next Advocacy Service report will cover the quarter July to September 2019 and will be available in early October 2019.

Phoebe Churches

Manager, Advocacy & Legal

July 2019