

Student Academic Misconduct Procedures

Approved by:	Effective date:	Next review:
Education & Student Experience Committee	1 August 2023	2023/24. For implementation of any changes in 2024/25

Student Academic Misconduct Procedures statement

The Academic Misconduct Procedures outline the University's approach to dealing with alleged breaches of the Academic Integrity Policy. This includes allegations of plagiarism and academic misconduct. The Procedures apply to all modes of assessment and all students (undergraduate and postgraduate). It gives guidance on the academic misconduct process at the University, explains the stages in the process and the potential outcomes at each stage.

Who needs to know about the Academic Misconduct Procedures?

- Deans of Faculty and Pro Vice-Chancellors
- Heads of School and Department
- Course Directors
- Module Leaders
- Personal Academic Tutors
- Staff with a Partnership responsibility (both academic and administrative)
- Teaching Staff
- Course Administrators
- Registry Services Staff
- Faculty Registrars
- Students

Purpose of the Academic Misconduct Procedures

The Academic Misconduct Procedures outline the processes for dealing with breaches of the Academic Integrity Policy. It explains the stages in the process, roles and responsibilities, and potential outcomes at each stage.

Contacts

The Directorate of Student Resolution and Student Protection is responsible for:

- Academic Misconduct Procedures
- Providing advice and assistance on the operation of the Procedures
- Guidance and templates
- Delivering training

The team can be contacted by emailing: casehandling@canterbury.ac.uk

Learning and Teaching Enhancement (LTE) is responsible for:

- Academic Integrity Policy
- Providing advice and assistance on good academic practices
- Delivering training on good academic practices

The team can be contacted by emailing: LTE-ADMIN@canterbury.ac.uk

Student Academic Misconduct Procedures

Contents

1. Introduction.....	3
2. Scope of the Procedures.....	4
3. Investigations of Academic Misconduct	4
4. Overview of the Stages in the Process	5
5. Sequencing of Stages	5
6. Detection of Academic Misconduct.....	6
7. Anonymous Marking	6
8. Initiating Academic Misconduct Procedures.....	7
9. Detailed Stages in the Process	8
10. Gross Academic Misconduct.....	10
11. General matters applying to all Stages	11
12. Investigations of Joint or Group Allegations of Academic Misconduct.....	14
13. Students with Disabilities.....	15
14. Professional Disciplinary Action	15
15. Appeals against Academic Misconduct Investigation Decisions	15
16. Academic Misconduct Appeal Hearing	16
17. Office of the Independent Adjudicator of Higher Education (OIA).....	18
18. Appendix 1 – Operational Schedules.....	19
19. Appendix 2 - What is Academic Judgment?	37

Student Academic Misconduct Procedures

1. Introduction

- 1.1 These Procedures should be read in conjunction with the University's [Academic Integrity Policy](#).
- 1.2 These Procedures apply to all breaches of the [Academic Integrity Policy](#). Breaches are called 'Academic Misconduct'.
- 1.3 These Procedures apply to registered students and graduates of the University, and to the students and graduates of the University's Partner Institutions. These Procedures apply to students studying on both taught and research courses of study. These Procedures apply only to work submitted for an award from Canterbury Christ Church University.
- 1.4 Students are expected to act with honesty, trust, fairness, responsibility, and respect in relation to completing assessments in their course of study.¹ These expectations and obligations are set out in the [Requirements Relating to Student Registration](#) and in the [Academic Integrity Policy](#).
- 1.5 These Procedures explain how the University will investigate and deal with suspected breaches of academic integrity. Definitions of terms and examples of academic misconduct are given in Section 2 of the [Academic Integrity Policy](#). The table of examples given is illustrative and not intended to be exhaustive.
- 1.6 The University's Partner Institutions are required to follow the Procedures outlined in this document in relation to suspected breaches of academic integrity. For non-academic misconduct cases, Partner Institutions are expected to follow their own non-academic misconduct or disciplinary procedures.
- 1.7 Students have the right of appeal against the decision of an academic misconduct investigation. The process is explained in Section 16 of these Procedures.
- 1.8 The Course Director is responsible for initiating the Academic Misconduct Procedures. A Course Director may appoint or nominate another member of staff to undertake the responsibilities set out in the Procedures.
- 1.9 Any reference in these Procedures to Course Director applies, where relevant, to the Course Director's nominee. In the case of Postgraduate Research students, the responsibilities of Course Director, as outlined in these Procedures, will be undertaken by the Dean of the Graduate College or a Faculty Director of Research.

¹ Adapted from International Center for Academic Integrity (2014), *The Fundamental Values of Academic Integrity* 2nd ed, online at https://www.chapman.edu/academics/academic-integrity/_files/the-fundamental-values-of-academic-integrity.pdf

Student Academic Misconduct Procedures

2. Scope of the Procedures

- 2.1 These Procedures apply to all student work submitted for formal assessment (also called 'summative' assessment). The Procedures do not apply to formative or draft submissions. All the work of a student submitted for formal assessment may be investigated under these Procedures. This includes work already submitted, marked, returned to the student, and ratified by a Board of Examiners; in cases where academic misconduct is found to have occurred, any penalty awarded will supersede the original mark.
- 2.2 These Procedures apply to all forms of assessment including but not limited to coursework, examinations, and research. It covers the assessment submitted as well as student conduct in the completion of the assessment.
- 2.3 The Procedures extend to allegations of academic misconduct in any formal submission, whether a first or subsequent (re)submission, including a subsequent submission arising from a re-presentation.

3. Investigations of Academic Misconduct

- 3.1 There is a staged approach to investigating allegations of academic misconduct, and normally students would be taken through these stages sequentially.
- 3.2 At all Stages, if allegations of academic misconduct are not established by the Investigating Officer/Panel, the student would not progress to the next stage for a subsequent investigation. As such, a student will remain at the same Stage and not progress to the next Stage until allegations were upheld. Students, therefore, may go through stages more than once.
- 3.3 Introductory Stage and Stage 1 are investigated by an Investigating Officer.
- 3.4 Investigating Officers are nominated by the Course Director and would normally be a tutor from the course team other than the tutor identifying the alleged academic misconduct. Where the course team is particularly small, the Investigating Officer may be from another course team but within the same School/Faculty. The Investigating Officer must not have been engaged in the assessment of the work or previously acted as Investigating Officer for the same student. The Course Director may be the Investigating Officer if they meet the criteria above.
- 3.5 Stages 2 and 3 are conducted by a Panel (at School and Faculty level, respectively) each with a Panel Chair.
- 3.6 At each stage, the Investigating Officer or Panel should reach their determination based on the balance of probabilities (Section 11.4 – 11.5). Decisions must be supported by appropriate evidence.

Student Academic Misconduct Procedures

- 3.7 If the Investigating Officer / School Panel considers that the allegations constitute Gross Academic Misconduct, they should seek advice about that assessment and, where appropriate, may refer the case to a Stage 3 Faculty Panel for determination. This is only for cases of suspected Gross Academic Misconduct (Section 10). Referral should not be taken on a routine basis or because the student was at an advanced stage in their studies. Any referral is expected to be part of the outcome of an investigation at an earlier stage.

4. Overview of the Stages in the Process

- 4.1 Introductory Stage
- 4.2 Stage 1 – Course level investigation
- 4.3 Stage 2 – School level investigation
- 4.4 Stage 3 – Faculty level investigation

5. Sequencing of Stages

- 5.1 No matter the level of study, the academic misconduct investigations are undertaken in sequence, with the exception identified in Section 3.6.
- 5.2 Students in their first year studying with the University will commence any academic misconduct process at Introductory Stage, regardless of level (including postgraduate). This is in recognition that students in their first year at the University may require tuition in good academic practice over and above the general briefings provided.
- 5.3 If a student who is not in their first year studying at the University faces allegations of academic misconduct for the first time in their period of registration², Stage 1 of the Procedures would be applied, rather than Introductory Stage.
- 5.4 A student will not move to the next Stage unless academic misconduct is found to have taken place at the previous Stage. As such, a student may have multiple investigations at any Stage.
- 5.5 Previous periods of registration are counted when managing the sequencing of Stages. Academic misconduct investigations which took place either earlier in the current academic year or in the previous 5 academic years, whether during the student's current or a previous period of registration, will be counted when determining the correct stage for the current case.

² I. e. the student is not a direct entrant to that level and has previously studied at the University at a lower or equivalent level in their current or previous period of registration.

Student Academic Misconduct Procedures

- 5.6 The stages in the process entail a progressive increase in the potential penalties. It is expected that, normally, a penalty applied at a particular Stage will be the equivalent or higher than a penalty applied at an earlier Stage. A penalty equivalent to that applied at an earlier Stage would only be applied in exceptional extenuating circumstances. A penalty applied at a particular Stage would not be lesser in severity than a penalty applied at an earlier Stage.
- 5.7 Where an error is made in applying the correct Stage in sequence for a student, the student should be returned to the correct Stage and any inappropriate outcomes or penalties given at an incorrect Stage should be corrected. For example, should Stage 2 penalties have been applied, these should be corrected and amended (where appropriate) to penalties relevant to Stage 1. The Early Resolution & Case Handling team will provide advice on correcting procedural errors.

6. Detection of Academic Misconduct

- 6.1 The University uses text matching software (Turnitin) linked to the e-submission tool in the VLE, to review overall levels of originality. Where appropriate, information from this system may be used to establish cases where action may be taken under these Procedures.
- 6.2 Staff will use their academic judgment³ to identify where academic misconduct may have taken place, for example, awareness of key texts, the consistency of style within the writing or the use of web search engines to check phrases.
- 6.3 All work submitted for formal assessment across Levels 0, 4, 5, 6, 7, 8 should be subject to University electronic originality checking unless there are compelling pedagogic, technical, or administrative reasons not to.
- 6.4 Where the electronic originality checking system is used:
- Students will be advised in advance, i.e., there should be no retrospective use;
 - For each assignment, all students' work in the cohort will be submitted for checking;
 - Students will be able to submit at least one draft for each piece of summative work through the system for the purpose of checking originality prior to submission.

7. Anonymous Marking

- 7.1 The University operates an [Anonymous Marking Policy](#). The first year of operation is the academic year 2023/24.
- 7.2 Where academic misconduct is suspected, the identity of the student will remain unknown to markers until the formal investigation is initiated by the Course Director (see Section 3 of the [Anonymous Marking Policy](#)). Anonymity will not be lifted upon suspicion only.

³ See Appendix 2 for definition of Academic Judgment.

Student Academic Misconduct Procedures

8. Initiating Academic Misconduct Procedures

- 8.1 The Course Director is responsible for initiating the Academic Misconduct Procedures. A
- 8.2 Course Director may appoint or nominate another member of staff to undertake the responsibilities set out in the Procedures (such as Investigating Officer). Any reference in these Procedures to a Course Director applies to the Course Director's nominee. Their nominee must not have been involved in the assessment marking process.
- 8.3 In the case of postgraduate research students, the Dean of the Graduate College or a Faculty Director of Research performs the same function of a Course Director as set out in these Procedures. Any reference in these Procedures to the Course Director applies to the Dean of the Graduate College or a Faculty Director of Research.
- 8.4 As soon as academic misconduct is suspected, (whether in relation to assessment by coursework or examination), the evidence will be given preliminary consideration by the module leader (or supervisor for postgraduate research students). Having agreed that the case should proceed, the module leader will collect the evidence (see 8.4) and report the alleged academic misconduct to the Course Director.
- 8.5 The module leader is responsible for collecting appropriate evidence, including marking the student's work with annotations to indicate the relevant material. The evidence should be as comprehensive as possible. In the case of coursework or a take-home examination, even where Turnitin evidence is available, this should be supported by a short written notification from the marker indicating why academic misconduct is suspected. Evidence may also include that provided by other students, members of staff from across the University and/or from outside the University, suitably anonymised. Once the evidence is collected, the module leader should present this to the Course Director.
- 8.6 An invigilator or module leader may act in the case of any student suspected of academic misconduct during an examination.
- a. A full notification of the incident must be written immediately after the examination by the invigilator(s) and submitted to the Early Resolution & Case Handling team (who act with delegated authority on behalf of the Director of Student Resolution and Student Protection).
 - b. Upon receipt of such a notification, the Early Resolution & Case Handling team (who act with delegated authority on behalf of the Director of Student Resolution and Student Protection) will refer to the case to the Course Director where they determine there is sufficient evidence to support the allegation of academic misconduct.
 - c. In the case of take-home examinations, where the marker suspects academic misconduct has taken place, they should refer the case to the module leader. The module leader will give preliminary consideration to the evidence and, having agreed the case should proceed,

Student Academic Misconduct Procedures

will report the allegation to the Course Director.

- 8.7 The Course Director decides whether there is sufficient evidence to proceed with the case and will determine whether the case should be referred to an Investigating Officer or Panel (depending on which stage is appropriate, see Section 5).
- 8.8 If the Course Director decides to initiate the procedures, written notification is to be sent to the student in accordance with the appropriate Schedule (Appendix 1).

9. Detailed Stages in the Process

Introductory Stage

- 9.1 At the Introductory Stage, there is an emphasis on support for the student. In their first year studying at the University (at any level, including postgraduate), the first allegation of academic misconduct will be considered at Introductory Stage.
- 9.2 The outcome of the Introductory Stage will normally not involve the application of penalties. Cases of suspected Gross Academic Misconduct will involve a referral to a Stage 3 Faculty Panel.
- 9.3 Following allegations of academic misconduct, the student should be interviewed by an Investigating Officer appointed by the Course Director. The Investigating Officer should normally be a tutor from the course team other than the tutor identifying the alleged academic misconduct. Where the course team is particularly small, the Investigating Officer may be from another course team but within the same School/Faculty.

The Investigating Officer must not have been engaged in the assessment of the work. The Course Director may be the Investigating Officer if they meet the criteria above.

- 9.4 The operational arrangements for the Introductory Stage are set out in **Schedule 0 of Appendix 1**.

Stage 1 – Course Level Investigations

- 9.5 At Stage 1, course level investigations are undertaken by an Investigating Officer appointed by the Course Director. The student should be interviewed by the Investigating Officer.
- 9.6 The Investigating Officer should normally be a tutor from the course team other than the tutor identifying the academic misconduct. Where the course team is particularly small, the Investigating Officer may be from another course team but within the same School/Faculty.

The Investigating Officer must not have been engaged in the assessment of the work. The Course Director may be the Investigating Officer if they meet the criteria above.

- 9.7 The operational arrangements for Stage 1 are set out in **Schedule 1 of Appendix 1**.

Student Academic Misconduct Procedures

Stage 2 – School Level Investigations

- 9.8 At Stage 2, the investigation will be overseen by the relevant Head of School. The Head of School may delegate operational arrangements.
- 9.9 The investigation will be undertaken by a Panel of two members. The first member will be the Chair of the Panel. This will be the relevant Head of School (or alternate, if the Head of School has been connected with a previous investigation). The second member must be from another course but may be from the same School or Faculty.
- 9.10 Members of the Panel must not have been involved in the assessment of the work under consideration or be connected with any previous investigation, including Introductory Stage. Should the relevant Head of School have been connected with a previous investigation (as Investigating Officer), they should nominate an alternate Head of School to Chair the Panel.
- 9.11 The Panel will meet with the student and the Course Director (or their nominee) at the same time.
- 9.12 The operational arrangements for Stage 2 are set out in **Schedule 2 of Appendix 1**.

Stage 3 – Faculty Level Investigations

- 9.13 At Stage 3, the investigation will be overseen by the relevant Dean of Faculty. The Dean may delegate operational arrangements.
- 9.14 Only where academic misconduct is established at Stage 2, at a previous Stage 3 Panel, or there is a referral from an earlier stage in relation to Gross Academic Misconduct (Section 3.6), may the matter be investigated by a Stage 3 Faculty Panel.
- 9.15 In the case of a referral from an earlier stage in relation to Gross Academic Misconduct, the Dean will ensure that the correct procedure was followed before the referral was made. The Dean may only decline to initiate a Stage 3 investigation, following a referral, as a result of procedural error or irregularity. In this circumstance, the case will be returned back to the stage at which the referral was made for further consideration.
- 9.16 At Stage 3, the investigation will be undertaken by a Faculty Panel of three members, appointed and chaired by the relevant Dean of Faculty. The Secretariat for the Faculty Panel will be the Early Resolution & Case Handling team (Directorate of Student Resolution and Student Protection).
- 9.17 In all Stage 3 Panels, at least one member must be from a different Faculty. Up to two members of the Panel (including the Chair) may be from the Faculty initiating the proceedings.
- 9.18 Members of the Panel must not have been involved in the assessment of the work under consideration and must not be connected with any previous investigation for the student, at any Stage. Should the relevant Dean have been connected with a previous investigation or chaired a previous Stage 3 Panel for the student, they should nominate an alternate Dean or

Student Academic Misconduct Procedures

Head of School to chair the Panel.

9.19 The Panel will meet with the student and the Course Director (or nominee) at the same time.

9.20 The operational arrangements for Stage 3 are set out in **Schedule 3 of Appendix 1**.

10. Gross Academic Misconduct

10.1 Gross Academic Misconduct is deliberate wrongdoing by the student that is so serious that it fundamentally undermines the academic integrity of the student's work. Given the severity of the potential penalties and the impact this would have on a student's studies, there is a need for a higher standard of proof for gross academic misconduct.

10.2 Indicative examples of the factors to consider in determining whether the student potentially committed gross academic misconduct include, but are not limited to, the following:

- a. the alleged misconduct occurred in an important part of the work, considering the level of study;
- b. more than 75% of the assessed work related to the alleged misconduct, for instance taken from published work, the internet, or another student's submission without due acknowledgement, considering the relative weighting of the assessment and the level of study;
- c. the student sought to gain an unfair advantage through the alleged act;
- d. the student was alleged to use technology to source answers during an examination or time constrained assessment, without being authorised to do so;
- e. the student was alleged to have fabricated or falsified research data in an assignment, a dissertation, or a thesis, including the principal data on which the results of a postgraduate dissertation or thesis are based;
- f. the student was alleged to have engaged in repeated and serious contract cheating and/or the purchase or commissioning of work by others, including generative AI.
- g. the student was alleged to be in possession of unauthorised items/materials during an examination or during a comfort break;
- h. the student was alleged to have cheated in written examinations or in-class tests that was extensive or systematic;
- i. the student was alleged to have been found with an additional, completed, examination answer booklet;
- j. the student was alleged to have impersonated or attempted to impersonate another student, or asked others, including generative AI to impersonate the student, in any assessment, including misrepresentation of identity;

Student Academic Misconduct Procedures

- k. the student was alleged to have conspired or colluded with others to commit any of the above.

11. General matters applying to all Stages

Burden of Proof

- 11.1 Under these Procedures, the burden of proof rests principally with the University. The University must prove the student has committed the act of academic misconduct.
- 11.2 The student is, at all times, responsible for appropriate acknowledgment where they have used the material, ideas, or arguments of another person.
- 11.3 There are occasions when students need to prove they have or have not done something, or that something happened. For example, if two students are accused of academic misconduct, and one student provides compelling evidence the other student cheated, the other student needs to rebut that evidence. Students will also need to prove any extenuating factors they rely on when the University considers the penalty or outcome.

Standard of Proof

- 11.4 Under these Procedure, the standard of proof is based on the balance of probabilities. The balance of probabilities means it is more likely than not that something happened. The standard of proof is higher than simply believing that something is likely to have happened. Furthermore, decisions must be supported by appropriate evidence.
- 11.5 The more severe the penalty, the greater the need for the evidence to support the decision that academic misconduct was found. This means that the more serious the allegation the stronger the evidence needs to be before concluding that the allegation is established on the balance of probabilities.

Feedback on assessed work

- 11.6 Where an allegation of academic misconduct is made, no feedback on the assessed work or provisional mark will be given to the student, either through Turnitin or other means, until the investigation is concluded.
- 11.7 Where the outcome of the investigation finds that academic misconduct took place and the student is required to make a re-presentation, no feedback on the assessment subject to the allegation will be provided. The student should be given advice on which sections of the original assessment relate to substantiated academic misconduct and should be re-presented. Only after completion of the re-presentation (provided the re-presentation is not subject to further allegations of academic misconduct) should the student receive the provisional mark and formal feedback.
- 11.8 Where the outcome of the investigation does not find that academic misconduct took place, the student should receive confirmation of the provisional mark and the feedback for the

Student Academic Misconduct Procedures

original submission.

Academic Misconduct in more than one piece of work

11.9 Where a student is alleged to have committed academic misconduct in more than one piece of work concurrently, and the submission dates for the work and the marking session are, in the view of the Course Director(s), reasonably close together, the investigations will be conducted together at the same stage and be regarded as the same instance. The purpose behind regarding these as the same instance is that the student had not been made aware of the allegation of academic misconduct and had not been given the opportunity to undertake learning development.

Periods of Registration

11.10 Previous periods of registration with Canterbury Christ Church University are counted when managing the sequencing of Stages. Academic misconduct investigations which took place either earlier in the current academic year or in the previous 5 academic years, whether during the student's current or a previous period of registration, will be counted when determining the correct stage for the current case.

11.11 A Reassessment with Attendance year would not be counted as the first year at the University. For students undertaking Reassessment with Attendance, an allegation of academic misconduct would be handled under the next sequential stage of these Procedures as appropriate.

Right of the Student to a Hearing and to be Accompanied

11.12 The student will be invited to appear face to face (whether physically or via video conferencing) to make an oral presentation and answer questions. The student may be accompanied by a 'friend', defined as a fellow student, a member of the Students' Union, or a member of staff of the University. The 'friend' may speak on behalf of the student. The student would not normally be accompanied to a meeting with the Investigating Officer at Introductory Stage.

11.13 The student is to have notice of the meeting to prepare their response to the allegation and gather supporting evidence before the meeting. The periods of notice are set out in the relevant schedule.

11.14 If the student does not wish to attend the meeting, they have the right to submit a written statement to the Investigating Officer or Panel.

11.15 If the student does not respond to invitations to meet with the Investigating Officer or attend a Panel meeting, the University will assume that they do not wish to attend. In these circumstances, the Investigating Officer or Panel will investigate the case and determine the penalty (if appropriate) in the absence of the student. It is expected that the University will make a reasonable number of requests to the student to attend a meeting, before this clause is invoked.

Request by a Student to Reschedule a Meeting

11.16 A student may request the rescheduling of a meeting (either with the Investigating Officer or a

Student Academic Misconduct Procedures

Panel) provided that the rescheduled meeting takes place within a reasonable period after the notification of the allegations. What is reasonable depends on the circumstances, but usually the meeting should take place within two weeks of the originally scheduled meeting.

- 11.17 Any request to reschedule a meeting should be received at least 24 hours before the meeting except for in exceptional circumstances.

Non-attendance by a Student or a member of Staff at Meetings

- 11.18 If the student or member of staff does not attend the scheduled meeting, the Investigating Officer or Panel may investigate the case and determine the penalty (if appropriate) in the absence of the student or member of staff.

Presentation of Extenuating Circumstances

- 11.19 Students should have the opportunity to present any extenuating circumstances or factors that they believe should be considered by the Investigating Officer or Panel. Such factors are not relevant to determining whether a student committed academic misconduct. They should only be considered when deciding on the penalty, if the student is found to have committed academic misconduct.
- 11.20 Where it is available, if the student has supporting evidence relating to extenuating circumstances, they should provide this to the Investigating Officer or Panel in advance of the meeting.

Provision of Evidence to the Student

- 11.21 At all Stages within the Procedures, the appropriate evidence held by the University in relation to the alleged academic misconduct will be shared with the student in advance of the Investigating Officer meeting or Panel meeting.

Confidentiality

- 11.22 Panel deliberations at Stage 2 and Stage 3 usually take place after the meeting with the student and Course Director has concluded. This allows the Panel to reach their determination on whether academic misconduct has taken place and, if so, what the appropriate penalty may be. Only Panel members and the Panel Secretary may attend the Panel deliberations.
- 11.23 The investigation outcome and Report will be provided to the student and Course Director, however, notes of deliberations are not produced verbatim. The Panel Report is only disclosed to those individuals or teams identified in the Schedules. It is a confidential document.

Communications and Record Keeping

- 11.24 A record of every meeting will be kept in accordance with the arrangements in the relevant Schedule and a copy of this is to be provided to the Early Resolution & Case Handling team for the purpose of management information. This will include the Report at each Stage.

Student Academic Misconduct Procedures

- 11.25 Recordings of meetings are not permitted. The University will not record meetings.
- 11.26 The student will be informed in writing of the outcome of the investigation in accordance with the arrangements in the relevant Schedule. The decision maker should give reasons for the decision and any penalty.
- 11.27 The Course Director will be notified of the decision and, where appropriate, inform the Board of Examiners.

Boards of Examiners

- 11.28 The findings of academic misconduct investigations and panels will be binding upon the relevant Boards of Examiners.

Outcomes: Re-Presentation or Re-Examination of Work

- 11.29 The re-presentation or re-examination of work is not considered as a Deferral. The re-presentation or re-examination of work does not count as a reassessment attempt.
- 11.30 Where a student is given re-presentation or re-examination of the work as an outcome to any Stage, the student may request an extension through the Extenuating Circumstances process and/or submit an Impaired Performance application in the usual way. Late penalties apply to any work re-presented which is submitted after the deadline in the normal way.
- 11.31 Where a student is given re-examination as an outcome to any Stage in relation to an examination, the Course team should set a new examination paper with new questions. The date of the re-examination should be set before the next formal assessment point (where practicable), in order to avoid a student exhausting formal assessment points but not their (re)assessment opportunities.
- 11.32 Where re-examination is given as an outcome, the re-examination should be in the same format as the original examination. For example, if the original examination was on-site, the re-examination would be on-site, or if the original examination was a take-home exam, the re-examination would be a take-home exam. Course teams, rather than the central services, will be expected to organise such re-examinations.

12. Investigations of Joint or Group Allegations of Academic Misconduct

- 12.1 Under these Procedures, the University may investigate joint or group allegations. These are allegations against two or more students. The University will deal with these cases in a way that is fair to all the students involved.
- 12.2 Where possible, the same Investigating Officer or Panel will consider the case against all the students involved either at a joint hearing or individually.
- 12.3 The University will enable all students involved to hear and respond to what the others have said, and the evidence provided. The intention is to consider joint or group allegations at a single meeting with all students in attendance. Students will also be given an opportunity to speak to the Investigating Officer or Panel privately so that they can raise matters relating to extenuating factors.

Student Academic Misconduct Procedures

- 12.4 Where it is not possible or practical for matters to be considered at a single hearing, the University will ensure there is a consistent approach to all the students involved.
- 12.5 A decision will be made for each student individually, taking account of their particular circumstances. It is expected that penalties will be broadly consistent for all students in similar circumstances, recognising that students may be under consideration at different Stages.

13. Students with Disabilities

- 13.1 Students with disabilities are subject to these Procedures as normal.
- 13.2 Students with disabilities should be advised about the specific support services available within the University to assist them in responding to allegations of academic misconduct. If a student appears unable to engage effectively with the academic misconduct process, the University may agree with the student to suspend the process until the student is able to receive appropriate support.
- 13.3 The University will consider whether to make reasonable adjustments to the operation of the Procedures. This is to take account of the particular requirements of individual students. There may be a need to make reasonable adjustments for misconduct hearings, agree with the student a longer period to respond to allegations, or permit the attendance at a meeting of an individual to provide specific support to the student.
- 13.4 It may be appropriate for the Investigating Officer or Panel to consider a student's disability as an extenuating factor when setting penalties.

14. Professional Disciplinary Action

- 14.1 A student may be subject to professional disciplinary action in addition to academic misconduct procedures where the regulations of a statutory or regulatory body concerned with professional registration require academic misconduct to be reported for further investigation in line with the arrangements set out in the relevant Fitness to Practise or Professional Suitability Procedures.
- 14.2 The Course Director will make the report of an investigation under these Procedures available to a Fitness to Practise or Professional Suitability Investigator/Panel and, where required, any relevant statutory or regulatory body, together with any other information that is necessary to investigate the need for a professional disciplinary action. The student has the right to request any information provided by the University in respect of any professional disciplinary action.
- 14.3 If the Course Director is unsure whether to make an onward referral for professional disciplinary action, they should seek advice from their Faculty Director of Quality.

15. Appeals against Academic Misconduct Investigation Decisions

- 15.1 A student may appeal a finding of academic misconduct, or a penalty imposed following an outcome

Student Academic Misconduct Procedures

from the relevant academic misconduct stage.

- 15.2 To meet the ground(s) for an appeal, the student shall:
- identify a material administrative error or irregularity that occurred in the conduct of the investigation and as a result the decision was unreasonable; and/or
 - provide new material evidence that, for valid reasons, the student was unable to provide during the process and had a bearing on the penalty but not the finding of academic misconduct; and/or
 - demonstrate the penalty imposed was disproportionate or not permitted under the Procedures.
- 15.3 There is no right of appeal by the student against the Academic Judgment of an Investigating Officer or a Panel concerning the finding of academic misconduct.⁴

16. Academic Misconduct Appeal Hearing

- 16.1 If a student wishes to appeal, the student must submit an Academic Misconduct Appeal Form within 10 working days notification of the written outcome of the relevant academic misconduct stage.
- 16.2 The appeal must be submitted to the Early Resolution & Case Handling team within 10 working days of notification of the written outcome.
- 16.3 The ground(s) for appeal must be made clear in the prescribed Academic Misconduct Appeal Form.
- 16.4 In exceptional circumstances, a request to extend the appeal timeframe must be submitted to the Early Resolution & Case Handling Team. The Early Resolution & Case Handling Team may consider an extension request if supported with evidence.
- 16.5 The Early Resolution & Case Handling Team may deem an appeal invalid that:
- 16.5.1 is received late and there is no explanation supported by accompanying evidence why it could not be submitted within the 10 working days' timeframe: or
 - 16.5.2 does not clearly state the grounds on which the appeal is being made;
- 16.6 In such circumstances, the student shall be notified in writing of this and be deemed to have accepted the original decision.
- 16.7 At this point, students have completed the University's internal procedures, following which, the University will issue a Completion of Procedures Letter. Details of the next steps and submitting a Complaint to the Office of the Independent Adjudicator (OIA) will be provided. Students who remain dissatisfied with the outcome have the right to submit a complaint to

Student Academic Misconduct Procedures

the OIA. A complaint must be submitted to the OIA within 12 months of the date of an Appeal outcome.

- 16.8 Where an appeal is not deemed invalid, the Head of Early Resolution & Case Handling (or nominee) shall convene an Appeal hearing no later than 20 working days after notification of this procedure. A member of the Early Resolution & Case Handling Team with no prior involvement in the case will act as Clerk at the hearing.
- 16.9 The Head of Early Resolution & Case Handling (or nominee) shall notify the student in writing to attend a hearing in person or via Microsoft (MS) Teams. The student should be given the proposed date of the meeting with at least 5 working days' notice.
- 16.10 The student will have the opportunity to submit written representations, confirm their attendance at the scheduled hearing, or decline to attend. When the student submits written representations in place of attending the hearing, they should do so no later than 3 working days before the scheduled hearing date.
- 16.11 The student has the right to be accompanied by a "Friend" who shall normally be a member of staff, a student at the University, or a Students' Union advisor by way of support. The Head of Early Resolution & Case Handling (or nominee) may permit the "Friend" to speak on behalf of the student if it would assist the hearing. It is not usually permitted to be represented by a legally qualified solicitor or barrister, but the University may allow legal representation at the Appeal hearing in exceptional circumstances, such as where the misconduct penalty results in the student being expelled from the University or excluded from any future assessments or examinations of the University or that an award already made is revoked.
- 16.12 The hearing will be conducted in accordance with the directions of the Head of Early Resolution & Case Handling (or nominee), who may also determine the order of proceedings. Such directions may include:
- hearing of related allegations relating to two or more students at the same meeting.
 - imposing time limits on submissions.
- 16.13 The Head of Early Resolution & Case Handling (or nominee) shall consider the appeal and determine whether there is sufficient supporting evidence to substantiate the appeal.
- 16.14 Once the meeting is concluded and all evidence has been considered, the Head of Early Resolution & Case Handling (or nominee) will determine either to:
- 16.14.1. reject the appeal and uphold the original decision and penalty; or
 - 16.14.2. uphold the appeal and provide a new decision or penalty
 - 16.14.3. partially uphold the appeal and provide a new decision or penalty; or
 - 16.14.4. refer the case for a fresh investigation under the applicable stage where it has been determined that these Procedures were not correctly followed, or the penalty or penalties were not appropriate to the misconduct that has been

Student Academic Misconduct Procedures

proven.

- 16.15 A written record of the meeting will be taken, the decision shall be kept and shall be shared with the student.
- 16.16 The student can expect to receive an Appeal outcome from the Early Resolution & Case Handling Team within 10 working days of the meeting.

17. Office of the Independent Adjudicator of Higher Education (OIA)

- 17.1 An Appeal outcome represents the final decision of the University. At this point, students have completed the University's internal procedures, following which, the University will issue a Completion of Procedures Letter. Details of the next steps and submitting a Complaint to the Office of the Independent Adjudicator (OIA) will be provided. Students who remain dissatisfied with the outcome have the right to submit a complaint to the OIA. A complaint must be submitted to the OIA within 12 months of the date of an Appeal outcome.

⁴ See Appendix 2 for definition of Academic Judgment.

Student Academic Misconduct Procedures

18. Appendix 1 – Operational Schedules

Schedule 0 Introductory Stage

<p>Introductory Stage: Advisory and Educative</p> <p>Only applied to students in their first year studying with the University (at any Level).</p>	
<p>Initiation of stage</p>	<p>Academic misconduct is reported by the marking tutor to the module leader. The module leader will give the evidence preliminary consideration and, having determined the case should proceed, will report the allegations to the Course Director. The module leader will gather all relevant evidence for provision to the Course Director.</p> <p>The marking tutor/module leader should ensure no provisional mark or academic feedback is released through Turnitin for the work in question during the initiating and investigation process.</p> <p>The Course Director decides whether there is sufficient evidence to proceed with the case. Should they decide that sufficient evidence exists, the Course Director will appoint an Investigating Officer.</p> <p>Where anonymous marking has taken place, the anonymity can be lifted.</p> <p>Once the Stage is initiated, the module leader should add a statement to Turnitin (template wording available from the Early Resolution & Case Handling Team) to advise the student why no mark or feedback has yet been published.</p> <p>The Investigating Officer would normally be a tutor from the course team other than the tutor identifying the academic misconduct. Where the course team is particularly small, the Investigating Officer may be from another course team but within the same School/Faculty.</p> <p>The Investigating Officer must not have been engaged in the assessment of the work. The Course Director may be the Investigating Officer if they meet the criteria above.</p> <p>If the Course Director decides to initiate the procedures, written notification is to be sent to the student, inviting them to attend a meeting with the Investigating Officer. The written notification should also set out:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> a. the allegation and the grounds for the allegation; b. the Stage of the procedures initiated, and where to obtain a copy of the procedures c. any available supporting evidence; d. the arrangements for undertaking the investigation; <p>the right to seek support for their preparation for the meeting from the Department of Student Support, Health and Wellbeing or the</p>

Student Academic Misconduct Procedures

<p>Introductory Stage: Advisory and Educative</p> <p>Only applied to students in their first year studying with the University (at any Level).</p>	
	<p>Students' Union.</p> <p>f. the right, if the student chooses, to present a written statement before any meeting with an Investigating Officer.</p> <p>e. Any evidence available should be made available to the student and the Investigating Officer in advance of the meeting.</p>
Method	<p>The Investigating Officer meets the student. Where relevant, the student may participate in a telephone or video conference. There is no right to be accompanied at Introductory Stage meetings (see Note* below). For group cases or students with a disability, see Procedures for specific arrangements.</p> <p>No representative of the Course team is expected to attend the meeting between the Investigating Officer and the student.</p> <p>If the student does not wish to attend the meeting, they have the right to submit a written statement to the Investigating Officer, in response to the allegations and any evidence. The written statement should be submitted at least 24 hours before the meeting.</p> <p>At the meeting, the allegations are to be explained to the student and the student invited to respond.</p>
Timescales	<p>Where the decision is made to initiate the Introductory Stage, the Course Director should normally inform the student within 7 working days of receiving the information from the module leader.</p> <p>The Investigating Officer should arrange the meeting with the student to take place within 7 working days of the notification to the student from the Course Director.</p> <p>A student may request to reschedule the meeting, provided the rescheduled meeting takes place within a reasonable period after the notification to the student of the allegations. The Investigating Officer will determine a new date for the meeting taking into account relevant Board of Examiners timescales.</p> <p>In the event of the student's non-attendance at the meeting, the Investigating Officer may investigate the case and determine the outcome in the absence of the student.</p> <p>The Investigating Officer should inform the student of the outcome of the Stage within 7 working days of the meeting.</p>
Purpose	<p>To require the module leader to identify the evidence giving rise to the allegations of academic misconduct when the student meets with the Investigating Officer.</p> <p>The Investigating Officer will discuss how the suspected academic misconduct came about, and to discuss the issues identified.</p> <p>The purpose of Introductory Stage is educative, rather than disciplinary, except</p>

Student Academic Misconduct Procedures

	<p>where the Investigating Officer considers the student may have engaged in Gross Academic Misconduct.</p> <p>Students should have the opportunity to present any extenuating circumstances or factors that they believe should be considered. Such factors are not relevant to determining whether a student committed an offence.</p> <p>Should the student present any extenuating circumstance information, the Investigating Officer should make the student aware of appropriate support mechanisms, if appropriate, such as Temporary Learning Agreements, the Extenuating Circumstances process and the services provided by Student Support, Health and Wellbeing.</p>
Outcomes	<p>The Investigating Officer will determine whether, on the balance of probabilities, academic misconduct did or did not occur.</p> <p>Where the Investigating Officer determines that academic misconduct did not occur, they will record the student as not guilty of academic misconduct. However, they may recommend that the student undertakes additional learning development</p> <p>Where the Investigating Officer determines that academic misconduct did occur, they will require one or more of the following from the student:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Re-presentation of the assessment(s) or re-examination of the assessment subject to academic misconduct, with no mark penalty. • Attendance at learning development sessions to enable the student to develop the appropriate style of presentation. • Re-interview with the marking tutor/module leader (or another representative of the Course Director) following the marking of the re-presented/re-examined work to review progress and identify further action points. <p>In the case of suspected Gross Academic Misconduct, the Investigating Officer will not require one of the above actions from the student but will refer the case to the relevant Dean for determination by a Stage 3 Faculty Panel. They will inform the student that the referral is the outcome of the Stage.</p> <p>The statement made on Turnitin regarding the mark and feedback should be removed.</p>
Penalties	<p>No penalty may be imposed other than those set out in the Outcome section above.</p> <p>The re-presented/ re-examined work would be marked on its own merits and the mark and grade included in the student's profile.</p> <p>Where a student declines to re-present the work, engage in re-examination, or attend for re-interview, a mark of zero is awarded.</p>

Student Academic Misconduct Procedures

Introductory Stage: Advisory and Educative Only applied to students in their first year studying with the University (at any Level).	
Communication of Outcome	<p>The student is to be informed in writing of the outcome of the interview. The Investigating Officer should give reasons for the decision.</p> <p>The decision notice should give information about:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> (a) The student's right to appeal; (b) The grounds on which they can do so; (c) The time limit for submitting an appeal; (d) The appropriate appeals procedure; (e) Where and how to access support; and (f) The submission date of any required re-presentation or re-examination
Records	<p>The Investigating Officer is to record the key points of the discussion and the decision arising from the discussion with the student, using the standard template provided by the Early Resolution & Case Handling team.</p> <p>The Investigating Officer must send a copy of the recorded decision to the student, the marking tutor/module leader, the Course Director, and the Early Resolution & Case Handling team. This would normally be within 7 working days of the meeting.</p> <p>Where the student is referred to the Dean for a Stage 3 Faculty Panel, the Investigating Officer is to send a copy of the recorded decision to the relevant Head of School.</p> <p>Where the student is taking a combined honours course, the Course Director is to copy the decision to the Course Director for the other subject.</p>
Record Retention	<p>The course team undertaking the investigation retains the record for the duration of the student's study, and for 12 months after the student leaves the course.</p> <p>Other courses receiving a copy of the record should retain the record for 12 months after the completion of the level concerned.</p> <p>The Early Resolution & Case Handling team maintains an entry in the academic misconduct log for 6 years.</p>
Note*	<p>At this stage, only the student would attend the Introductory Stage meeting. The student would not be accompanied by another member of the University. This is an exception to the general provision that a student may be accompanied to disciplinary events. The reason is that the event is not a disciplinary action.</p>

Student Academic Misconduct Procedures

Schedule 1 Course Level Investigation (Stage 1)

Stage 1: Investigation at Course Level, applicable to all Levels of study.	
Initiation of stage	<p>Academic misconduct is reported by the marking tutor to the module leader. The module leader will give the evidence preliminary consideration and, having determined the case should proceed, will report the allegations to the Course Director. The module leader will gather all relevant evidence for provision to the Course Director.</p> <p>The marking tutor/module leader should ensure no provisional mark or academic feedback is released through Turnitin for the work in question during the initiating and investigation process.</p> <p>The Course Director decides whether there is sufficient evidence to proceed with the case. Should they decide that sufficient evidence exists, the Course Director will appoint an Investigating Officer.</p> <p>Where anonymous marking has taken place, the anonymity can be lifted.</p> <p>Once the Stage is initiated, the module leader should add a statement to Turnitin (template wording available from the Early Resolution & Case Handling team) to advise the student why no mark or feedback has yet been published.</p> <p>The Investigating Officer would normally be a tutor from the course team other than the tutor identifying the academic misconduct. Where the course team is particularly small, the Investigating Officer may be from another course team but within the same School/Faculty.</p> <p>The Investigating Officer must not have been engaged in the assessment of the work. The Course Director may be the Investigating Officer if they meet the criteria above.</p> <p>If the Course Director decides to initiate the procedures, written notification is to be sent to the student setting out:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> g. the allegation, the grounds for the allegation, and the possible penalties; h. the Stage of the procedures initiated, and where to obtain a copy of the procedures i. any available supporting evidence; j. the arrangements for undertaking the investigation; k. the student's right to be accompanied by a 'friend', defined as a fellow student, a member of the Students' Union, or a member of staff of the University; l. the right to seek support for their preparation for the meeting from the Department of Student Support, Health and Wellbeing or the Students' Union.

Student Academic Misconduct Procedures

Stage 1: Investigation at Course Level, applicable to all Levels of study.	
	<p>m. the right, if the student chooses, to present a written statement before any meeting with an Investigating Officer.</p> <p>Any evidence available should be made available to the student and the Investigating Officer in advance of the meeting.</p>
Method	<p>The Investigating Officer will meet jointly with the marking tutor identifying the academic misconduct (or another suitable nominee of the tutor when the tutor is unavailable) and the student.</p> <p>The student may be accompanied at the meeting by a 'friend' (as defined in the Procedures). The 'friend' may speak on behalf of the student.</p> <p>Where relevant, the student may participate in a telephone or video conference. For group cases or students with a disability, see Procedures for specific arrangements.</p> <p>If the student does not wish to attend the meeting, they have the right to submit a written statement to the Investigating Officer, in response to the allegations and any evidence. The written statement should be submitted at least 24 hours before the meeting.</p> <p>At the meeting, the allegations are to be explained to the student and the student invited to respond. The allegations should always be presented first by the marking tutor (or nominee).</p>
Timescales	<p>Where the decision is made to initiate Stage 1, the Course Director should normally inform the student within 7 working days of receiving the information from the module leader.</p> <p>The Investigating Officer should arrange the meeting with the student to take place within 7 working days of the notification to the student from the Course Director.</p> <p>A student may request to reschedule the meeting, provided the rescheduled meeting takes place within a reasonable period after the notification to the student of the allegations. The Investigating Officer will determine a new date for the meeting taking into account relevant Board of Examiners timescales.</p> <p>In the event of the student's non-attendance at the meeting, the Investigating Officer may investigate the case and determine the outcome in the absence of the student.</p> <p>The Investigating Officer should inform the student of the outcome of the Stage within 7 working days of the meeting.</p>
Purpose	<p>To require the module leader to identify the evidence giving rise to the allegations of academic misconduct when the student meets with the</p>

Student Academic Misconduct Procedures

	<p>Investigating Officer.</p> <p>The Investigating Officer will discuss how the suspected academic misconduct came about, and where academic misconduct is found to have occurred, to determine the appropriate penalty.</p> <p>Students should have the opportunity to present any extenuating circumstances or factors that they believe should be considered when determining any penalty. Such factors are not relevant to determining whether a student committed an offence. They should only be considered when deciding on the penalty if the student is found to have committed an offence.</p> <p>Should the student present any extenuating circumstance information, the Investigating Officer should make the student aware of appropriate support mechanisms, if appropriate, such as Temporary Learning Agreements, the Extenuating Circumstances process and the services provided by Student Support, Health and Wellbeing.</p>
Outcomes	<p>The Investigating Officer will determine whether, on the balance of probabilities, academic misconduct did or did not occur. Where the Investigating Officer determines that academic misconduct did occur, they will determine the appropriate penalties (see Penalties section).</p> <p>Where the Investigating Officer determines that academic misconduct did not occur, they will record the student as not guilty of academic misconduct. However, they may recommend that the student undertakes additional learning development.</p> <p>In the case of suspected Gross Academic Misconduct, the Investigating Officer will refer the case to the relevant Dean for determination by a Stage 3 Faculty Panel.</p> <p>Where a student is subject to PSRB requirements and academic misconduct is established, the Course Director may make a referral to Fitness to Practise or Professional Suitability Procedures as part of the outcome. The Course Director should seek advice from their Faculty Director of Quality should they be unsure of whether to make an onward referral.</p> <p>The statement made on Turnitin regarding the mark and feedback should be removed.</p>
Penalties	<p>Where academic misconduct is found to have occurred, the Investigating Officer will require one or more of the following actions from the student:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Re-presentation of the assessment(s) or re-examination of the assessment subject to academic misconduct, with the work capped at the pass mark for the level. <p>Where a student declines to re-present the work or engage in re-examination, a mark will be calculated on the basis of the original sections of the work only (i.e. the sections where academic misconduct does not apply). [Note in most instances a mark of zero is likely to be awarded.]</p> <p>Only the sections of the assessment not subject to academic misconduct are assessed, with a mark of zero for those sections that are not assessed.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Attendance at specified learning development sessions to address weaknesses identified through the investigation. (Failure by the student to attend would result in the mark of zero for the re-presented or re-examined work, irrespective of whether the work achieves a marginal pass

Student Academic Misconduct Procedures

Stage 1: Investigation at Course Level, applicable to all Levels of study.	
	<p>mark.)</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Re-interview with the marking tutor/module leader (or another representative of the Course Director) after the marking of the re-presented or re-examined work to review progress. Failure by the student to engage would result in the mark of zero for the re-presented or re-examined work, irrespective of whether the work achieves a marginal pass mark.
Communication of Outcome	<p>The student is to be informed in writing of the outcome of the investigation.</p> <p>The Investigating Officer should give reasons for the decision and any penalty. The Investigating Officer should explain why any lesser penalty was not suitable.</p> <p>The decision notice should give information about:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> The student's right to appeal; The grounds on which they can do so; The time limit for submitting an appeal; The appropriate appeals procedure; Where and how to access support; and The submission date of any required re-presentation or re-examination.
Records	<p>The Investigating Officer is to record the key points of the discussion and the decision arising from the discussion with the student, using the standard template provided by the Early Resolution & Case Handling team.</p> <p>The Investigating Officer must send a copy of the recorded decision to the student, the marking tutor/module leader, the Course Director, and the Early Resolution & Case Handling team. This would normally be within 7 working days of the meeting.</p> <p>Where the student is referred to the Dean for a Stage 3 Faculty Panel, the Investigating Officer is to send a copy of the recorded decision to the relevant Head of School.</p> <p>Where the student is taking a combined honours course, the Course Director is to copy the decision to the Course Director for the other subject.</p>
Record Retention	<p>The course team undertaking the investigation retains the record for the duration of the student's study, and for 12 months after the student leaves the course.</p> <p>Other courses receiving a copy of the record should retain the record for 12 months after the completion of the level concerned.</p> <p>The Early Resolution & Case Handling team maintains an entry in the academic misconduct log for 6 years.</p>

Student Academic Misconduct Procedures

Schedule 2 School Level Investigation (Stage 2)

Stage 2: Investigation and disciplinary action at a School Level.	
Initiation of stage	<p>Academic misconduct is reported by the marking tutor to the module leader. The module leader will give the evidence preliminary consideration and, having determined the case should proceed, will report the allegations to the Course Director. The module leader will gather all relevant evidence for provision to the Course Director.</p> <p>The marking tutor/module leader should ensure no provisional mark or academic feedback is released through Turnitin for the work in question during the initiating and investigation process.</p> <p>The Course Director decides whether there is sufficient evidence to proceed with the case. Should they decide that sufficient evidence exists, and that the student has previously been subject to a Stage 1 investigation, the Course Director will initiate a Stage 2 investigation. The student may have had a previous Stage 2 investigation in which they were acquitted of allegations of academic misconduct.</p> <p>Where anonymous marking has taken place, the anonymity can be lifted.</p> <p>Once the Stage is initiated, the module leader should add a statement to Turnitin (template wording available from the Early Resolution & Case Handling team) to advise the student why no mark or feedback has yet been published.</p> <p>The Course Director should notify the relevant Head of School.</p> <p>The Head of School oversees Stage 2 investigations but may delegate operational arrangements.</p> <p>The Head of School will send written notification to the student setting out:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> a. the allegation, the grounds for the allegation, and the possible penalties; b. the stage of the procedures initiated, and where to obtain a copy of the procedures c. any available supporting evidence; d. the arrangements for undertaking the investigation; e. the student's right to be accompanied by a 'friend', defined as a fellow student, a member of the Students' Union, or a member of staff of the University; f. the right to seek support for their preparation for the meeting from the Department of Student Support, Health and Wellbeing or the Students' Union. g. the right, if the student chooses, to present a written statement before any meeting with the panel.

Student Academic Misconduct Procedures

Stage 2: Investigation and disciplinary action at a School Level.	
	<p>The investigation will be undertaken by a School-level Panel. The Head of School (or their operational nominee) will make arrangements for the Panel meeting and confirm these to the student, relevant course team members, and Panel members.</p> <p>Any evidence available should be made available to the student and the Panel members in advance of the meeting.</p> <p>The Panel will consist of 2 members. The Chair of the Panel will be the relevant Head of School (or nominee, if the Head of School has been connected with a previous investigation). The second member must be from another course but may be from the same School or Faculty.</p> <p>Members of the Panel must not be connected with any previous investigation, including Introductory Stage, nor engaged in the assessment of the work. Should the relevant Head of School have been connected with a previous investigation (as Investigating Officer), they should nominate an alternate Head of School to Chair the Panel.</p>
Method	<p>The Panel will meet with the student and the Course Director (or their nominee) at the same time.</p> <p>The student may be accompanied at the meeting by a 'friend' (as defined in the Procedures). The 'friend' may speak on behalf of the student.</p> <p>Where relevant, the student may participate in a telephone or video conference. For group cases or students with a disability, see Procedures for specific arrangements.</p> <p>If the student does not wish to attend the meeting, they have the right to submit a written statement to the Chair of the Stage 2 Panel, in response to the allegations and any evidence. The written statement should be submitted at least 24 hours before the Panel meeting.</p> <p>At the meeting, the allegations are to be explained to the student and the student invited to respond. The allegations should always be presented first by the Course Director.</p>
Timescales	<p>Where the decision is made to initiate Stage 2, the Head of School should normally inform the student within 7 working days of receiving the information from Course Director. Normally, the Faculty Manager (Quality) will act as the nominee of the Course Director.</p> <p>The Faculty Manager (Quality) should arrange the Stage 2 Panel meeting to take place within 14 working days of the notification from the Course Director.</p> <p>A student may request to reschedule the meeting, provided the rescheduled meeting takes place within a reasonable period after the notification to the student of the allegations. The Faculty Manager (Quality) will determine a new date for the meeting taking into account relevant Board of Examiners timescales.</p> <p>In the event of the student's non-attendance at the meeting, the Stage 2 Panel members may investigate the case and determine the outcome in the absence of the student.</p>

Student Academic Misconduct Procedures

Stage 2: Investigation and disciplinary action at a School Level.	
	The Head of School should inform the student of the outcome of the Stage within 7 working days of the Panel meeting.
Purpose	<p>To investigate the allegations of academic misconduct and, where academic misconduct is found to have occurred, to determine the appropriate penalty or penalties.</p> <p>In undertaking the investigation, the Panel members may take account of any previous investigation (excepting Introductory Stage).</p> <p>Students should have the opportunity to present any extenuating circumstances or factors that they believe should be considered when determining any penalty. Such factors are not relevant to determining whether a student committed an offence. They should only be considered when deciding on the penalty if the student is found to have committed an offence.</p> <p>Should the student present any extenuating circumstance information, the Panel should make the student aware of appropriate support mechanisms, if appropriate, such as Temporary Learning Agreements, the Extenuating Circumstances process and the services provided by Student Support, Health and Wellbeing.</p>
Outcomes	<p>The Panel will determine whether, on the balance of probabilities, academic misconduct did or did not occur. Where the Panel determines that academic misconduct did occur, they will determine the appropriate penalty or penalties (see Penalties section).</p> <p>Where the Panel determines that academic misconduct did not occur, they will record the student as not guilty of academic misconduct. However, they may recommend that the student undertakes additional learning development.</p> <p>In the case of suspected Gross Academic Misconduct, the Panel will refer the case to the relevant Dean for determination by a Stage 3 Faculty Panel.</p> <p>Where a student is subject to PSRB requirements and academic misconduct is established, the Panel may make a referral to Fitness to Practise or Professional Suitability Procedures as part of the outcome. The Chair of the Panel should seek advice from their Faculty Director of Quality should they be unsure of whether to make an onward referral.</p> <p>The statement made on Turnitin regarding the mark and feedback should be removed.</p>
Penalties	<p>Where academic misconduct is found to have occurred, the Panel will require one or more of the following:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Re-presentation of the assessment(s) or re-examination of the assessment subject to academic misconduct, with the work capped at the pass mark for the level. <p style="text-align: center;">Where a student declines to re-present the work or engage in</p>

Student Academic Misconduct Procedures

	<p>re-examination, a mark will be calculated on the basis of the original sections of the work only (i.e. the sections where academic misconduct does not apply). [Note in most instances a mark of zero is likely to be awarded.]</p> <p>Only the sections of the assessment not subject to academic misconduct are assessed, with a mark of zero for those sections that are not assessed.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Attendance at specified learning development sessions to address weaknesses identified through the investigation. (Failure by the student to attend would result in the mark of zero for the re-presented or re-examined work, irrespective of whether the work achieves a marginal pass mark.) • Re-interview with the Course Director after the marking of the re-presented or re-examined work to review progress. Failure by the student to engage would result in the mark of zero for the re-presented or re-examined work, irrespective of whether the work achieves a marginal pass mark.
Communication of Outcome	<p>The student is to be informed in writing of the outcome of the investigation.</p> <p>The Panel should give reasons for the decision and any penalties. The Panel should explain why any lesser penalty was not suitable.</p> <p>The decision notice should give information about:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> (a) The student's right to appeal; (b) The grounds on which they can do so; (c) The time limit for submitting an appeal; (d) The appropriate appeals procedure; (e) Where and how to access support; and (f) The submission date of any required re-representation or re-examination
Records	<p>The Faculty Manager (Quality) is to record the key points of the discussion and the decision arising from the discussion with the student, using the standard template provided by the Early Resolution & Case Handling team.</p> <p>The Head of School must send a copy of the recorded decision to the student, the marking tutor/module leader, the Course Director, and the Early Resolution & Case Handling team. This would normally be within 7 working days of the meeting.</p> <p>Where the student is taking a combined honours course, the Faculty Manager (Quality) is to copy the decision to the Course Director for the other subject.</p>
Record Retention	<p>The School undertaking the investigation retains the record for the duration of the student's study, and for 12 months after the student leaves the course.</p>

Student Academic Misconduct Procedures

Stage 2: Investigation and disciplinary action at a School Level.	
	<p>Other courses receiving a copy of the record should retain the record for 12 months after the completion of the level concerned.</p> <p>The Early Resolution & Case Handling team maintains an entry in the academic misconduct log for 6 years.</p>

Student Academic Misconduct Procedures

Schedule 3 Faculty Level Investigation (Stage 3)

Stage 3: Investigation and disciplinary action at a Faculty Level.	
Initiation of stage	<p>The Dean of Faculty oversees Stage 3 investigations but may delegate operational arrangements.</p> <p>Academic misconduct is reported by the marking tutor to the module leader. The module leader will give the evidence preliminary consideration and, having determined the case should proceed, will report the allegations to the Course Director. The module leader will gather all relevant evidence for provision to the Course Director.</p> <p>The marking tutor/module leader should ensure no provisional mark or academic feedback is released through Turnitin for the work in question during the initiating and investigation process.</p> <p>Once the Stage is initiated, the module leader should add a statement to Turnitin (template wording available from the Early Resolution & Case Handling team) to advise the student why no mark or feedback has yet been published.</p> <p>Where the student was subject to a Stage 2 investigation in which academic misconduct was found to have occurred, or subject to a previous Stage 3 Panel, the Course Director will decide whether to initiate a Stage 3 investigation.</p> <p>Where there is a referral from an earlier stage in relation to Gross Academic Misconduct, the Dean of Faculty will decide whether to initiate a Stage 3 investigation. The Dean may only decline to initiate a Stage 3 investigation in the case of procedural irregularity at an earlier stage. In this circumstance, the case will be referred back to the stage at which the referral was made.</p> <p>Where anonymous marking has taken place, the anonymity can be lifted.</p> <p>The Dean of Faculty will send written notification to the student setting out:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> a. the allegation, the grounds for the allegation, and the possible penalties; b. the stage of the procedures initiated, and where to obtain a copy of the procedures c. any available supporting evidence; d. the arrangements for undertaking the investigation; e. the student's right to be accompanied by a 'friend', defined as a fellow student, a member of the Students' Union, or a member of staff of the University; f. the right to seek support for their preparation for the meeting from the Department of Student Support, Health and Wellbeing or the Students' Union. g. the right, if the student chooses, to present a written statement before any meeting with the Panel.

Student Academic Misconduct Procedures

Stage 3: Investigation and disciplinary action at a Faculty Level.	
	<p>The investigation will be undertaken by a Faculty-level Panel. The office of the Dean of Faculty (or their operational nominee) will make arrangements for the Panel meeting in liaison with the Early Resolution & Case Handling Team. The office of the Dean will confirm the arrangements to the student, relevant course team members, and Panel members.</p> <p>The Panel will consist of 3 members. The Chair of the Panel will be the relevant Dean of Faculty (or alternate Dean or Head of School, if the relevant Dean has been connected with a previous investigation). Up to 2 members of the Panel (including the Chair) may be from the Faculty initiating the proceedings. At least 1 member must be from a different Faculty.</p> <p>Members of the Panel must not be connected with any previous investigation, including Introductory Stage, nor engaged in the assessment of the work.</p> <p>Any evidence available should be made available to the student and the Panel members in advance of the meeting.</p> <p>The Early Resolution & Case Handling team will act as Secretary to the Panel meeting.</p>
Method	<p>The Panel will meet with the student and the Course Director (or their nominee) at the same time.</p> <p>The student may be accompanied at the meeting by a 'friend' (as defined in the Procedures). The 'friend' may speak on behalf of the student.</p> <p>Where relevant, the student may participate in a telephone or video conference. For group cases or students with a disability, see Procedures for specific arrangements.</p> <p>If the student does not wish to attend the meeting, they have the right to submit a written statement to the Chair of the Stage 3 Panel, in response to the allegations and any evidence. The written statement should be submitted at least 24 hours before the Panel meeting.</p> <p>At the meeting, the allegations are to be explained to the student and the student invited to respond. The allegations should always be presented first by the Course Director.</p>
Timescales	<p>Where the decision is made to initiate Stage 3, the Dean should normally inform the student within 7 working days of receiving the information from the Course Director or referral from an earlier stage.</p> <p>The Dean's office should arrange for the Stage 3 Panel meeting to take place within 14 working days of the notification from the Dean to the student.</p> <p>A student may request to reschedule the meeting, provided the rescheduled meeting takes place within a reasonable period after the notification to the student of the allegations. The Dean's office will determine a new date for the meeting taking into account relevant Board of Examiners timescales.</p> <p>In the event of the student's non-attendance at the meeting, the Stage 3 Panel</p>

Student Academic Misconduct Procedures

Stage 3: Investigation and disciplinary action at a Faculty Level.	
	<p>members may investigate the case and determine the outcome in the absence of the student.</p> <p>The Early Resolution & Case Handling Team (on behalf of the Dean) should inform the student of the outcomes within 7 working days of the meeting.</p>
Purpose	<p>To investigate the allegations of academic misconduct and/or Gross Academic Misconduct, where misconduct is found to have occurred, to determine the appropriate penalty or penalties.</p> <p>In determining the penalty or penalties, the Panel will take account of the reports of previous investigations at all Stages (except Introductory Stage, unless the Investigating Officer had referred the case as suspected Gross Academic Misconduct).</p> <p>Students should have the opportunity to present any extenuating circumstances or factors that they believe should be considered when determining any penalty. Such factors are not relevant to determining whether a student committed an offence. They should only be considered when deciding on the penalty if the student is found to have committed an offence.</p> <p>Should the student present any extenuating circumstance information, the Panel should make the student aware of appropriate support mechanisms, if appropriate, such as Temporary Learning Agreements, the Extenuating Circumstances process and the services provided by Student Support, Health and Wellbeing.</p>
Outcomes	<p>The Panel will determine whether, on the balance of probabilities, academic misconduct and/or Gross Academic Misconduct did or did not occur. Where the Panel determines that misconduct did occur, they will determine the appropriate penalty or penalties (see Penalties section).</p> <p>Where the Panel determines that academic misconduct did not occur, they will record the student as not guilty of academic misconduct. However, they may recommend that the student undertakes additional learning development.</p> <p>Where a student is subject to PSRB requirements and academic misconduct is established, the Panel may make a referral to Fitness to Practise or Professional Suitability Procedures as part of the outcome. The Chair of the Panel should seek advice from their Faculty Director of Quality should they be unsure of whether to make an onward referral.</p> <p>The statement made on Turnitin regarding the mark and feedback should be removed.</p>
Penalties	<p>Where academic misconduct or Gross Academic Misconduct is found to have occurred, the Panel has the discretion to determine the range of academic penalties to be imposed.</p> <p>The following are indicative of the penalties:</p> <p>(a) That a person designated by the Panel informally reprimands the student</p>

Student Academic Misconduct Procedures

Stage 3: Investigation and disciplinary action at a Faculty Level.

and reminds the student of the need to strictly observe assessment/examination procedures. This informal reprimand will not be entered on the student's record.

- (b) That the student be formally reprimanded and reminded of the need to strictly observe assessment/examination procedures. This formal reprimand shall be entered on the student's record for a specified period, which will be no longer than 6 months after the completion of the course.
- (c) That a reduced mark be given the assessment(s) in question.
- (d) That the student re-presents the work or engages in a re-examination with a capped assessment or module mark.
- (e) That a mark of zero be given for part or all of the assessment(s) in question.
- (f) That the mark of either the assessment(s) or the module be capped at the pass mark for the Level.
- (g) That the student fails the module in which the assessment(s) in question falls, with or without reassessment.
- (h) That the student be permitted reassessment in part or all of those assessments or examinations on the next scheduled occasion, either to enable the student to gain a marginal pass mark for the course or a marginal pass mark.
- (i) That the student be denied any further reassessment attempts remaining to them under the Regulations.
- (j) Recommend, in writing, to the Academic Board the award be reduced by one or more classification.
- (k) Recommend, in writing, to the Academic Board that no award is made or that the student be excluded from any future assessments or examinations of the University or that an award already made should be revoked.
- (l) Recommend, in writing, to the Deputy Vice-Chancellor that the student be expelled from the University.

Where the Panel permits the re-presentation of work or a re-examination (subject to the maximum number of reassessment opportunities permitted), the extent of the re-presentation/ re-examination required will be determined by the Panel and is not limited to the re-presentation/ re-examination of work for the module concerned. The Panel may determine that work from other modules may need re-presentation/ re-examination, even when the student had been deemed to have passed the work concerned. This includes cases where a Board of Examiners confirmed a mark.

Where reassessment is not permitted, the consequences will be made clear to the

Student Academic Misconduct Procedures

Stage 3: Investigation and disciplinary action at a Faculty Level.	
	student.
Communication of Outcome	<p>The student is to be informed in writing of the outcome of the investigation.</p> <p>The Panel should give reasons for the decision and any penalties. The Panel should explain why any lesser penalty was not suitable.</p> <p>The decision notice should give information about:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> (a) The student's right to appeal; (b) The grounds on which they can do so; (c) The time limit for submitting an appeal; (d) The appropriate appeals procedure; (e) Where and how to access support; and (f) The submission date of any required re-presentation or re-examination
Records	<p>A record of the Stage 3 Panel meeting will be taken by the Early Resolution & Case Handling team.</p> <p>The Early Resolution & Case Handling team on behalf of the Chair of the Panel) will inform the student of the outcome and communicate the decision to those members of the University who need to be informed.</p> <p>A copy of the record of the proceedings and the decision is to be retained by the Faculty.</p> <p>If a student is undertaking a combined honours course, the Early Resolution & Case Handling team sends a copy of the decision to relevant Course Directors.</p>
Record Retention	<p>The Student Procedures Office is responsible for retaining the records of the proceedings, together with the supporting evidence, for the duration of the student's registration with the course, and for 12 months after the student has left the course.</p> <p>The Early Resolution & Case Handling team maintains an entry in the academic misconduct log for 6 years.</p>
Further action under the Proceds	<p>If the student is permitted re-presentation/ re-examination of the work by a Faculty Panel, any subsequent allegations of academic misconduct or Gross Academic Misconduct will be referred to a further Stage 3 Panel.</p>

Student Academic Misconduct Procedures

19. Appendix 2 - What is Academic Judgment?

- Academic judgment is the decision made by academic staff on the quality of the work itself or the criteria being applied. It is a judgment made about a matter where the opinion of an academic is essential. It is based on the scholarly and/or professional knowledge and expertise which academic staff and external examiners draw upon in reaching an academic decision. Identifying suspected academic misconduct and making decisions on academic misconduct cases will often, but not always, involve academic judgment. Examples of academic judgment include:
 - (a) interpreting text matching software reports, such as Turnitin
 - (b) deciding whether the standard of work so out of line with the student's other work to suggest cheating
 - (c) deciding whether the student copied the ideas from others, including generative AI.
 - (d) deciding the extent of the academic misconduct
 - (e) deciding whether the student's working notes support a case that the submitted work was produced by them
 - (f) deciding whether the student's ideas represent common usage
- Where an academic judgment is made it should be evidence-based.
- Deciding questions of fact does not involve academic judgment. Examples of fact include:
 - (a) whether the student advertised others, including generative AI to do the work for them
 - (b) whether the student paid others, including generative AI to do the work for them
 - (c) whether there was intent to cheat
 - (d) whether the correct academic conventions were used
 - (e) whether the student used a prohibited mobile device in an examination
- Deciding on the penalty does not normally require academic judgment.

Student Academic Misconduct Procedures

Document Information	Description of Document Information
Document Title	Academic Misconduct Procedures
Department Owner	Directorate of Student Resolution and Student Protection.
Document Category	<p>Academic - Documents directly affecting research, assessment or teaching within the University</p> <p>Administrative Practice - Documents of an administrative or operational nature</p> <p>Equality and Diversity - Documents relating to the promotion of equality and diversity</p> <p>Ethics and Compliance - Documents concerning appropriate conduct or compliance with legal or regulatory requirements</p> <p>Information Technology - Documents relating to IT systems, data, and related issues</p> <p>Students - Documents directly affecting student life at the University</p>
Document Owner	Deputy Vice-Chancellor
Document Manager	Head of Early Resolution & Case Handling
Related University Policies	<p>Regulations and Credit Framework</p> <p>Academic Integrity Policy</p> <p>Anonymous Marking Policy</p> <p>Timely Feedback Policy</p> <p>Research and Enterprise Integrity Framework, which includes the Research and Enterprise Misconduct Policy.</p>
Related University Procedures	Marking Procedures
Approved by	Education & Student Experience Committee, on behalf of Academic Board
Date Approved	19 July 2021 Updated August 2023
Date of Commencement	1 September 2021
Review Date	2023/24. For implementation of any changes in 2024/25.
Version	V3
History of revisions of the Document	<p>Version 1, 28 June 2021</p> <p>Version 2, 19 July 2021</p> <p>Version 3, August 2023</p>
Web Address	https://www.canterbury.ac.uk/our-students/ug-current/academic-services/assessments/plagiarism