

Academic Integrity Procedures

1. Purpose

The Academic Integrity Procedures enact the Academic Integrity Policy. The procedures:

- outline how the Institution educates and supports students and staff to develop an integrity-based approach to academic work;
- explain how academic misconduct is detected and categorised;
- identifies responsibilities for decision making and processes;
- provide clear, easy to follow and fair processes for investigating and assessing allegations of misconduct;
- establish fair and consistent penalties applicable to different categories of misconduct.

2. Scope

All prospective and current students, alumni and staff at the Institution. This policy pertains to academic misconduct. For misconduct of a general nature refer to the General Misconduct Policy.

3. Definitions

All definitions relating to academic integrity have been sourced or adapted from TEQSA's Academic Integrity Toolkit.

Academic integrity: The expectation that teachers, students, researchers and all members of the academic community act with: honesty, trust, fairness, respect and responsibility.

Academic misconduct: A breach of academic integrity (e.g. all types of cheating). This may have occurred recently or in the past. Examples are listed in this Glossary of Terms and include, but are not limited to: collusion, contract cheating, exam cheating, file sharing, impersonation, plagiarism, and fabrication or falsification of data/information, recycling or resubmitting previously submitted work, unauthorised and/or undeclared use of generative artificial intelligence.

Cheating: A generic umbrella term for a range of student behaviours that

undermine academic integrity. Cheating is academic misconduct. Examples are listed in this Glossary of Terms and include, but are not limited to: collusion, contract cheating, exam cheating, file sharing, impersonation, plagiarism, and fabrication or falsification of data/information, recycling or resubmitting previously submitted work, unauthorised and/or undeclared use of generative artificial intelligence.

Collusion: Unauthorised collaboration in preparation or presentation of work including knowingly allowing a student's own work to be copied by others. Collusion involves engaging in illegitimate cooperation with one or more other students to complete assessable work. This is different to working on group assignments that are set by lecturers, whereby authorised collaboration is encouraged and a fundamental aspect of the assessment task. Examples of illegitimate cooperation include working with a friend or group of friends to write an essay or report that is meant to be an individual piece of work. It can also include sharing quiz or test questions and answers with other students, as well as written assignments like reports and essays. Illegitimate cooperation can unfairly advantage a student or group of students over others. Students should also never share their work with others as there is a risk the person it is shared with could upload it to an illegal commercial cheating service or circulate it to others.

Contract cheating: is a type of illegal cheating. It is a process where a student requests someone else to produce all or part of an assessment task that is submitted as their own work, including paid arrangements through a third party. This can include asking another person (e.g. relative or friend) to assist with an assessment task, someone else to sit an exam or having them write an essay, report or some other kind of assignment, which is sometimes referred to as 'ghost-writing'. Actions that support illegal contract cheating services are also considered breaches of academic integrity. This includes students uploading teaching materials such as practice exams, lecture slides and assignment questions to 'study notes'

Exam cheating: includes but is not limited to:

- writing 'cheat notes' on a person's body or materials taken into the exam room
- attempting to copy from other students
- communicating with other students or people outside the exam venue

while the exam is in progress

- using electronic devices to access information related to the exam while it is in progress
- bringing prohibited items, such as unapproved calculators or textbooks into exams
- impersonation
- use of additional screens in a proctored exam (whereby proctoring software monitors a computer's desktop).

Fabricating or falsifying information: intentional creation, and unauthorised or undisclosed alteration, of any information or citation. For example, the use of artificial intelligence platforms (such as Generative Pre-trained Transformers - GPTs) to fabricate information.

File-sharing: the unauthorised sharing of course content and assessment material on online study platforms and commercial contract cheating websites.

General misconduct: unacceptable or improper behaviour at the Institution is defined as either academic misconduct or general misconduct. General misconduct is governed by the General Misconduct Policy.

Generative artificial intelligence (AI) refers to a category of AI models and systems that are designed to generate new content, such as text, images, music, or videos, that resembles human-created content. These AI models are trained on large datasets and learn patterns and structures within the data to generate new examples that are similar in style and format.

Ghost writing: Also known as contract cheating or impersonation. See contract cheating definition.

Impersonation: where a student requests someone else to produce all or part of an assessment task that is submitted as their own work, including sitting an examination. This is also known as contract cheating or ghost writing.

Misconduct: see academic misconduct.

Moderation means quality assurance, control processes and activities such as peer review that aim to assure:

- consistency or comparability, appropriateness, and fairness of assessment

judgments; and

- the validity and reliability of assessment tasks, criteria and standards.

Moderation of assessment processes establish comparability of standards of student performance across, for example, different markers, locations, subjects, providers and/or courses of study.

Natural justice: a technical term for the rule against bias and the right to a fair hearing. Also referred to as a duty to act fairly.

Plagiarism: Submitting work that is not a student's own without acknowledging, citing or referencing the original source of the work. It does not matter whether this is accidental or on purpose, whether the words are changed to make them the student's own (e.g. use of text spinners and paraphrasing tools) or simply copy and paste. This includes the deliberate use of translation tools (including tools that convert voice / video to text), synonym generators or similar, to rephrase existing content & copying / rephrasing content from samples/exemplars of assessments found in Moodle subjects, 'washing', or the use of software to disguise plagiarism. When a student is using another person's thoughts and ideas, they must reference the source material.

Procedural fairness: Acting fairly in administrative decision making. It relates to the fairness of the procedure by which a decision is made.

Recycling or resubmitting work: Submitting (or resubmitting) work that has already been assessed, without the lecturer's permission. For example, submitting a report that a student was graded on in a first-year class as part of their work in a third-year class. If a student wants to build on their previous work (including when repeating a subject), they should discuss this first with their lecturer and the amount can only make up a very small percentage of the content submitted, and must be referenced accordingly. Also known as self-plagiarism.

Self-plagiarism: see recycling or resubmitting work definition.

4. Procedures

Education of students

4.1 Orientation programs, held at the start of each study period, explain the importance and meaning of academic integrity to new students.

4.2 All students are required to undertake the compulsory Academic Integrity Module (AIM). This must be completed in Moodle to gain full access to course materials.

4.3 Academic writing and study skills are embedded into the delivery of subjects in order to educate students on the importance of academic integrity, including keeping records of draft versions of assessments to demonstrate efforts of their own work.

4.4 Additional specialised tutorials on referencing techniques, paraphrasing, the appropriate use of generative artificial intelligence, and academic writing and study skills are offered regularly through the Student Success Centre (SSC).

4.5 Academic staff remind students about the potential consequences of academic misconduct well in advance of assignment due dates and regularly promote the academic integrity policies, procedures and Moodle resources in class.

Education of staff

4.6 All academic staff are required to undertake the compulsory AIM and integrate this into their learning and teaching activities. This must be completed as part of their induction when they start their employment and/or when the AIM is updated.

4.7 Academic staff, including academic developers, learning advisors, library and Student Success Centre staff, are briefed of their academic integrity obligations every Faculty Day at the start each study period.

4.8 Software detection training and materials are available to all academic staff in the L&T Hub.

4.9 Professional development opportunities are available to academic staff and academic integrity decision-makers in how to identify academic misconduct, how to verify the appropriate and inappropriate use of generative artificial intelligence in education, the curriculum design, teaching strategies, assessment and marking.

4.10 Program Managers ensure that marking guidelines, instructions, the conditions for use of artificial intelligence in assessments and reminders are regularly communicated to academic staff.

4.11 Program Managers remind academic staff of their responsibilities to refer students to the Student Success Centre for additional support as needed.

Support

4.12 Academic staff and Student Success Centre staff make themselves available for learning help and support. Students are encouraged to approach staff for assistance and clarification on assessment requirements.

4.13 Academic staff provide constructive, meaningful and timely feedback for each student.

4.14 Information and access to advice, support (i.e. language, academic skills) and/or counselling is available through the Student Success Centre as outlined in the Student Wellness Procedures.

4.15 Academic integrity management at the Institution is underpinned by the Academic Integrity Partnership Model which comprises the collaborative efforts of the Dean/Associate Dean, Program Managers and a team consisting of an Academic Integrity Coordinator (AIC) and Academic Integrity Officers (AIO). This partnership model aims to offer comprehensive support to faculty members in matters related to academic integrity.

4.16 The Academic Integrity Coordinator (AIC) encompasses coordinating the allocation of academic integrity-related cases, facilitating effective communication with various internal stakeholders, providing comprehensive support, and ensuring the seamless implementation of the Academic Integrity Policy and these procedures.

4.17 Academic Integrity Officers (AIO) are detection experts and available for advice when required. In collaboration with the Academic Integrity Coordinator and the Academic Integrity Advisor, the AIOs manage the academic integrity cases, ensuring that investigations are conducted fairly and impartially. They may assist in gathering evidence, conducting interviews, and documenting the progress.

Curriculum and assessment design strategies

4.18 Academic staff are required to provide clear instructions, marking rubrics, the conditions for use of artificial intelligence in assessments, and the opportunity

for discussions for all assessment tasks.

4.19 Academic staff make small changes to the content or type of assessment tasks every study period to limit the potential for students to commit misconduct.

4.20 Academic staff are advised to use the following types of assessments to address the threat of academic misconduct:

- use tasks that require students reflect on and evaluate their use of AI (or any sources of information);
- use tasks that ask students to integrate / reflect apply issues to their own context and experience or utilise current / recent events and hot topics;
- ask students to submit evidence of their information gathering and planning, or have staged assessment where students submit partially complete work prior to final submission
- ask students to provide working drafts or incorporate a re-drafting process into the task itself;
- use tasks that are interdependent and build upon each other;
- use tasks that tie in the classroom experience. For example include class discussions in assignments, use presentations in class and ask students to informally (or formally) report on their assessment work in class.
- use assessment tasks that include a secured or supervised component that is conducted face-to-face or synchronously online to verify student learning where necessary, especially when the use of AI tools is permitted or authorised.

Proactive identification of misconduct

4.21 Students are required to submit all assignments electronically, via the assessment section of the learning management system (i.e. Moodle) and complete an Academic Integrity Assessment Cover Sheet for every assessment task, which is downloadable through Moodle.

4.22 Academic staff are required to consistently use Turnitin software for all text-based assignments submitted through the Moodle assignment tool, regardless of discipline and for all students, not just those suspected of plagiarism or other academic misconduct.

4.23 Program Managers are required to undertake regular moderation to ensure

that academic staff are proactively detecting breaches of integrity and addressing concerns.

4.24 Program Managers are required to consistently evaluate the design of assessments and oversee the moderation of assessment outcomes, to ensure that the inappropriate use of artificial intelligence is avoided in assessments.

4.25 When academic staff suspect that generative artificial intelligence has been used in breach of institutional guidelines, AI detection scores (e.g., Turnitin AI) may be used as an initial indicator, but cannot be relied upon as sole evidence of misconduct. Where a breach is suspected, staff must collect additional evidence to substantiate their concern. This may include, but is not limited to:

- undeclared or unauthorised use of AI tools;
- significant inconsistencies in writing style or authorship;
- fabricated or irrelevant references;
- inability to explain or verify content during an interview.

These evidentiary expectations are intended to ensure that allegations of academic misconduct involving AI are based on triangulated and verifiable information in accordance with principles of procedural fairness.

Types of misconduct, penalties and handling allegations of academic misconduct

4.26 The Institution identifies four categories of academic misconduct – a warning plus three levels of academic misconduct. Assigned penalties are proportionate to the type and circumstance of the misconduct. The following is taken into account when determining the level and penalty of academic misconduct:

- the type of academic misconduct;
- the extent of academic misconduct;
- the experience of the student;
- the student's stage in the course;
- whether the misconduct was deemed unintentional or intentional;
- whether the student cooperates or shows any remorse;
- any previous offences or allegations.

TABLE 1: MISCONDUCT LEVELS AND PENALTIES

Warning	
<p>Description</p> <p>For unintentional misconduct (e.g. negligible plagiarism by students normally in their first study period) and usually dealt with in an educative manner.</p>	<p>Penalty</p> <p>No grade penalty and retake the Academic Integrity Module. Student management system / Academic Integrity Register (Salesforce) updated by the lecturer.</p>
Level 1 (minor & unintentional)	
<p>Description</p> <p>For minor and/or unintentional misconduct committed by a student who is not fully aware of the seriousness of the issue (e.g. plagiarism). Misconduct at this level is usually dealt with by the lecturer in an educative manner. Factors taken into account when determining Level 1 misconduct normally include:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • if the student is in the first year of their course and has not received a prior warning; • if the student is from an educational background where different norms apply for the acknowledgement of sources; • a nominal amount of misconduct has been detected; • the student has made an inadequate attempt at referencing. <p>Repeat Level 1 offences are normally escalated to a Level 2.</p>	<p>Penalty</p> <p>Penalties are determined at the discretion of the Institution and one or more may be applied. Penalties include, but are not limited to:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Revise the original assessment and resubmit by the new submission date (no grade penalty). If the assessment is not resubmitted by the due date, the original assessment receives a reduced mark as a penalty, including a fail grade appropriate to the extent of the misconduct. <p><i>*For assessments that are marked 0%, the grade is recorded as 0.1% to differentiate with non-submission of assessments.</i></p> <p>OR</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The grade of the original assessment is lowered appropriate to the extent of the misconduct. The student is not given the opportunity to resubmit the assessment. <p>AND</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Re-take the Academic Integrity Module. Non-completion may result in additional penalties. • Attend specialised tutorials on referencing techniques, paraphrasing and academic writing and study skills through the Student Success Centre. Non-completion may result in additional penalties. • Student management system / Academic Integrity Register updated by the Academic Integrity Coordinator (AIC).
Level 2 (intentional)	

Description	Penalty
<p>For intentional misconduct, deliberate plagiarism and repeat offences.</p> <p>Factors taken into account when determining Level 2 misconduct normally include:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> the student cohort was given information on how to acknowledge extracts and quotations. The student was present, received that information and knew that the use of material without acknowledgement was unacceptable; a prior warning given; repeat Level 1 offence(s); the work is obviously of a much higher level than previously submitted or may be highlighted by a Turnitin report with a high 'percentage similarity' or a high artificial intelligence (AI) score (that is, large sections of copied and pasted text from other sources with no references). A high AI score from Turnitin is not treated as definitive evidence of academic misconduct. Instead, a high AI score is considered a prompt for further investigation, similar to how similarity reports are used for plagiarism checks. <p>A third recorded Level 2 offence allows Academic Integrity Officers to consider Level 3 penalties up to exclusion.</p>	<p>Penalties are determined at the discretion of the Institution and one or more may be applied.</p> <p>Penalties include, but are not limited to:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> The grade of the original assessment is lowered, normally between the range of 0%* to 49%. The student is not given the opportunity to resubmit the assessment. <p>OR</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Revise the original assessment and resubmit by the extended date, with a grade of 0%*-50%. If the assessment is not resubmitted by the due date, the original assessment receives a reduced mark, including 0%*, appropriate to the extent of the misconduct. <p>OR</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Complete an additional or alternative assessment task, and resubmit by the extended date, with a maximum possible grade of 50%. If the alternative assessment is not resubmitted by the due date, the original assessment receives a reduced mark, including 0%*- appropriate to the extent of the misconduct. <p>OR</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> The student is not given the opportunity to resubmit the assessment and a 0%*grade for the assessment is awarded. <p>OR</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> The final grade for the subject is lowered. <p>AND</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> No supplementary assessments permitted. Re-take the Academic Integrity Module. Non-completion may result in additional penalties. Attend specialised tutorials on referencing techniques, paraphrasing and academic writing and study skills through the Student Success Centre. Non-completion may result in additional penalties. Student management system / Academic Integrity Register updated by the Academic Integrity Coordinator. <p><i>*For assessments that are marked 0%, the grade is recorded as 0.1% to differentiate with non-submission of assessments.</i></p>

Level 3 (serious and intentional)	
<p>Description</p> <p>This level is the most serious, where there have been repeat offences, obvious collusion, copying of others work, contract cheating and/or deemed to be a significant and serious breach of the policy. Factors taken into account when determining Level 3 misconduct normally include:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • the alleged offence may affect the Institution's reputation; • clear evidence of collusion between students; • third recorded Level 2 offence(s); • contract cheating; • students are typically, but not always, in the later stage of their studies and should have acquired the skills necessary to demonstrate academic integrity. 	<p>Penalty</p> <p>Penalties are determined at the discretion of the Institution and one or more may be applied. Penalties include, but are not limited to:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The student is awarded a 0%* grade for the assessment. <p>OR</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The student is awarded a 0%* grade for the subject. <p>OR</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The student is excluded from the subject. <p>OR</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The student is suspended from the course for a specified period in accordance with the <i>Suspension and Cancellation Procedures</i> for repeat Level 3 offences. <p>OR</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The student is permanently excluded from the Institution and their enrolment is cancelled in accordance with the <i>Suspension and Cancellation Procedures</i>. <p>AND</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • No supplementary assessments permitted. • Re-take the Academic Integrity Module. Non-completion may result in additional penalties. • Attend specialised tutorials on referencing techniques, paraphrasing and academic writing and study skills through the Student Success Centre. Non-completion may result in additional penalties. • Student management system / Academic Integrity Register updated by the Academic Integrity Coordinator. <p><i>*For assessments that are marked 0%, the grade is recorded as 0.1% to differentiate with non-submission of assessments.</i></p>

TABLE 2: PROCESS

Process	Person responsible	Timeframe	
Warning*			

<p>1. A lecturer may issue a student with a warning if they suspect a first offence.</p> <p>2. The lecturer submits the online academic integrity form in Moodle which is referred to the Academic Integrity Coordinator (AIC).</p> <p>3. The AIC checks the student's file in the student's profile to ensure that the incident was a first offence and notifies the lecturer within two business days.</p> <p>4. The lecturer then communicates the warning to the student by email, advising that no penalty has been given but that the warning has been added to the student's record.</p> <p>5. The AIC updates the Academic Integrity Register.</p> <p>6. The lecturer may seek advice from the Academic Integrity Coordinator (AIC) if required.</p>	Lecturer & AIC	Immediate	
Level 1 (minor & unintentional)*			
<p>1. If a lecturer suspects Level 1 academic misconduct, the lecturer completes the online academic integrity form in Moodle.</p> <p>2. The Academic Integrity Coordinator (AIC) checks the student's file in the student's profile to ensure that the incident was a first offence and notifies the lecturer within two business days.</p> <p>3. The lecturer determines the Level 1 penalty (see Table 1). Past precedents of Level 1 penalties are referred to as a guide for ensuring consistency.</p> <p>4. The lecturer emails the student (and the AIC) of the outcome and advises them that they have the right to lodge a complaint as per the <i>Complaints and Appeals Policy</i> if they are dissatisfied with the outcome.</p> <p>5. The AIC updates the student record in the Academic Integrity Register.</p> <p>6. The lecturer may seek advice from the AIC if required.</p>	Lecturer & AIC	<p>Student responds within three working days</p> <p>Penalty determined within five working days of receiving the student's response</p>	
Level 2 (intentional)* and Level 3 (serious and intentional)*			
<p>1. The lecturer completes the online academic integrity form. At this stage, it may not be evident if the misconduct is a Level 2 or Level 3.</p> <p>2. The Academic Integrity Coordinator (AIC) checks the student's profile for any previous allegations of misconduct and notify the lecturer if a change is needed within two business days.</p> <p>3. The AIC then assigns the case to an Academic Integrity Officer (AIO) and notifies the relevant Program Manager(s). The AIO then reviews the allegation which includes discussing the case with the lecturer, reviewing all evidence and using detection software as necessary.</p> <p>4. The AIO emails the student inviting them to attend an interview with the AIO and lecturer to respond to an academic integrity concern.</p> <p>The interview is normally scheduled to be held within five working days of the student being contacted. The interview is recorded and the student may bring a support person if they wish, but the support person is not permitted to participate.</p> <p>Students are expected to bring evidence in support of their case e.g. drafts of assignments, evidence of access to references, etc.</p> <p>If the student is unable to attend on the prescribed date/time (some flexibility, within a three-day period, may be afforded at the Institution's discretion), they are advised that the investigation will continue in their absence.</p> <p>4. After the interview, the AIO and lecturer discuss the student's response, and determines whether the allegation has been proven and the level of misconduct.</p> <p>5. Within three working days of the interview, the AIO emails the relevant Program Manager and AIC (Level 2) or the Program Manager, Dean/Associate Dean and the AIC (Level 3) with:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • a recording of the interview; • a summary of the discussions between the AIO and lecturer; • the evidence; • the student's response; • a recommendation of Level 2 or Level 3 misconduct. <p>6. For Level 2 cases, the Program Manager reviews the case (including a check of the student's record for previous offences) and makes a final determination on the level of misconduct and the appropriate penalty (see Table 1). The outcome is normally determined within five working days of receipt of the documentation from the AIO. Past precedents of penalties are referred to as a guide for ensuring consistency.</p> <p>7. For Level 3 cases, the Program Manager convenes an Academic Integrity Panel to review the case (including a check of the student's record for previous offences) and makes a final determination on the level of misconduct and the appropriate penalty (see Table 1).</p> <p>The Academic Integrity Panel normally comprises the Program Manager, AIO and the relevant Dean/Associate Dean. For cases that may involve suspension or cancellation of enrolment, the DVC (Learning and Teaching) and Registrar are also invited as members of the Panel.</p> <p>The outcome is normally determined within five working days of receipt of the documentation from the AIO. Past precedents of penalties are referred to as a guide for ensuring consistency.</p> <p>8. The Program Manager emails the student of the outcome and advises them that they have the right to lodge a complaint as per the <i>Complaints and Appeals Policy</i> if they are dissatisfied with the outcome.</p> <p>9. The Student Success Centre is notified of all Level 3 cases and contacts the student for support.</p> <p>10. The AIC updates the student record in the Academic Integrity Register.</p> <p>11. For international students, the Program Manager notifies the Student Centre of any enrolment changes so that they can report this to the Department of Home Affairs (after the appeals process is complete), as per the Suspension and Cancellation Procedures.</p>	<p>Lecturer Academic Integrity Coordinator Academic Integrity Officer Program Manager Dean/Associate Dean</p>	<p>Student responds within three days to the invitation to attend an interview.</p> <p>Penalty determined within five working days of receipt of the documentation from the AIO</p>	
Historical cases of academic misconduct			

1. For historical cases of academic misconduct that have been identified (i.e. lapsed enrolment, graduated from a course or been identified through TEQSA's data disclosure processes), an AIO reviews the allegation which includes discussing the case with the lecturer, notifying the student's Program Manager, reviewing all evidence and using detection software as necessary. 2. For cases that relate to a student who is currently enrolled, the processes outlined above in Table 2 are followed. 3. For cases that relate to a student who has already graduated, the AIC convenes an Academic Misconduct Panel. 4. If the Academic Misconduct Panel determines to pursue the allegation, the graduate is notified of the allegation and given the opportunity to respond. 5. The Academic Misconduct Panel considers the graduate's response and the appropriate penalty, which may include rescinding the qualification. 6. For recommendations that relate to the revocation of an award, legal advice should be sought.	Academic Integrity Coordinator		
---	--------------------------------	--	--

**An academic integrity allegation may be withdrawn at the discretion of the Institution as a result of an investigation. Allegations that are withdrawn by the Institution are not recorded in the Academic Integrity Register or, if applicable, deleted from the Academic Integrity Register.*

5. Compliance, monitoring and reporting

5.1 The Learning and Teaching Committee (LTC) monitors the effectiveness of the Academic Integrity Procedures and receives regular reports on academic integrity matters and misconduct data for quality assurance and improvement purposes and to monitor for any emerging threats to academic integrity. The LTC reports to the Academic Board.

5.2 For international students on a student visa, the Institution ensures that any suspensions, cancellations or expulsions are undertaken in accordance with the Standard 9 of the National Code of Practice for Providers of Education and Training to Overseas Students 2018.

5.3 For international students, a suspension or cancellation of the student's enrolment is reported to the Department of Home Affairs via PRISMS as soon as practicable. Students will need to seek advice from immigration on the potential impact on their student visa.

5.4 Confidentiality is maintained at all times in accordance with the Privacy Policy.

The [Academic Integrity Partnership Model](#) provides a visual representation of the procedures.

Approved by Learning and Teaching Committee on 20 June 2025