

Code of Good Practice on Managing Academic Misconduct (including plagiarism, cheating and collusion)

[TQA Manual - Introduction and Contents](#)

[Implementation: for all with effect from the start of the academic year 2008/09]

[PART I](#) of this document sets out the principles and procedures which will be observed by the University when dealing with an allegation of academic misconduct by both currently registered students and alumni of the University.

[PART II](#) of this document sets out the definitions used by the University in the area of academic misconduct.

[PART III](#) sets out the University categorisation of Academic Misconduct and links to annex 1 which sets out the range of penalties linked to each category.

[PART IV](#) sets out the responsibilities of the University, Schools and Students in the area of academic misconduct.

[PART V](#) of this code contains the Procedures for Handling Cases of Suspected Cheating, including Plagiarism, in University Assessments which must be adhered to by all staff handling cases of suspected cheating.

References to "assessment" should be taken to include any piece of work submitted for either formative or summative assessment, including an examination script or thesis.

This code does not cover academic misconduct by University staff.

If students or staff require advice or guidance about this document, they should contact the [Faculty Office](#) on 01392 26(3328). Students should also note that the [Guild Advice Unit](#) can provide support for students in the handling of academic misconduct cases, they can be contacted on 01392 26(3052) or studentadvice@exeter.ac.uk.

PART I

Principles

1. The University takes any instances of academic misconduct very seriously and expects all of its students to behave in a manner which upholds the principles of academic honesty. The University will promote a culture of academic honesty, encouraging academic honesty in all students.

2. Academic honesty is fundamental to the values promoted by the University and no student should be allowed to obtain for him/herself, or for another candidate, an unfair advantage as a result of academic dishonesty. 'Academic Honesty' means never falsifying the results of any research and always giving full credit for any other people's contributions to our own achievements.¹
3. The Taught and Research Faculties will have oversight of all cases of academic misconduct in order that they can carry out the University's reporting requirements. This will include responding to requests for information under the Freedom of Information and Data Protection Acts.
4. All decisions taken under this code of good practice or the Procedures for Handling Cases of Suspected Cheating, including Plagiarism, in University Assessments shall take full account of natural justice, fairness and equity, and all procedures and penalties should be applied consistently within and between Schools and the Faculties.
5. Any penalty imposed should be proportionate to the seriousness of the academic misconduct. Clear evidence of an intention to gain advantage will also be an aggravating factor. The level at which the student is studying may also be a relevant criterion. The extent of the misconduct and the extent of the intention to deceive are the key factors in determining the category of academic misconduct.
6. When considering an allegation of academic misconduct the assessment impact is not a relevant issue i.e. Staff should not differentiate between formative and summative assessments.
7. Students found guilty of 'Academic Misconduct' or 'Severe Academic Misconduct' (see annex 1) should be penalised more severely than those who do not submit an assessment by the required deadline.
8. When considering cases of alleged academic misconduct, Committees will investigate, adjudicate and then apply penalties if appropriate.
9. If after investigation no case of academic misconduct is found against a student, no record will be kept on the student's file.
10. Information on proven cases of academic misconduct will be available to staff who are asked to provide references for students.
11. All cases of academic misconduct shall be defined as 'poor academic practice' 'academic misconduct' or 'severe academic misconduct' (see [Part II](#) for the definition of these categories).
12. The University provides guidance on appropriate penalties for cases of academic misconduct (see annex 1). However, each School Panel or Committee of Academic Enquiry will have discretion in the penalty they choose to apply within the defined range.
13. Where there is a prima facie case of suspected cheating/plagiarism all previous summatively assessed work counting towards classification of a programme will be re-checked for evidence of academic misconduct. In the case of cheating in an examination, any penalty imposed is not necessarily limited to the exam in which the cheating took place.
14. Second cases of academic misconduct will normally receive a more severe penalty than earlier ones. However, a case will only be regarded as a second case if the assessment in question was submitted after the student had been found guilty of 'poor academic practice'/'academic misconduct' in an earlier piece of work and a penalty imposed, i.e. after they have been informed of the outcome by the School/Committee of Academic Enquiry.

15. In general, the University will not consider mitigation in cases of academic misconduct. Students who are unable to complete an assessment through illness or other personal circumstances should apply for mitigation through the appropriate channels at the time that the circumstances and/or illness occurs and such circumstances cannot be considered as an excuse for academic misconduct. The only exception would be when a student could provide clinical evidence that the mitigating circumstances affected the student's judgement in such a way as to lead directly to the alleged misconduct. Students presenting such evidence should be immediately referred to the Fitness to Study procedure, and all academic misconduct proceedings suspended.

PART II

Definitions

Cheating

Cheating is defined as any illegitimate behaviour which may deceive those setting, administering and marking the assessment. Cheating in a University assessment is a very serious academic offence, which may lead ultimately to expulsion from the University. Cheating can take one of a number of forms, including:

- (a) The use of unauthorised books, notes, electronic aids or other materials in an examination;
- (b) Obtaining an examination paper ahead of its authorised release;
- (c) **Collusion**, i.e. the representation of another's work or ideas as one's own without appropriate acknowledgement or referencing, where the owner of the work knows of the situation and both work towards the deceit of a third party. This differs from plagiarism where the owner of the work does not knowingly allow the use of his or her work;
- (d) Acting dishonestly in any way including fabrication of data, whether before, during or after an examination or other assessment so as to either obtain or offer to others an unfair advantage in that examination or assessment;
- (e) **Plagiarism**, i.e. the act of representing another's work or ideas as one's own without appropriate acknowledgement or referencing. There are three main types of plagiarism, which could occur within all modes of assessment (including examination):
 - (i) Direct copying of text from a book, article, fellow student's essay, handout, thesis, web page or other source without proper acknowledgement.

(ii) Claiming individual ideas derived from a book, article etc. as one's own, and incorporating them into one's work without acknowledging the source of these ideas.

(iii) Overly depending on the work of one or more others without proper acknowledgement of the source, by constructing an essay, project etc. by extracting large sections of text from another source, and merely linking these together with a few of one's own sentences.

(Schools may wish to extend these definitions for specific subject areas and provide students with examples as appropriate. The correct referencing system for making quotations explicit and acknowledging sources should be available through personal tutors or supervisors, specific tutorial sessions in Schools, and Schools' student and research handbooks.)

Assessment

Any piece of work submitted for either formative or summative assessment, including an examination script or thesis.

Formal Examinations

An assessment within a formal (including School-based) examination hall.

References to People or Offices

Where the procedures refer to University officers and members of staff (including members of Senate), it is standard practice that such procedures may, where appropriate, be handled through an appropriate person nominated by the stated officer/staff member to act on their behalf.

In the cases below where the Faculty Office is referenced they are acting on the delegated authority of the Director of Academic Services, direct reference to the Faculty Office has been made however to ensure that the actions that need to be taken are as clear as possible.

All references to the Head of School can also imply that the Head of School may delegate their authority within this procedure to another senior member of staff within the School.

References throughout this document to students should also be taken to mean alumni of the University in respect of work undertaken whilst a student of the University.

PART III

Categorisation of Academic Misconduct

The tariff of penalties for academic misconduct are detailed in annex 1.

Poor Academic Practice

Misconduct appears to have arisen from lack of understanding of academic protocols, most common in early stages of programme.

Examples:

- inadequate referencing
- inclusion of inadequate paraphrasing or of un-attributed or incorrectly attributed copying, based on the same point of misunderstanding.

It would not be acceptable to consider a case as “poor academic practice” in any of the following circumstances:

(a) there is any indication that the student intended to gain an unfair advantage, or;

(b) the student had already committed an offence of “poor academic practice” of a similar academic kind or had committed an offence of “academic misconduct” or “severe academic misconduct” of any kind.

Poor academic practice cases are always handled at School-level.

Academic Misconduct

Misconduct involves behaviour which, if not detected, would have deceived those setting, administering and marking the assessment and/or would have obtained advantage on the part of the student.

Examples:

- An assignment includes text which is either inadequately paraphrased or directly quoted without speech marks and not referenced;
- An assignment fails to provide a reference in the text for ideas that are not the student's own;
- An assignment contains text, tables etc which are identical to that of another student;
- An assignment which is identical or closely related to one submitted by the student at an earlier point and for which a mark has been received.

Academic misconduct cases are normally handled at School-level. All cases of cheating in examinations must be referred to the Faculty Office, and as such should be classed as examples of severe academic misconduct.

Severe Academic Misconduct

Misconduct is a second offence or involves evidence of extensive plagiarism or cheating, clear evidence of behaviour which is designed to deceive those setting, administering and marking the assessment and/or to obtain advantage on the part of the student.

Examples:

- Taking notes into or using any unauthorised device in an examination;
- Impersonating another person during an examination or arranging for another person to impersonate you during an examination;
- An assignment includes extensive and significant quantities of un-attributed or incorrectly attributed copying which makes a significant contribution to the assignment;
- Any case where a student has previously been penalised for plagiarism;
- The use by a student of essay sites that involve a commercial transaction;
- Plagiarism within a dissertation or thesis of a postgraduate programme (both taught and research) would be placed within this category, unless the extent of the plagiarism was considered to be very minimal.

Suspected severe academic misconduct cases are normally referred by the School directly to a Committee of Academic Enquiry.

PART IV

Responsibilities of the University

1. The University will ensure that all procedures and policies relating to academic misconduct are fit for purpose and widely available to both staff and students.
2. The University will ensure that all staff involved in handling academic misconduct cases have access to suitable training and development opportunities.
3. The University will support Schools in developing methods to reduce the incidences of plagiarism, particularly in the design of assessment and will provide staff with the appropriate tools to detect cases of plagiarism in a timely manner.
4. The University will ensure that students have access to the appropriate levels of support, counselling and advice to help avoid academic misconduct and to support students if academic misconduct is proven against them.
5. The University will provide appropriate online training for students in how to avoid academic misconduct.
6. The University will keep records of all cases of academic misconduct, providing reports to relevant bodies as appropriate.

Responsibilities of Schools

1. All Schools will ensure that they have appropriate arrangements in place to ensure that they comply with the requirements set out in this code of practice and will follow the procedures set out in the Procedures for Handling Cases of Suspected Cheating, including Plagiarism, in University Assessments when handling suspected cases of academic misconduct.
2. All Schools will appoint at least one Academic Misconduct Officer who will:
 - (a) Provide a source of information and support within their School on dealing with cases of suspected cheating as well as being the primary School-based source of advice on preventative measures;

(b) Attend School-level plagiarism hearings, and act as an expert and source of advice to their Head of School in these matters;

(c) Be available to attend Committees of Academic Enquiry as committee members.

3. All Schools will provide students with training and support on what constitutes academic misconduct alongside subject specific information on appropriate referencing during the induction process (for all stages of entry i.e. including those who enter mid- year or directly into year 2). This information should be reinforced as appropriate throughout a student's studies.
4. All Schools will have in place mechanisms to inform students at the start of their programme that they are required to complete the WebCT course 'Academic Honesty and Plagiarism'.
5. All Schools will provide students with assessment cover sheets for written work or the opportunity to agree to a declaration for electronic submission, which certifies that their submitted work is entirely their own or appropriately referenced (See: Guidelines for setting and submission of work).
6. All Schools will ensure that their handbooks provide guidance on academic misconduct and links to relevant University documentation on academic misconduct.
7. All Schools will have appropriate mechanisms to detect plagiarism and will provide School specific guidance for all staff involved in investigating alleged cases of academic misconduct.
8. All Schools will consider the issue of academic misconduct when designing assessment, and will promote assessment designed to limit opportunities for academic misconduct.

Resources for Staff

The Academic Development Unit website is the key resource for staff. See:
<http://www.as.ex.ac.uk/eeu/academicdevelopment/content/view/35/76/>

Responsibilities of Students

1. Each student will adopt the University's culture of academic honesty, encouraging academic honesty in others.
2. Each student will familiarise him or herself with the University procedures relating to academic misconduct and their School specific guidance on referencing and how to avoid plagiarism. Ignorance of these procedures and guidance is not considered to be an excuse for academic misconduct.
3. Each student will certify when submitting work for assessment the extent to which the work is his/her own.
4. Each student will complete the WebCT course 'Academic Honesty and Plagiarism' at the start of their programme and will seek guidance from their Personal Tutor if further support is required.

5. Each student will regularly re-evaluate their own understanding of the principle of academic honesty, seeking additional support if required from their Personal Tutor or other relevant staff as indicated by the School in their Student Handbooks.
6. Each student will participate in any additional support recommended by their School, such as the academic writing course or tutorial support offered through INTO.

Resources for Students

The key resource for students is the module “Academic Honesty and Plagiarism” which can be found near the top of the list of modules on each students’ WeBCT home page. Every student has access to this course and is required to complete the course at the start of each academic year.

The Library provides students with guidance on Citing and Referencing, see:
<http://www.library.ex.ac.uk/infoskills/referencing.html>

Each School will provide discipline specific resources to help students avoid academic misconduct.

PART V

Procedures for Handling Cases of Suspected Cheating, including Plagiarism, in University Assessments

The University has a procedure which sets out how cases of Suspected Cheating, including Plagiarism, in University Assessments will be handled. All cases of suspected cheating will be handled in accordance with these procedures. The Procedures should be handled in the context of the whole Code of Practice, and particular attention should be paid to the definitions listed above.

[Implementation: for all with immediate effect]

[Procedures for Partner Institutions: All partner institutions delivering programmes validated by the University of Exeter are required to follow the procedures below, except that 'Head of School' shall be taken to mean Head of the academic unit concerned, who shall keep the Principal of the partner institution informed.]

1 Definitions

1.1 Section II of the Code of Good Practice sets out the definitions used within this document.

2 Application

2.1 These procedures apply to all currently registered students and alumni of the university.

2.2 In the interests of natural justice, a student should normally be present at any School panel meeting or Committee of Academic Enquiry in order to defend their conduct. However, a student may not prevent a hearing by refusing to attend, so a Panel or Committee of Academic Enquiry may proceed without the student's presence if (a) the student has agreed to this happening or (b) reasonable steps have been taken to enable the student to be present.

2.3 The majority of staff on a School Panel should not include those who are responsible for setting, marking or supervising the assignment to which the allegation refers.

2.4 All allegations of academic misconduct should be considered in a timely fashion and students should be informed of any delays to proceedings.

3 Guidance to Invigilators and Markers where Evidence of Suspected Cheating/Plagiarism is found

3.1 Suspected Cheating/Plagiarism in Essays, Projects, Dissertations, Class Tests and Other Assessment Types:

Where a marker suspects that a student's submission contains evidence of cheating/plagiarism, he/she should consult the Head of the School responsible for the teaching of the module concerned before any further action is taken.

3.2 Where there is clear evidence of an attempt to cheat during a formal examination, the Principal Invigilator in that examination hall shall, having consulted all other Invigilators present, warn the candidate of their conduct, but allow the candidate to complete the examination, confiscating any unauthorised materials immediately. At the end of the examination the Principal Invigilator will inform the student that a report will be submitted to the Director of Academic Services' office directly thereafter.

4 Procedures for dealing with Suspected Cheating/Plagiarism at School Level

4.1 In cases where evidence of suspected cheating/plagiarism is found, the Head of the School teaching that module (or, in the case of postgraduate research students the Head of School to which the student belongs) shall deal with the matter internally in the first instance.² If the Head of School believes that there is a *prima facie* case of suspected cheating/plagiarism, the student will be advised in writing (normally within 10 working days of the case being reported to the Head of School) of the nature of the suspected offence. The letter should include, as a minimum, the information laid out in the appropriate template letter in the annex 3. In this letter the Head of School will indicate which of the following procedures will apply:

- (i) The Academic Misconduct Officer will present a case to the Head of School for application of penalty without a formal meeting with the student, in accordance with the Procedure outlined under 4.2 below. This is normally appropriate for cases of poor academic practice;

(ii) a formal meeting² with the student will be convened and chaired by the Head of School to discuss the case, in accordance with the Procedure outlined under 4.3 below. This is normally appropriate for cases of Academic Misconduct;

(iii) the case will be referred directly to the [Faculty Office](#), in accordance with the Procedure outlined under 5 below. This is normally appropriate for cases of Severe Academic Misconduct where the School believes that the appropriate penalty goes beyond that which it is in their powers to apply (see Annex 1).

In all cases the [Faculty Office](#) shall be copied into the Head of School's letter.

4.2 In those cases in which clear evidence of poor academic practice has been found and the Head of School considers that an appropriate penalty may be applied in accordance with 4.4, they may inform the student of the decision without it being necessary to convene a meeting with the student. A letter should be sent to the student, along with all documentation, providing them with an opportunity, within 10 working days of receipt of the letter to ask for a meeting to be held in accordance with 4.3, where they can present evidence to suggest why the penalty outlined by the Head of School is inappropriate, the letter should include, as a minimum, the information laid out in the template letter A in annex 3.

4.3 In those cases in which a meeting with the student is convened and chaired by the Head of School or representative, such a meeting will include at least one other member of staff of the School and the School Administrator or representative acting as secretary to the meeting, and taking a written record of the meeting for the file. Attention should be given to gender balance, in the make-up of the panel. Panels should normally include an Academic Misconduct Officer. A majority of the panel should not have had prior involvement in the case. The student shall be entitled to attend for the duration of the meeting, although the panel may ask the student and their representative to withdraw, whilst reaching a decision. All relevant documentation shall be made available to a student five working days prior to the meeting. The student may make a written statement to the Committee and may also call witnesses of his/her own. The student may be accompanied by a person who should normally be a member of the University (with any variation to this principle at the discretion of the Chair), such as a staff member, a member of the Guild of Students, or another student. The purpose of this person is to assist the student during the course of the meeting, and they may take a written record on the student's behalf, although the use of electronic audio recording equipment will not normally be allowed. The student must provide the School with their written statement at least one whole working day ahead of the meeting along with confirmation of whether or not they will be attending, whether they will be calling any witnesses and whether they will be bringing someone with them.

If it is determined that an offence has taken place, the student shall be informed in writing (normally within five working days) of the decision and the penalty to be imposed, in accordance with 4.4 below, as soon as practicable, the letter should include, as a

minimum, the information laid out in the template letter B in annex 3. The letter must be copied to the relevant [Faculty Office](#).

4.4 Should the Head of School conclude, that there has indeed been a case of cheating (including plagiarism/collusion) the Head of School may apply a penalty that will not, of itself immediately endanger a student's progression or intended final award. Performance on other modules should not be a consideration at this point. Decisions on penalties should be made with consideration of the tariff of penalties, attached as [annex 1](#).

The Head of School may also refer the case to the [Faculty Office](#) (see section 5), if none of the above sanctions appears appropriate, and will write to the student to indicate this, the letter should include, as a minimum, the information laid out in the template letter C in annex 3.

4.5 For instances of suspected cheating/plagiarism for postgraduate research students where suspected cheating/plagiarism is discovered at the pre-submission stage, the Head of School shall deal with the matter internally in the first instance as set out in section 4.1. In those cases in which a meeting with the student is convened, the maximum penalty shall normally be a requirement to re-draft the relevant section(s) of the thesis to the satisfaction of the supervisor and the Head of School. Cases where minor redrafting would be inappropriate in view of the prima facie case found by the Head of School should be referred to the [Faculty Office](#) (see section 5).

4.6 For instances of suspected cheating/plagiarism for postgraduate research students where suspected cheating/plagiarism is discovered by the examiner(s) at the post-submission stage, the examiner(s) shall prepare a jointly-signed report to be sent without delay to the [Faculty Office](#), copied to the Head of School. The Director of Academic Services in consultation with the Dean of the appropriate Faculty shall decide whether the case warrants convening a Committee of Academic Enquiry or whether to refer the case back to the Head of School to deal with the matter internally, as set out in section 4.1. If the case is referred back to the Head of School to handle, the maximum penalty shall normally be a requirement to re-draft the relevant section(s) of the thesis to the satisfaction of the supervisor, the examiners and the Head of School.. The Board of Examiners should not meet, or prepare a final report, until the Chair of the Board is notified of the outcome of the case.

4.7 The student shall have the right of appeal against any decision taken under sections 4.2/4.3/4.4. The appeal, which must be received by the [Faculty Office](#) within 10 working days of the student receiving the Head of School's letter, shall be heard by the Dean of the appropriate Faculty. (Where the Dean is a member of the School concerned a Dean from another Faculty shall hear the appeal.) If the Dean and the Director of Academic Services consider that a case may be a valid appeal, a Senate Appeal Committee shall be convened. There shall be no right of appeal against the decision of the Dean in such cases (see also section 6: Appeals).

5 Procedures for Committees of Academic Enquiry

[See the flowchart at Annex 2]

5.1 In cases of suspected cheating referred to the [Faculty Office](#) after consideration at School level (Section 4), the Head of the School teaching the module shall without delay submit a report, counter-signed by the marker of the assessment (where different) to the [Faculty Office](#), at the same time informing the student that he/she is being reported for suspected cheating/plagiarism. In cases of plagiarism the report shall clearly indicate (by cross-referencing) what sections of text have been plagiarised, and from what source; in other instances of cheating clear evidence supporting the case must be provided. For postgraduate research students, where the suspected cheating is discovered by the examiner(s) at the post-submission stage the report by the Head of School should include a jointly-signed report prepared by the examiners.

5.2 In cases of suspected cheating discovered during formal exam hall conditions, on receipt of the Principal Invigilator's report and the accompanying evidence, the [Faculty Office](#) shall without delay inform the student in writing that they have been reported for suspected cheating. The [Faculty Office](#) shall copy the Principal Invigilator's report to the Head of the School teaching the module and to that School's (or department's, where appropriate) Academic Misconduct Officer. The Principal Invigilator's Report to the Director of Academic Services shall be counter-signed by the other Invigilators present.

The Director of Academic Services, having consulted all Invigilators present and the student's Head of School as necessary, shall decide whether the case warrants invoking the procedures for handling cases of suspected cheating. In cases where such a process is not deemed necessary, the student shall be warned as appropriate by the Director of Academic Services (normally within ten working days of the suspected offence) concerning their conduct.

If it becomes apparent after an examination has finished (for instance when the work is being marked) that a student may have cheated during that examination, then the same procedures are to be followed. In such cases the report shall be submitted by the Head of the School teaching the module concerned to the [Faculty Office](#).

5.3 In the case of taught programmes, where a meeting of a Board of Examiners is imminent, the Head of School shall ensure that the Chair of the Board receives a copy of the report to the [Faculty Office](#). The Board of Examiners shall consider the examinee's programme assessment profile purely on the marks available to it. Once the Board of Examiners has reached its decision the Chair shall then inform the Board of the receipt of a report regarding suspected cheating/plagiarism for that candidate. The Board of Examiners shall not include on any class or pass list the name of any candidate in respect of whom it has received such a report until the Chair of the Board is notified of the outcome of the case by the [Faculty Office](#). In the case of cheating relating to research programmes, the Board of Examiners should not meet, or prepare a final report, until the Chair of the Board of Examiners is notified of the outcome of the case by the [Faculty Office](#).

5.4 The [Faculty Office](#) shall normally convene a (non-standing) Committee of Academic Enquiry to meet as soon as possible following receipt of the Head of School's report. The Committee shall hear and decide upon the case (with Senate's delegated authority). The Committee shall comprise a Dean of the relevant Faculty (or a nominated representative) as chair and two members drawn from nominated School Academic

Misconduct Officers. The Committee of Academic Enquiry will not include any members from the School of the student in question.

5.5 Exceptionally (in cases where the scale of offence does not warrant a Committee hearing), on receiving a report from a Head of School and/or Principal Invigilator the Director of Academic Services may, in consultation with the Dean of the appropriate Faculty, direct the Head of School to deal with the suspected case as set out in section 4 of these procedures.

5.6 The [Faculty Office](#) shall inform the student in writing of the Committee's meeting, to which he/she is invited to attend. Not less than five working days ahead of that meeting, the [Faculty Office](#) shall supply the student with a copy of the report from the Head of School/Principal Invigilator, along with any other supporting evidence and a copy of these procedures. The student may make a written statement to the Committee and may also call witnesses of his/her own, the details of which must be provided to the [Faculty Office](#) not later than one whole working day ahead of the Committee's meeting.

The student shall be entitled to attend the Committee meeting for the duration of the hearing (except as detailed in 5.8 below). The student may be accompanied by a person who should normally be a member of the University (with any variation to this principle at the discretion of the Chair), such as a staff member, a member of the Guild of Students, or another student. The purpose of this person is to assist the student during the course of the meeting, and they may take a written record on the student's behalf, although the use of electronic audio recording equipment will not normally be allowed. With the permission of the Chair, s/he may take a role in the cross-examination of any witnesses on behalf of the student and may make summative remarks following the student's concluding statement. The student may indicate at the start of the hearing whether the accompanying person was expected to take an active role in the proceeding. The student may direct questions to the Head of School or representative (and any witnesses called) directly in an appropriate manner.

5.7 The Head of the School or representative submitting the report shall be invited to attend for the duration of the meeting (except as detailed in 5.8 below) and present the case to the Committee, and shall have the right to call other witnesses to appear before the Committee. The [Faculty Office](#) shall be notified of these witnesses not later than one whole working day ahead of the Board meeting. The Head of School or representative may also call the student as a witness and may then direct questions to the student directly in an appropriate manner at the Chair's discretion. A student may refuse to give evidence without detrimental effect.

Should a student decide not to exercise his or her right of attendance, the hearing may proceed in the student's absence. Should the student subsequently, normally within 10 working days, present mitigating circumstances explaining the absence to the Chair's satisfaction, a Committee consisting of members not previously involved may be convened.

[For details to the conduct of a hearing, see flowchart at Annex 2]

5.8 The Committee shall require the student and the Head of School or representative concerned to withdraw while it reaches its decision. However, a student may, at the

Chair's discretion, be given the opportunity to address the panel in the absence of the Head of School or representative. The panel may recall the Head of School following the student's statement, should the need arise.

If the Committee determines that an offence has taken place, it shall inform the student, the Head of School (and the Chair of the Board of Examiners where different) in writing of its decision and the penalty to be imposed. The penalties open to the Committee shall include expulsion from the University.

6 Appeals

6.1 The student shall have the right of appeal against a decision taken at School-level or at a Committee of Academic Enquiry. The student must submit a letter, to the [Faculty Office](#), describing the grounds of their appeal with reference to any appropriate evidence. The appeal must be received by the [Faculty Office](#) within 10 working days of the student receiving a letter regarding the outcome of the hearing.

6.2 Students should note that an appeal against a decision taken at School level or at a Committee of Academic Enquiry will only be accepted if:

- (a) there is evidence of procedural irregularity;
- (b) there is evidence of bias;
- (c) the decision reached is one that no reasonable body (properly directing itself, and taking into account all relevant factors) could have arrived at;
- (d) the student submits further material circumstances which could not reasonably have been expected to have been submitted for consideration to the Committee of Academic Enquiry (see principle 16 above).

The appeal, which must be received within 10 working days of the student receiving a letter regarding the outcome of the hearing, shall be heard by a Senate Appeal Committee. This Committee would have the power to confirm, to set aside or to vary the penalty imposed by the School-level hearing or the Committee of Academic Enquiry. There shall be no internal right of appeal against the decision of the Appeal Committee.

6.3 The Director of Academic Services in consultation with the Dean of the Faculty to which the student belongs or their nominated representatives, who will not have had any previous involvement with the case, will establish whether there is a prima facie case for considering the case before a Senate Appeal Committee.

6.4 If no prima facie grounds for appeal are found, the [Faculty Office](#) and the Dean or their representatives shall dismiss the appeal, informing the student in writing of the reasons for doing so. See also paragraph 6.13.

6.5 If it is decided that there is a prima facie case for an appeal, a Senate Appeal Committee shall be convened. This Appeal Committee would have the power to confirm,

to set aside or to vary the penalty imposed by the School-level hearing or the Committee of Academic Enquiry. There shall be no further internal right of appeal against the decision of the Appeal Committee.

6.6 A Senate Appeal Committee shall comprise three members (including a student representative) of the Senate, which shall appoint the Chair from among that number. No person shall be entitled to be a member of the Appeal Committee who is also associated with the appellant's School and/or programme of study or who has previously been involved in the appeal.

6.7 The appellant shall be informed of the date of the meeting of the Appeal Committee not less than 10 working days in advance. He/she may choose to appear before the Appeal Committee but the Committee may also hear a case, by mutual agreement, in the absence of the appellant. The appellants shall be entitled to attend the Committee meeting for the duration of the hearing, but will be required to withdraw whilst the Committee reaches its decision. Proxies for appellants shall not normally be allowed. The student may be accompanied by a person who should normally be a member of the University (with any variation to this principle at the discretion of the Chair), such as a staff member, a member of the Guild of Students, or another student. The purpose of this person is to assist the student during the course of the meeting, and they may take a written record on the student's behalf, although the use of electronic audio recording equipment will not normally be allowed. With the permission of the Chair, s/he may take a role in the cross-examination of any witnesses on behalf of the student and may make summative remarks following the student's concluding statement. The student may indicate at the start of the hearing whether the accompanying person was expected to take an active role in the proceeding. The student may direct questions to the Head of School or representative (and any witnesses called) directly in an appropriate manner.

6.8 The Appeal Committee shall call the Head of School or academic unit (or appropriate representative) and shall be empowered to call other members of the University or partner institution.

6.9 The Appeal Committee, having considered the evidence, may uphold or reject the appeal, such a decision being final.

6.10 The Appeal Committee shall minute its deliberations and decisions and submit a report to the Senate. If the Committee's report includes a recommendation requiring action before the next meeting of the Senate, it shall be for the Vice-Chancellor to authorise action and then report to the Senate retrospectively.

6.11 The Secretary of the Committee shall notify the appellant in writing of the Appeal Committee's decision, giving the reasons for it.

6.12 If an appeal is upheld by the Appeal Committee, the appellant has the right to make representations to the Registrar and Secretary for the reimbursement of reasonable and proportionate incidental expenses incurred by the appeal.

6.13 There are no other University appeal procedures beyond those stages detailed above. If in the opinion of a student an appeal remains unresolved after the exhaustion

of the appropriate processes, application may be made to the Office of the Independent Adjudicator (OIA) for Higher Education. For further details see <http://www.oiahe.org.uk>.

PROFESSOR J M KAY
Deputy Vice-Chancellor

July 2008

Last updated May 2009

Last reviewed October 2008

ANNEX 1 - TARIFF OF PENALTIES

Poor Academic Practice ⁴		
Action	Effect on Mark	Notes
Receive a written warning	None	Ensures that a record is kept in case of future incidences. Should be used in concert with webCT module
Complete webCT plagiarism module	None	Rehabilitative and ensures full understanding on part of the student going forward
Receive individual Support	None	Rehabilitative and ensures full understanding on part of the student going forward.
Require student to apologise to those they have deceived	None	Highlights impacts of plagiarism on other people. May be used in cases of cheating where e.g. a student has used another's work. May also consider asking student to apologise to academic staff.

Revise piece of work in question to remove reference to plagiarism	None	Ensures student's understanding of offence going forward.
	Award same penalty as for non-submission of work	Only suitable for formative assignments
	Cap item at or above pass mark	
	Cap item between pass mark and 0	
	Cap module between pass mark and 0	If module is non-condonable student may not be able to proceed or receive intended award
Submit a new piece of work in its place	None	

Academic Misconduct ⁵		
Action	Effect on Mark	Description
Complete webCT plagiarism module.	None*	Rehabilitative and ensures full understanding on part of the student going forward.
Receive individual Support	None*	Rehabilitative and ensures full understanding on part of the student going forward.
Require student to apologise to those they have deceived	None*	Highlights impacts of plagiarism on other people. May be used in cases of cheating where e.g. a student has used another's work. May also consider asking student to apologise to academic staff.
Revise piece of work in question to remove	Cap item at or above pass mark	

reference to plagiarism	Cap item between pass mark and 0	
	Cap module at or above pass mark	
	Cap module between pass mark and 0 with the right of referral	
	Cap module between pass mark and 0	If module is non-condonable student may not be able to proceed or receive intended award
Submit a new piece of work in its place	None	
	Cap item at or above pass mark	
	Cap item between pass mark and 0	
	Cap module at or above pass mark	
	Cap module between pass mark and 0 with the right of referral	If module is non-condonable student may not be able to proceed or receive intended award
	Cap module between pass mark and 0	

* These actions should only be applied in conjunction with at least one other non-asterisked action.

Severe Academic Misconduct ⁶		
Action	Effect on Mark	Description
Complete webCT plagiarism module	None*	Rehabilitative and ensures full understanding on part of the student going forward
Receive individual Support	None*	Rehabilitative and ensures full understanding on part of the student going

		forward
Require student to apologise to those they have deceived	None*	Highlights impacts of plagiarism on other people. May be used in cases of cheating where e.g. a student has used another's work. May also consider asking student to apologise to academic staff
Revise piece of work in question to remove reference to plagiarism	Cap module at or above pass mark	
	Cap module between pass mark and 0 with the right of referral	
Submit a new piece of work in its place	Cap module at or above pass mark	
	Cap all examinations taken during the same examination period at 0	Suitable for cheating in examinations
	Cap module between pass mark and 0 with the right of referral	If module is non-condonable student may not be able to proceed or receive intended award
	Cap module between pass mark and 0	
Cap student's award at one lower than that for which they are registered		
Expulsion	Student will not receive marks which have not yet been confirmed	

* These actions should only be applied in conjunction with at least one other non-asterisked action.

ANNEX 2 (SECTION 1)

[Procedures for dealing with Cheating/Plagiarism at School Level – Flowchart](#)

ANNEX 2 (SECTION 2)

[Procedures for Committees of Academic Enquiry – Flowchart](#)

ANNEX 3

The following letters constitute minimum standards for the amount of information which should be communicated to students; Schools should feel free to expand upon them as appropriate. Aqua text indicates text which needs to be replaced by specifics.

A: Letter under 4.1(i) of the Procedures. Click [here](#) to download.

B: Letters under 4.1(ii) of the Procedures. Click to download [letter B\(1\)](#) or [letter B\(2\)](#).

C: Letter under 4.1(iii) of the Procedures. Click [here](#) to download.

¹ 'All my own work? Plagiarism and how to avoid it'

<http://www.ukcle.ac.uk/resources/trns/plagiarism/guide.html>, last accessed on 18 April 2008.

² The Faculty Office undertakes the collation of cases and penalties occurring across the University. Information and advice will be provided to Heads of School on request.

³ Student may choose not to exercise the right to attend for good reason. A student should not suffer any penalty for such a decision.

⁴ The penalty should be determined by the severity and extent of poor academic practice discovered. The level or stage at which a student is studying may also be relevant, in determining expected levels of familiarity and understanding of academic protocols: use of penalties with no effect on the mark would not normally be appropriate for students beyond stage 2.

⁵ The penalty should be determined by the severity and extent of academic misconduct discovered, and the degree to which deceit has been exercised. The level or stage at which a student is studying may also be relevant, in determining expected levels of familiarity and understanding of academic protocols.

⁶ The penalty should be determined by the severity and extent of severe academic misconduct discovered, and the degree to which deceit has been exercised. The level or stage at which a student is studying may also be relevant, in determining expected levels of familiarity and understanding of academic protocols.

Last updated September 2008

Last reviewed September 2008

[Top](#)
