

Procedures for Investigations of Cases of Alleged Academic Misconduct

Contents

1. Introduction..... 2

2. Definitions and Examples 3

3. Description of Penalties 5

4. Implementation of Penalties 8

5. Academic Integrity Tutors (AIT) 10

6. Procedures for the Academic Integrity Tutor (AIT) 11

7. Academic Misconduct Committee 12

8. Meeting of the Academic Misconduct Committee 12

9. Procedures for Review of the Decision of the Academic Integrity Tutor 15

10. Procedures for Review of the Academic Misconduct Committee 16

11. Office of the Independent Adjudicator for Higher Education (OIA) 16

12. Annual Report 16

13. Advice and Support 17

1. Introduction

- 1.1 Assessment, whatever form it takes, is the means by which the University tests whether a student has achieved the outcomes of a course and the standards of an award. It is fundamentally important that students are assessed fairly, and on equal terms with each other for the same award. Academic misconduct undermines the standards of the University's awards and gives unfair advantage over those students who have attempted to complete their assessments fairly and honestly.
- 1.2 These procedures apply to all assessment items submitted for the undergraduate (Levels 4-6), postgraduate taught (Level 7) and for research students (Level 8) and will include all documentation relating to progression, thesis submitted for examination and published MPhil or PhD.
- 1.3 There are no time limits associated with the investigation of alleged academic misconduct and where a case is identified including after an award has been made or the student has left the University, the case will be fully investigated using these procedures. If an Academic Misconduct Committee concludes, retrospectively, that an offence had occurred then the appropriate penalty will be applied. This may mean that the Committee recommends to Academic Board that an award should be rescinded.
- 1.4 It is the responsibility of the Course Team to ensure every student is aware of the requirements of academic integrity and is able to demonstrate use of appropriate academic conventions and practices for assessed work. Within every programme of study, staff will provide advice and guidance on the University's academic conventions and practices.
- 1.5 It is a student's responsibility to engage with the academic conventions and practices applicable to the course on which they are registered. It is the responsibility of students to ensure that the work they submit for assessment is entirely their own, or in the case of group-work the group's own.
- 1.6 It is the responsibility of each individual student when submitting an assessment item to ensure that the work which they are submitting is the work which they wish to be assessed.
- 1.7 In all cases of alleged academic misconduct, students will be treated as innocent until a case against them has been investigated and upheld. Students will be able to continue studying whilst an investigation is carried out, except where professional body regulations apply.
- 1.8 Where a student has declared a disability to the University, the University will endeavour to ensure that information is available to them at all stages of the procedure in appropriate formats, and that any reasonable adjustments are made to the associated proceedings to accommodate the student's needs.
- 1.9 The student has the right to be accompanied by a representative, who is not acting in a legal capacity, at any meeting. The representative must be a member of the University, i.e.:
 - a) a registered student;
 - b) a member of staff;
 - c) a member of staff or Sabbatical Officer of the Students' Union.

The role of the representative will be to support and advise the student and to help them to present their case.

1.10 Where students are registered on awards which lead to professional registration and there is [Fitness to Practise requirements](#), an offence may be referred to an appropriate Fitness to Practise Committee for consideration.

1.11 It is sufficient to establish cases, and the outcome of cases of academic misconduct on the 'balance of probabilities', rather than 'beyond all reasonable doubt'.

2. Definitions and Examples

2.1 Plagiarism

Plagiarism is the most common form of academic misconduct and may arise intentionally or otherwise (e.g., through negligence, poor scholarship or lack of understanding). At the University of Worcester, plagiarism is defined as the taking of another person's thoughts, words, results, judgements, ideas, images, etc., without correct acknowledgement, including take home/online/open book assessments or examinations.

Examples of plagiarism include but are not limited to:

- a) Copying: a student should not copy someone else's work or thoughts and pass this off as their own, even if the student has their permission. This includes using images and audio-visual presentations without acknowledgement;
- b) Copying and pasting: a student may not copy text verbatim or closely paraphrase a source text and pass this off as their own, without using quotation marks and citing the original source;
- c) Paraphrasing: a student should avoid closely paraphrasing someone else's work (e.g., by changing the words or the order of the words slightly) and should always acknowledge the source using the appropriate citation conventions which vary according to discipline.
- d) Sham paraphrasing: When someone copies text, word for word from a source, references the work but does not place it in quotation marks so it appears to be paraphrased.

2.2 Inappropriate referencing

Examples of inappropriate referencing include.

- a) Incorrect referencing: a student should not insert the writing or thoughts of others into their written work without the correct acknowledgment.
- b) Fake Referencing: To make up quotations and/or supply fake citations. The fake citation can be either.
 - I. completely fabricated
 - II. reference a real source (book, journal, or Web site) which contains no such

- article or words, or using references that are unrelated to the subject matter.
- III. citing sources that have supposedly been used or to imply that books and/or journals have been read when they have not.
- IV. using Artificial Intelligence to create your work and then adding references to it.

2.3 Recycling (sometimes referred to as self-plagiarism)

Recycling or self-plagiarism is where a piece of work that has already been submitted for assessment, is resubmitted, in whole or in part, for assessment in the same or in a different programme of study without appropriate acknowledgement and/or permission.

2.4 Collusion

When two or more students prepare an assessment item together that is presented as their own individual work.

Collusion differs from assessments which are identified as group work projects. Assessments based on group work usually require students to work together to share ideas, research and have joint responsibility for the development of the assessment whether in written or other format. In some group work assessments, students are required to work together in the planning and development of the work, but then to produce an independent piece of work.

Peer review of each other's work or discussing an assessment item can be helpful; however, students should be wary of falling into an act of collusion by actually producing/writing parts of an assessment item for their peer/friend.

2.5 Contract cheating, including use of essay mills

This includes the following:

- a) Purchasing or commissioning an assessment from a professional writing service or third party and presenting it as if it was their own.
- b) Commissioning a third party to translate an assessment from one language to another.
- c) Student asking a friend, colleague or family member to write an assessment item for them.

2.6 The use of Artificial Intelligence

Artificial Intelligence relates to web engines, online software and tools that draw on knowledge from the internet to create resources and content and write or rewrite work.

Academic misconduct occurs when students have used Artificial Intelligence to create some or all of the content of an assessment item without acknowledgment of this source.

2.7 Fabrication or falsification of data

This is the practice of inventing, altering or misrepresenting data, results or other information. This would include: claiming to have carried out experiments, observations,

surveys, interviews which a student has not, in fact, carried out; claiming to have obtained results or other evidence which have not, in fact, been obtained; changing data or results so that it supports findings, hypotheses or conclusions not supported by the actual data/results.

2.8 Failure to engage with appropriate ethical approval processes

Where a student does not gain ethical approval through the University's ethical approval processes as described in the [Research Ethics Policy](#) or, if required, an appropriate external ethical approval body (such as an NHS Research Ethics Committee) *prior* to beginning research **or** where the student makes a major deviation from any approved research without gaining additional ethical approval.

2.9 Actions in relation to examinations

Academic misconduct in relation to examinations held in person can include:

- a) Attempting to get sight of the examination paper before it is published;
- b) Taking or using unauthorised material or an electronic device in an examination;
- c) Copying or trying to copy the work of another student;
- d) Asking another student for help during an examination;
- e) Letting another student copy;
- f) Impersonation.

Academic misconduct in relation to examinations held online can also include:

- g) Using the internet or other unauthorised materials (including material pre-prepared by the student or any other person);
- h) Using an unauthorised electronic device;
- i) Using material provided by someone else including another student or an essay writing service;
- j) Sharing material with, or otherwise helping, another student prior to them submitting their answer paper;
- k) Doing anything else to obtain an unfair advantage over other students.

This list is not exhaustive and academic misconduct may also take other forms.

3. Description of Penalties

3.1 The following table of penalties applies to substantiated **first offence** of Academic Misconduct.

3.2 Academic naivety relates to poor academic practice, where work is not deemed acceptable under the University's academic misconduct policy, as a result of misunderstanding requirements or carelessness.

3.3 In cases of misconduct on the MBChB programme, the penalty applied to modules will be applied to MBChB elements of assessment.

Responsibility	Penalty	Description
Academic Integrity Tutor	Academic naivety:	<p>Written warning.</p> <p>Failure of the assessment item.</p> <p>An academic discussion will take place between the AIT and the student. The student will be required to resubmit the work. If the original submission was at first attempt the resubmission will not be capped.</p> <p>The student would be expected to engage with the online Academic Integrity training.</p> <p>This outcome will be formally recorded on the Academic Integrity portal.</p>
Academic Integrity Tutor	Penalty 2:	<p>Failure of the assessment item, with reassessment right where permissible. A fail grade of RR (Reassessment Required) will be recorded. The assessment item mark/grade will be capped at the minimum pass mark/grade.</p>
Academic Integrity Tutor	Penalty 3:	<p>Failure of the assessment item, with reassessment right where permissible. A fail grade of RR (Reassessment Required) will be recorded. The module result will be capped at the minimum pass mark/grade.</p> <p>MPhil/PhD students will be required to resubmit the documentation relating to progression in years 1 or 2 of their programme.</p>
Academic Integrity Tutor /Academic Misconduct Committee	Penalty 4:	<p>Failure in the module: the student must retake the same module at the next opportunity where the module result will be capped at the minimum pass mark/grade.</p> <p>When it is not possible to retake the same module, or no substitute module is permissible, the student may not be able to continue on the course.</p> <p>A fail grade of AM (Academic Misconduct) will be recorded.</p> <p>Research degree students will not be permitted to progress (including transferring to PhD) until they have clearly evidenced that they have addressed the issues that have come to light.</p>

<p>Academic Misconduct Committee</p>	<p>Penalty 5:</p>	<p>Failure in the module: the student must retake the same module at the next opportunity where the module result will be capped at the minimum pass mark/grade. When it is not possible to retake the same module or no substitute module is permissible the student may not be able to continue on the course.</p> <p>A fail grade of AM (Academic Misconduct) will be recorded.</p> <p>Additionally, the following penalty will be applied to the student's final award: Undergraduate Honours - student's final classification will be reduced to a Non-Honours Degree. Non-Honours Degree to Diploma in Higher Education Foundation Degree to Certificate in Higher Education Masters degree to a Post Graduate Diploma, Post Graduate Diploma to post graduate certificate.</p> <p>Research degree students will not be permitted to progress until they have clearly evidenced that they have addressed the issues that have come to light and may in some cases have their programme terminated. Any data, evidence or results collected/obtained up to that point cannot be used in any subsequently submitted thesis.</p>
<p>Academic Misconduct Committee</p>	<p>Penalty 6:</p>	<p>Expulsion. Failure in the module. A fail grade of AM (Academic Misconduct) will be recorded.</p> <p>A student will not be permitted to exit with their named award but may be permitted to exit with a lower award.</p> <p>Research students will be not awarded the degree and be not permitted to be reassessed.</p>

4. Implementation of Penalties

4.1 Penalties associated with assessment items

Type of offence	Penalty
In first cases of plagiarism, inappropriate referencing, recycling (self-plagiarism) and collusion	Academic naivety
In first cases of failing to gain appropriate ethical approval prior to undertaking research where the project is deemed ethically low risk	Penalty 2. The student may also be investigated under the Fitness to Practise Procedures if appropriate.
In first cases of failing to gain appropriate ethical approval prior to undertaking research where the project is deemed ethically high risk	Penalty 4. The student may also be investigated under the Fitness to Practise Procedures if appropriate.
In first cases of fabrication of data, contract cheating, actions in relation to examinations, or inappropriate use of Artificial Intelligence software	Penalty 4 or Penalty 5 The student may also be investigated under the Fitness to Practise Procedures if appropriate.
In second cases of plagiarism, inappropriate referencing, recycling (self-plagiarism) and collusion	Penalty 2, Penalty 3 or Penalty 4 The student may also be investigated under the Fitness to Practise Procedures if appropriate.
In second cases of failing to gain appropriate ethical approval prior to undertaking research where the project is deemed ethically low risk	Penalty 3. The student may also be investigated under the Fitness to Practise Procedures if appropriate.
In second cases of failing to gain appropriate ethical approval prior to undertaking research where the project is deemed ethically high risk	Penalty 4. The student may also be investigated under the Fitness to Practise Procedures if appropriate.
In second/third cases of fabrication of data, contract cheating, actions in relation to examinations, or inappropriate use of Artificial Intelligence software	Penalty 5 or Penalty 6 The student may also be investigated under the Fitness to Practise Procedures if appropriate.
In third cases of plagiarism, inappropriate referencing, recycling (self-plagiarism) and collusion	Penalty 4, Penalty 5 or Penalty 6 The student may also be investigated under the Fitness to Practise Procedures if appropriate.

4.2 Penalties associated with research degree programmes

Type of offence	Penalty
Evidence of plagiarism in the documentation for progression in years 1 and 2	Penalty 3

Evidence of plagiarism in the documentation for progression in years 3 and beyond	Penalty 4
Evidence of plagiarism in any other documentation identified prior to the submission of a thesis	Penalty 4
Evidence of significant plagiarism in a thesis submitted for examination (significant would be determined by the scale, frequency and type of plagiarism; where there is evidence of plagiarism but it is not deemed significant, this could be addressed by examiners through amendments to the thesis)	Penalty 6 Where this is identified by examiners (or others) prior to <i>viva voce</i> then the viva must not go ahead until an Academic Misconduct Committee has met and reached a decision; where plagiarism is identified during the <i>viva voce</i> , the examiners should continue with the viva and make recommendations to be ratified in the event that the alleged misconduct is not proven.
Evidence of fabrication or falsification of data, results, evidence or other information prior to submission of the thesis	Penalty 5 In addition, the student may be subject to investigation under the University's Procedures for Allegations of Research Misconduct.
Evidence of fabrication or falsification of data, results, evidence or other information in a thesis submitted for examination	Penalty 6 Where this is identified by examiners (or others) prior to <i>viva voce</i> then the viva must not go ahead until an Academic Misconduct Committee has met and reached a decision; where fabrication or falsification is identified during the <i>viva voce</i> , the examiners should continue with the viva and make recommendations to be ratified in the event that the alleged misconduct is not proven. In addition, the student may be subject to investigation under the University's Procedures for Allegations of Research Misconduct.
Commissioning or seeking to commission another party (either paid or unpaid) to complete some or all of a thesis on their behalf	Penalty 6
Failure to gain appropriate ethical approval prior to undertaking research where the project is deemed ethically low risk	Penalty 5 where this comes to light prior to the submission of the thesis for examination (in progression documentation) Penalty 6 where this comes to light after the thesis is submitted for examination.

<p>Failure to gain appropriate ethical approval prior to undertaking research where the project is deemed ethically high risk</p>	<p>Penalty 5 where this comes to light prior to the submission of the thesis for examination (in progression documentation) Penalty 6 where this comes to light after the thesis is submitted for examination. In addition, the student may be subject to investigation under the University's Procedures for Allegations of Research Misconduct.</p>
<p>Failure to seek renewed ethical approval when a student makes a major deviation from the approved research</p>	<p>Penalty 5 where this comes to light prior to the submission of the thesis for examination (in progression documentation). Penalty 6 where this comes to light after the thesis is submitted for examination. In addition, the student may be subject to investigation under the University's Procedures for Allegations of Research Misconduct.</p>
<p>Being party to any other arrangement that would constitute a breach of these Procedures</p>	<p>Penalty will correspond to the nature of the offence and will be in accordance with penalties outlined for each of the above.</p>

5. Academic Integrity Tutors (AIT)

5.1 Each School will appoint Academic Integrity Tutors who have the responsibility for dealing with all aspects of the investigation into cases of alleged academic misconduct. This will include:

- a) Taking responsibility for investigation of the referral from the tutor.
- b) Ensuring the student is kept fully informed about the investigation.
- c) If an offence has been committed, deciding upon the appropriate penalty as described above or referring the case to the Academic Misconduct Committee.
- d) In cases where recycling (self-plagiarism occurs), referring the module/s to the appropriate College Director for further investigation into the course assessment design.
- e) Acting as a member of the Academic Misconduct Committee when required.
- f) Presenting cases to the Academic Misconduct Committee on behalf of the School.
- g) Ensuring a complete report of the case and decisions are recorded in the Academic Integrity portal.
- h) Being an active member of the Academic Integrity Forum.
- i) Contributing to staff development for academic integrity.

6. Procedures for the Academic Integrity Tutor (AIT)

- 6.1 If a tutor suspects academic misconduct, they will discuss the evidence with an AIT before making a referral using the Academic Integrity portal. This should be completed as soon as practicable, but no later than 20 working days from the submission deadline for the work concerned.
- 6.2 If during an examination, an invigilator suspects that a student is engaging in academic misconduct, they will inform the student of their allegations, remove any unauthorised material, and clearly mark the examination script with the time they spoke to the student. The student should be allowed to continue their examination. Within three working days of the examination, the invigilator will liaise with the module leader who will make a referral through the Academic Integrity portal.
- 6.3 The Academic Integrity Tutor will review the referral and decide as to whether an Academic Integrity case warrants further investigation.
- 6.4 If a case warrants further investigation, the student and referring tutor will be invited to attend a meeting with the Academic Integrity Tutor. Meetings will take place in person or via MS Teams.
- 6.5 The student will be provided with a copy of the assessment item in question, any report generated by plagiarism detection software and a clear explanation of the issues identified through the Academic Integrity portal.
- 6.6 The student has the right to be accompanied by a representative, who is not acting in a legal capacity, at any meeting arranged to discuss the allegation. The representative must be a member of the University, i.e.:
 - a) a registered student;
 - b) a member of staff;
 - c) a member of the Student Help and Advice team or Sabbatical Officer of the Students' Union.

The role of the representative will be to support and advise the student and to help them to present their case. Students will be encouraged to seek support from the Students' Union, <https://www.worcsu.com/helpandadvice/adviceform/>

- 6.7 The meeting may proceed in the absence of a student who has either:
 - a) indicated an intention to be present and does not attend;
 - b) never responded to communications;
 - c) indicated that they do not wish to attend.

The Academic Integrity Tutor should be content that there is sufficient evidence available to consider the case and that the student has been given adequate notice of the meeting and an opportunity to provide a written statement.

- 6.8 In investigating a possible case of academic misconduct, it is possible that an Academic Integrity Tutor will decide that:
- a) the case should be dismissed,
 - b) a penalty will be applied, or
 - c) the case should be referred to the Academic Misconduct Committee.
- 6.9 In any case of academic misconduct, the Academic Integrity Tutor will apply the appropriate penalty up to and including Penalty 4.
- 6.10 If an Academic Integrity Tutor believes that the case warrants a Penalty 5 or higher, this should be referred to the Academic Misconduct Committee after the initial investigation has taken place.
- 6.11 If a student submits multiple assessment items within a similar timeframe (without the opportunity for feedback) and has made the same type of offence, the Academic Integrity Tutor will apply the same penalty to each item of assessment.

7. Academic Misconduct Committee

- 7.1 The Academic Misconduct Committee is a sub-committee of the Learning, Teaching and Student Experience Committee.
- 7.2 The student will be notified through the Academic Integrity portal informing them that an allegation of academic misconduct has been made and asking them to attend a meeting of the Committee. This will include details of the specific allegations against the student.
- 7.3 Membership of the Committee will be:
- The Academic Registrar or nominee (Chair)
 - 2 members of academic staff
- 7.4 No member of the Committee will have been involved in the decision to refer the matter to the Committee or have prior knowledge of the case.
- 7.5 A member of Registry Service's staff will act as Secretary to the Committee. The Secretary is not a member of the Committee.

8. Meeting of the Academic Misconduct Committee

- 8.1 The student will be notified of the date and time of the meeting at least five working days in advance of Committee meeting and all parties will receive copies of all documents which will be relied on at the meeting. The student may submit written evidence.
- 8.2 The student has the right to be present at the meeting of the Committee. Meetings will take place in person or via MS Teams.

- 8.3 The student has the right to be accompanied by a representative, who is not acting in a legal capacity, at any meeting arranged to discuss the allegation. The representative must be a member of the University, i.e.:
- a) a registered student;
 - b) a member of staff;
 - c) a member of staff or Sabbatical Officer of the Students' Union.

The role of the representative will be to support and advise the student and to help them to present their case.

- 8.4 The meeting may proceed in the absence of a student who has either:
- a) indicated an intention to be present and does not attend;
 - b) never responded to communications;
 - c) indicated that they do not wish to attend.

The Committee should be content that it has sufficient evidence available to consider the case and that the student has been given adequate notice of the meeting and an opportunity to provide a written submission.

- 8.5 The format of the meeting will normally be as follows:
- a) Private meeting of the Committee.
 - b) Student, and their representative, and the School representative (normally the Academic Integrity Tutor) are invited to join the meeting.
 - c) The Chair will summarise the procedure to be adopted and ask if there are any procedural questions.
 - d) The School representative will state the case against the student.
 - e) The Committee may then question the School representative.
 - f) The student will be invited to make an initial statement on the case and be given an opportunity to comment on the School's statement.
 - g) The Committee may then question the Student.
 - h) The School representative will be given an opportunity to comment on the Student's statement.
 - i) The student and their representative may then make a final statement.
 - j) The student and their representative and the School representative will then be asked to withdraw.
 - k) Private meeting of the Committee.
 - l) The Chair will summarise the decision of the Committee.

- 8.6 The Committee may call for any additional evidence in order to arrive at a decision and may, in exceptional cases, ask another member of staff or another student to attend the meeting.

8.7 Decision of the Committee

The Committee will work within the following principles in deciding whether or not academic misconduct has taken place:

- 8.7.1 Members of the Committee must be secure in their belief that academic misconduct has occurred based upon the evidence presented and the balance of probabilities.
 - 8.7.2 The Committee should be made aware of whether the case is a referral or a request to review.
 - 8.7.3 Every reasonable attempt should be made to ensure that the Committee has no prior knowledge about the student's record on the course.
 - 8.7.4 Students may make available to the Academic Misconduct Committee any information about their previous record on the course which they wish to draw to the attention of the Committee.
 - 8.7.5 The consequences for the student of implementing the appropriate penalty should not be a factor for the Committee in evaluating the evidence and making its decision.
- 8.8 Penalty to be applied
- 8.8.1 The Academic Misconduct Committee will decide that:
 - a) the case should be dismissed or
 - b) a penalty will be applied
 - 8.8.2 In determining the seriousness of the offence, the Academic Misconduct Committee should take into account the following factors:
 - a) the scale and extent of the academic misconduct;
 - b) any exceptional circumstances supported by relevant evidence, evidence must be provided by the student prior to the Committee meeting;
 - c) previous offences of academic misconduct and previous penalties.
 - 8.8.3 If a student submits multiple assessment items within a similar timeframe (and will not have had the opportunity to have had feedback) and has made the same type of offence, the Academic Misconduct Committee will apply the same penalty to each item of assessment.
 - 8.8.4 In cases where a student attempts to mislead the Committee, the Committee may impose a more severe penalty.
- 8.9 Record of the meeting
- 8.9.1 The formal minutes of the Committee will record those present and in what capacity present, the nature of the allegation, the decision of the Committee, any penalty imposed and the rationale for applying that particular penalty so that fairness and consistency can be ensured.
 - 8.9.2 The minutes will be confidential except for those present at the Committee and to inform any monitoring carried out.
- 8.10 Notification of the Committee's decision to the student

The student will be informed orally of the Committee's decision on the day of the meeting; and will normally be sent written confirmation of the decision within 5 working days after the meeting.

Notification to the student will:

- a) State the facts found
- b) Identify the main issues and the conclusions to each of them
- c) Make clear the basis for the final decision.

In cases where an allegation is confirmed a copy of any decision taken will be noted on the student record system.

8.11 Notification of the Committee's decision to the Board of Examiners

The Board of Examiners will be notified of the decision of any academic misconduct through the grade recorded on the Exam Board paperwork.

9. Procedures for Review of the Decision of the Academic Integrity Tutor

9.1 A student may request a review of the decision of an AIT on the following grounds:

- a) that procedures have not been correctly followed;
- b) that there is evidence that the penalty imposed was inconsistent with the type of offence and the penalties described in these procedures;
- c) that there is significant new evidence which could not have been made available to the Committee at the time of the meeting and would demonstrate that academic misconduct had not occurred.

9.2 A request to review the decision of an AIT should be made via the Academic Integrity portal within 10 working days of the written decision. On receipt of a request to review, the Academic Misconduct Officer will constitute an Academic Misconduct Review Panel.

9.3 Membership of the Academic Misconduct Review Panel will be a minimum of three members, comprising of Academic Integrity Tutors. The chair of the panel will be a senior/experienced Academic Integrity Tutor.

9.4 No member of the Panel will have been involved in the decision to refer the matter to the Committee or have prior knowledge of the case.

9.5 A member of Registry Service's staff will act as Secretary to the Panel.

9.6 The Panel will determine whether to:

- a) dismiss the request to review
- b) refer it back to the AIT for reconsideration, or
- c) refer it to the Academic Misconduct Committee.

9.7 A student may request a review of the decision of the Panel in writing within 10 working days of receipt of the written decision to the Pro Vice Chancellor Academic.

10. Procedures for Review of the Academic Misconduct Committee

10.1 A student may request a review of the decision of the Academic Misconduct Committee on the following grounds:

- a) that procedures have not been correctly followed;
- b) that there is evidence that the penalty imposed was inconsistent with the type of offence and the penalties described in these procedures;
- c) that there is significant new evidence which could not have been made available to the Committee at the time of the meeting and would demonstrate that academic misconduct had not occurred.

10.2 A request to review the decision of the Committee should be made in writing within 10 working days of receipt of the written decision to the Pro Vice Chancellor Academic. A request to review the decision under 9.1.3 is not time limited.

10.3 On receipt of a request to review, the Pro Vice Chancellor Academic (or nominee) will decide if there are clear grounds, and will either:

- a) dismiss the request to review,
- b) refer it back to the Committee for reconsideration, or
- c) constitute a new Committee.

10.4 Where the decision of the Pro Vice Chancellor Academic or the Committee is to uphold the original decision the letter to the student will draw attention to the individual's right to refer the matter to the Office of the Independent Adjudicator (OIA) and the student will be issued with a Completion of Procedures letter.

11. Office of the Independent Adjudicator for Higher Education (OIA)

11.1 A student who is not satisfied with the outcome of the Procedure and has exhausted all the stages of the procedure may request that the Office of the Independent Adjudicator (OIA) reviews the case. This may be done by completing the OIA scheme application form within twelve months of the date of the University's Completion of Procedures letter.

11.2 Where a case is considered eligible, the OIA will provide independent adjudication on the resolution of complaints once the University's internal procedures have been exhausted.

12. Annual Report

- 12.1 An annual report of investigations of cases of alleged academic misconduct and their outcomes will be made to the Learning, Teaching and Student Experience Committee.
- 12.2 An annual report of investigations of cases of alleged academic misconduct and their outcomes for research degree students only will be made to the Research Committee.

13. Advice and Support

- 13.1 Any queries in respect of this Procedure, should be directed to the Complaints and Appeals Officer or the Examinations and Assessment Officer, Registry Services.
- 13.2 The University recognises that a student suspected of academic misconduct can be stressful. Students are therefore advised to seek advice and guidance from the Students' Union.

Note: Where these Procedures state that certain actions will be taken within a specified timescale and this is not possible (e.g., because of the timing or because key information takes longer to obtain), parties will be kept fully informed of the progress of their case.

Version reference: 5.1

Author of the document: Kevin Pickess, Helen Hope, Joanne Lewis

Date document comes into effect: 1 September 2023

Document is due for review: 1 September 2027

Date checked for Accessibility: 1 August 2023

Revision History

Committee	Date	Change
Academic Regulations Governance Committee v5.1	15 November 2023	Minor revisions [ARGC23/05]
Academic Board v5.0	5 July 2023	Major revisions [AB22/60]
Academic Board Chairs Action v4.4	4 December 2020	Minor revisions
Academic Board v4.3	3 July 2019	Minor revisions [AB18-53]
Academic Board v4.2	25 April 2018	Minor revisions [AB17-53]
Academic Board v4.1	28 June 2017	Minor revisions [AB16-64]
Academic Board v4.0	27 April 2016	Major revisions [AB15-45]
Academic Board v3.4	27 January 2016	Minor revisions
Academic Board v3.3	29 April 2015	Minor revisions
Academic Board v3.2	21 January 2015	Minor revisions
Academic Board v3.1	8 October 2014	Minor revisions
Academic Board v3.0	30 April 2014	Major revisions
Academic Board v2.3	24 April 2013	Minor revisions
Academic Board v2.2	12 October 2011	Minor revisions
Academic Board v2.1	6 July 2011	Minor revisions
Academic Board v2.0	7 July 2010	Major revisions
Academic Board v1.1	26 April 2006	Minor revisions
Academic Board		New procedure Approved