



Quality Assurance Code of Practice

Examination and Assessment Offences

This document is primarily intended for:

All Academic Staff involved in teaching, tutoring, or supervision

Assistant Registrars in the Faculty/School or equivalents

Staff involved in Boards of Inquiry or Departmental Hearing Panels.

Students and Students' Union staff

Queries:

First point of contact –

Assistant Registrars in the Faculties/School or equivalents

Technical/specialist: contact: Academic Registry

1	Purpose and Scope.....	1
2	Principles and Overview.....	2
3	Roles and Responsibilities	3
4	Support and Advice for Students and Staff.....	4
5	The Mandatory Skills Training and Test	4
6	Procedures for Handling Alleged Offences: taught programmes and the taught elements of research programmes	5
	Departmental level process.....	6
7	Procedures for Research Programmes, excluding offences alleged to have occurred in connection with the assessment of taught elements of research programmes, which will be considered under the arrangements for taught programmes (see Section 6).	7
8	Board of Inquiry Process.....	9
9	Disciplinary Hearing	11
10	Monitoring and Review.....	11
	Appendix 1: Examples of Offences	13
	Appendix 2: Penalties	15

1 Purpose and Scope

- 1.1 This QA statement sets out the principles of academic integrity as they relate to examination and assessment offences and applies to all programmes of study leading to a credit-bearing award of the University of Bath, wherever delivered.
- 1.2 This QA statement may need to be read in conjunction with:
- University [Ordinances](#) and [Regulations](#)
 - University [Rule 2: Conduct of Examinations](#)
 - [QA7 Research Degrees](#)
 - [QA16 Assessment, Marking and Feedback](#)
 - [QA28 Conduct of Examinations](#)
 - University [Fitness to Practise](#) Policy.

- 1.3 This QA statement includes all forms of misconduct in any examination or assessment procedure as covered by Regulations of which the following are examples:

<u>Regulation 7.4(h)</u>	<u>Further examples or explanations</u>
Cheating e.g. unauthorised reference to notes or course material in an examination.	Use of unauthorised devices or communication during an examination, or obtaining an examination paper in advance of the examination time or impersonation of an examination candidate.
Fabrication e.g. reporting on experiments never performed.	Reporting on research never performed or data never collected.
Falsification e.g. misrepresentation of the results of experimentation.	
Plagiarism e.g. taking the writings or ideas of another and representing them as one's own.	<p>Direct quotation or paraphrase without appropriate acknowledgement including collusion e.g. the representation of work produced in collaboration with another person or persons as the work of a single candidate. In such cases <u>all</u> involved are guilty of misconduct.</p> <p>Use of others' ideas without acknowledging the source.</p> <p>Copying large portions of text from another source and linking them together with minimal text of one's own.</p>
Duplication of one's own work i.e. submitting as if for the first time and without acknowledgement, content which has previously been assessed.	<p>Where a student submits almost exactly the same piece of work for two different assessments, so that double credit would be gained and counted for the same work, whether submitted at Bath or elsewhere for any other academic award.</p> <p>Note: A student who is repeating a full year as if for the first time must repeat all practical classes and submit new reports accordingly.</p> <p>For more advanced students, where any published authors fail to cite themselves when using excerpts from their old work in a new and original work.</p>

2 Principles and Overview

- 2.1 The University expects all its students to commit to, and maintain, high standards of academic honesty and integrity, respecting the work and originality of others in the course of all their work.
- 2.2 The University needs to ensure that every student's attention is clearly drawn from the outset, and wherever applicable throughout their programme of study, to the nature of plagiarism, collusion and other offences, the consequences of detection and the penalties that will follow.
- 2.3 The process outlined in this statement is intended to ensure consistency and fairness in the detection and handling of alleged misconduct, proportionate to the particular facts in each case.

3 Roles and Responsibilities

- 3.1 **All staff** engaged in teaching, tutoring or supervision of students are responsible, where appropriate, for supporting students so that they are:
- routinely referred to sources of support, training and guidance, for the avoidance of offences and for their development of good academic practice;
 - aware that staff will take action to detect plagiarism and other offences and that if proven, the penalties can be serious.

Staff are responsible for making themselves aware of recognised strategies for the assessment of students' work which will make plagiarism or copying difficult including giving clear guidance to students on acceptable practice when writing up after group work, and for engaging in the sharing of good practice.

- 3.2 **Students** have a responsibility, bearing in mind the principles outlined above, to:
- maintain their understanding of the meaning of, and rules defining, plagiarism and other assessment and examination offences and their consequences, throughout their programme of study
 - review every submission for assessment for errors in the referencing or citing others' work
- and will be required to make a declaration when they submit a piece of assessed coursework in either hard or electronic copy, that the work is their own.

- 3.3 **Heads of Department/appropriate Director of Teaching (School)/or the HE Coordinator at partner organisations** are responsible for overseeing the processes for investigation of alleged examination and assessment offences including those relating to research degrees. A standing delegate may be nominated to perform this role with the approval of the Dean/Head of Learning Partnerships. In the case of the School of Management, the Associate Dean (Research) or the appropriate Director of Teaching normally will undertake responsibilities assigned to Head of School to assure appropriate independence and separation of powers.

Heads of Department/Appropriate Director of Teaching (School)/Learning Partnerships or HE Coordinators are also responsible for:

- ensuring that teaching staff are aware of opportunities for developing their learning and teaching strategies to combat plagiarism and other offences
 - ensuring that one or more sampling policies covering all programmes are in place (approved by faculty-level Learning Teaching and Quality Committees and reviewed periodically by the Department/School Learning Teaching and Quality Committees) and details are disseminated fully to all staff involved in assessment activities.
- 3.4 **Directors of Studies** are normally responsible for investigating and coordinating processes for handling offences, working with Heads of Department/appropriate Director of Teaching (School)/Learning Partnerships and Assistant Registrars in the Faculty/School or equivalents. For collaborative provision delivered by partner organisations, Programme Leaders normally will take on the Director of Studies' responsibility, working with each partner's HE Coordinator.
- 3.5 The following principal bodies are involved:
- **Boards of Studies** are responsible for the setting up of a Board of Inquiry to examine the facts in each case of an alleged serious offence, and receive the report of the Board of Inquiry. Chairs of Boards of Study are responsible for considering appeals from students. All references to the 'Board of Studies' means the Board of Studies of the

Faculty or School in which the student is registered. In the case of research programmes, including taught elements, it means the Board of Studies (Doctoral).

- **Boards of Inquiry** are responsible for inquiring into the case presented by the student and their supporter/s in person, reviewing and deciding the penalties (if any) or recommendations to a Disciplinary Committee, and informing the student promptly of the outcomes.
- **Faculty/School Learning, Teaching and Quality Committees** are responsible for undertaking an annual review of offences, including an assessment of the level of consistency in the determination of level of offence and degree of penalty awarded, and for notifying the University Learning, Teaching & Quality Committee of matters of broader institutional concern.
- **The University Learning, Teaching & Quality Committee** is responsible for reviewing offences as reported annually, for matters of institutional concern and for identifying further work required to enhance support to students and staff.

3.6 The following staff are responsible for providing professional advice as part of the process:

- **Assistant Registrars in the Faculty/School** (or equivalent) are responsible for supporting the setting up of Boards of Inquiry, the associated documentation of the Hearing, and the maintenance of records of all offences alleged or adjudged proven, and the provision of periodic reports.
- **Academic Registry**. The Director of Academic Registry should be consulted in relation to very serious offences to be dealt with under the Disciplinary Procedures (in Regulations), or on the interpretation of or disputes over what constitutes an offence. Academic Registry should be consulted in relation to the general interpretation of this QA statement, or in its relationship to offences arising out of [QA28](#) Conduct of Examinations. The Centre for Learning & Teaching (CLT) can offer advice on good practice in supporting the development and communication of the various sources of advice and guidance to students, and information to staff for the avoidance, deterrence and detection of offences.

4 Support and Advice for Students and Staff

- 4.1 All students will receive advice and guidance on plagiarism and other assessment offences in programme handbooks and through information on the university website and resources.
- 4.2 Guidance for staff in developing learning and teaching strategies for deterring or minimising opportunities for plagiarism and other offences in assessed work will be provided by the CLT.

5 The Mandatory Skills Training and Test

- 5.1 All students entering the University of Bath for the first time, including doctoral students, are required to undertake an academic integrity training session and satisfactorily complete a test of understanding within a defined initial period. It is expected that all students will undertake the training and complete the test within a short time after entry. This is intended to provide every student with a common minimum baseline of skills and knowledge of good educational and academic practice at an early stage, and thus assist them in preparing assignments while avoiding inadvertent assessment offences, particularly plagiarism.
- 5.2 The defined initial period starts with first registration upon entry and ends at the first progression point encountered thereafter.
- 5.3 Students who fail to complete the test satisfactorily by their next progression point will not be permitted to progress to the next stage of their programme of study.

- 5.4 It will normally be for Directors of Studies to determine the appropriate form of skills session and the appropriate test required for students on each stage of each programme. However, others may be involved e.g. Senior Tutors.
- 5.5 The University provides a baseline resource of an online tutorial for this purpose with a generic test as a default resource available to each Department/School/the LPO through the VLE (Moodle). Alternative or additional tests using subject-specific material or case studies, e.g. demonstrating poor academic practice and the penalties that can result, may be set by Directors of Studies.
- 5.6 Directors of Studies who opt to use an alternative form of mandatory test from the default University/Departmental version for their programmes or cohorts, must submit their test(s) for peer review and approval by the Department/School Learning Teaching and Quality Committee for the assurance of adequacy compared to the default version. The approval of an alternative test will be reported to the Faculty Learning Teaching and Quality Committees to inform them as part of the process of annual monitoring of offences.
- 5.7 Directors of Studies are responsible for ensuring that the date and results of a mandatory test that they have selected as an alternative are recorded on each student's record in SAMIS as soon as possible after a pass has been achieved, in order that updated information is available to all assessors.
- 5.8 **Claims of inadvertence or ignorance will not be accepted as a basis for mitigation of a penalty.**

Good Practice

- 1 Students are directed as a cohort to complete the skills training activity and attempt the test as early as possible after entry, preferably before the first major assignment for assessment.
- 2 In one programme, to raise awareness, students complete an early formative assignment which is put through a plagiarism detection service. The results are fully discussed with the cohort and with individuals as necessary. Students are warned that each of them will have at least one other assignment checked in this way during the rest of the year, but they will not be told which or when. Potential penalties are discussed. It would be appropriate for students to complete the academic integrity test as a cohort after the formative assessment and awareness-raising discussion, to reinforce the learning from the exercise.

6 Procedures for Handling Alleged Offences: taught programmes and the taught elements of research programmes

(See Section 7 for procedures for non-taught elements of research programmes)

Process

6.1 Degree of Proof required:

Regulation 8.2(i) states that those staff charged with determining issues under these procedures should be satisfied on reasonable grounds on the evidence before them. Proof does not have to be 'beyond reasonable doubt'.

6.2 **Timing of Procedures in relation to Boards of Examiners' meetings:**

Where an allegation of an offence is under consideration and has not been resolved when a Board of Examiners for Programmes or Board of Studies meets to consider the result(s) of that student, the Board shall not consider the student's results until the allegation has been resolved. When the allegation has been resolved, the Chair of the Board, in consultation with the appropriate External Examiner(s), Director of Studies and Head of Department/appropriate Director of Teaching (School)/ Learning Partnerships, will determine how to proceed.

6.3 If a member of staff suspects that an examination or assessment offence has been committed in connection with an item of assessment as defined in paragraph 1.3 s/he shall immediately inform the Unit Convenor and the Director of Studies responsible for the programme for which the student is registered.

6.4 The Director of Studies shall notify the Head of Department/appropriate Director of Teaching (School)/Learning Partnerships and arrange an investigation to determine whether an offence has occurred, collating evidence of the extent of the offence where appropriate. As part of this, the Director of Studies shall write to the student with a clear statement of the allegation and shall give the student the opportunity to respond to it within fourteen calendar days. The Director of Studies will discuss the matter with the student.

6.5 Where the Director of Studies concludes from the investigation that there is no case to answer, s/he will notify the student in writing that the case is closed, copying the letter to the Head of Department/appropriate Director of Teaching (School)/Learning Partnerships Office and the Assistant Registrar (Faculty/School).

6.6 Where the investigation reveals *prima facie* evidence of an offence the Director of Studies after consultation with the Unit Convenor (where appropriate) and with the Head of Department/appropriate Director of Teaching (School)/Learning Partnerships will review the circumstances and consider the apparent severity of the case. Guidance on these issues is available in Appendix 1.

6.7 The Head of Department/appropriate Director of Teaching (School), in consultation with the Director of Studies may:

- a) for Minor/Technical Offences or "Moderate" Academic Misconduct as typified in Appendix 1, Groups 1 and 2, deal directly with the case as indicated in paragraph 6.8-6.10, **or**
- b) for any case where the offence is deemed more serious either initially or after further investigation, refer the case to the Chair of the Board of Studies for consideration by a Board of Inquiry.

Departmental level process

6.8 Where the investigation reveals *prima facie* evidence of "Minor/Technical" or "Moderate" Academic Misconduct, the Head of Department/appropriate Director of Teaching (School)/Learning Partnerships, after consultation with the Director of Studies, will complete the investigation in order to determine the outcome of the case, drawing on all the evidence made available.

6.9 Where a case is proven the Head of Department/appropriate Director of Teaching (School), in consultation with the Director of Studies (and where appropriate, with other colleagues within or external to the Faculty/School/ Learning Partnerships for reasons of consistency), will select one or more penalties as given in Appendix 2 (Group 1 or Group 2 penalties). The Head of Department/appropriate Director of Teaching (School)/Learning Partnerships shall report the decision to the Board of Examiners for Programmes.

- 6.10 The Head of Department/appropriate Director of Teaching (School)/Learning Partnerships shall communicate the outcome to the student in writing and where appropriate shall include details of appeals procedures open to the student. Where there is evidence that an offence has been committed the outcome shall be recorded in the student's file and be notified to the Chair of the Board of Studies.
- 6.11 The student may apply to the Chair of the Board of Studies (or where this would not render an independent judgement, another academic member of the Board of Studies) for a review of the decision. This request must be submitted within fourteen calendar days of receipt of the written notification of the outcome of the investigation. The criteria for appeal are as follows:
1. that the proceedings of the investigation were not carried out in accordance with the procedures
 2. that fresh evidence can be presented which was not or could not reasonably have been made available to the investigation
 3. that the finding of the investigation was against the weight of the evidence.
- 6.12 In considering a request for a review, the Chair of the Board of Studies may take one of three decisions:
- a. decide there is no *prime facie* case for holding a review
 - b. decide there is a *prime facie* case and take executive action
 - c. decide there is a *prime facie* case and arrange for a Board of Inquiry to be convened in accordance with paragraphs 8 (1) – (11) of this document.
- 6.13 The outcome of the Chair of the Board of Studies deliberations will be communicated to the students in writing within seven calendar days.
- 6.14 The student shall have no further right of appeal, and a letter of completion of internal procedures shall be issued by the Chair of the Board of Studies.

7 Procedures for Research Programmes, excluding offences alleged to have occurred in connection with the assessment of taught elements of research programmes, which will be considered under the arrangements for taught programmes (see Section 6).

- 7.1 The procedure for dealing with alleged offences committed in the course of research for a research award requires a process of investigation which may, if a *prima facie* case exists, result in a Board of Inquiry Hearing and may be followed by a Disciplinary Committee under University Regulations. Supervisors have a responsibility to draw the attention of all new candidates to the Regulation and the penalties attached to a breach of them. The Supervisor should offer guidance if the student is in any doubt as to what constitutes misconduct.
- 7.2 In relation to formative or draft work submitted to a supervisor by a research student, where:
- a) the student can reasonably be expected to understand the assessment offences as set out under Regulation 7.4 (h), AND
 - b) the supervisor suspects a breach of Regulation 7.4 (h) would have occurred had the work been submitted for formal assessment, the supervisor will contact the Director of Studies,
- the Director of Studies will investigate the matter and interview the student. If the suspicion is confirmed, the Director of Studies will, after consulting the supervisory team, issue a formal written warning to the student. A copy of the warning will be placed on the student's file.
- 7.3 Where a suspicion arises that an assessment offence has been committed by a student in work to be assessed in connection with an application for confirmation of registration for PhD or transfer from MPhil/PhD to PhD, the procedure will be as follows:

- 1) The Head of Department/Associate Dean (School of Management) shall notify the Chair of the Board of Studies (Doctoral) and arrange an investigation. As part of this, the Head of Department/Associate Dean (School) shall write to the student including a written statement of the allegation and shall give the student the opportunity to respond to it within fourteen calendar days. The student may wish to consult with an adviser, e.g. the Students' Union, before responding. The Head of Department/Associate Dean (School) may also wish to discuss the matter with the student, the research supervisor and Director of Studies. Where the Head of Department/Associate Dean (School) concludes there is no case to answer s/he will notify the student in writing, copying the letter to the Chair of the Board of Studies (Doctoral), that the case is closed.
- 2) If there is evidence of an offence, the Head of Department/Associate Dean (School) shall take action in the form of a warning or requirement to resubmit, after consultation with the Chair of the Board of Studies (Doctoral). The Head of Department/Associate Dean (School) shall communicate the action taken to the student in writing and shall include details of the review procedures open to the student. The action taken shall be recorded in the student's file and the Director of Academic Registry will be notified. A second or subsequent breach in work submitted for assessment in connection with confirmation of registration for PhD or transfer to PhD will normally result in a reversion to MPhil-only registration with no right of referral or re-submission at a later date for transfer to PhD.
- 3) The student may apply to the Director of Academic Registry for a review of the decision of the Head of Department/School. This request must be submitted within fourteen calendar days of receipt of the written notification of the outcome of the investigation. The criteria for appeal are as follows:
 - that the proceedings of the investigation were not carried out in accordance with the procedures
 - that fresh evidence can be presented which was not or could not reasonably have been made available to the investigation
 - that the finding of the investigation was against the weight of the evidence.

The Director of Academic Registry shall determine whether a Board of Inquiry Hearing shall be convened in accordance with the procedures set out in paragraph 8 of this document. The student shall be notified of the decision of the Director of Academic Registry within twenty-eight calendar days of receipt of the request for a review.

- 7.4 If the suspected offence is discovered by Examiners during the preliminary assessment of the thesis or portfolio submitted for the award, the *viva voce* examination will be postponed pending the outcome of an investigation which should follow the procedures set out at paragraphs 7.7 – 7.8 and 9.1 - 9.4 below.
- 7.5 If the discovery of a suspected offence is made by Examiners during the *viva voce* examination of the thesis or portfolio submitted for the award the Examiners should continue with the examination and make recommendations on the award as if no offence was suspected. Following the *viva* investigations should be undertaken following the procedure as set out at paragraphs 7.7 – 7.8 and 9.1 – 9.4 below. The Examiners' recommendations will be carried forward to the Board of Studies (Doctoral) if no offence is subsequently proven.
- 7.6 If the discovery of a suspected offence is made after the *viva voce* examination but before the Examiners' recommendation has been ratified by the Board of Studies (Doctoral) the investigation should follow the procedures set out at paragraphs 7.7 – 7.8 below.
- 7.7 The allegation shall be referred via the Head of Student Services to the University Secretary.

- 7.8 In order for the University Secretary to determine under Regulation 8.1 (b) (i) whether there is a *prima facie* case for disciplinary action, s/he will ask the Chair of the Board of Studies (Doctoral) to set up a Board of Inquiry to investigate the allegation. The Board of Inquiry will be held in accordance with the procedure outlined in paragraph 8 (5) - (12) below but the Board will not make or enact a decision other than to report to the University Secretary with recommendations.

8 Board of Inquiry Process

- 8.1 Where the investigation reveals evidence of an examination or assessment offence that is more serious, the Head of Department/appropriate Director of Teaching (School)/Learning Partnerships shall refer the matter to the Chair of the Board of Studies who will set up a Board of Inquiry Hearing and notify the Director of Academic Registry.
- 8.2 Normally a second or subsequent offence should be referred to the Chair of the Board of Studies and will be subject to a Board of Inquiry Hearing. A second or subsequent offence is defined as one which has been committed after a student has received a penalty or warning following a previous offence committed in relation to an assessment on the same or another University of Bath programme of study.
- 8.3 The Board of Inquiry has delegated power to make final decisions unless otherwise indicated in the table at Appendix 2 and act on behalf of the Board of Studies. The membership of the Board of Inquiry will normally include:
- the Dean of Faculty/School or the Pro-Vice-Chancellor (International & Doctoral) or the Head of Learning Partnerships (Chair)
 - two nominated members of the Board of Studies
 - two members of academic staff drawn from a panel appointed by and from the Faculty or School or partner college for this purpose
 - In the case of the School of Management or partner colleges, the Inquiry Sub-Committee should co-opt at least three members external to the School or partner college drawn from those eligible to act as members of Boards of Inquiry in the Faculties, or the School of Management.
- 8.4 All members of the Board of Inquiry will have equal voting rights. No member, except where necessary, the Chair, should have had a previous involvement in the case. The Board of Inquiry will, as appropriate, invite witnesses to give evidence. These witnesses will not have voting rights.
- 8.5 Unless all parties agree otherwise, a student should receive at least seven calendar days' written notice of the Board of Inquiry Hearing and should be informed of his/her right to provide a written submission or to attend the Board of Inquiry and to be accompanied by, or represented by, a friend or adviser (for example, a representative from the Students' Union). The student must inform the Chair not less than three calendar days before the Hearing of her/his intention to be accompanied or represented by a friend or adviser, and include contact details for the friend or adviser. Any written submission from the student should be received by the Chair of the Board a minimum of three calendar days in advance of the meeting. The Board of Inquiry will give the student or her/his representative the opportunity to be heard in person before reaching any decision concerning the offence. If the student or her/his representative fails to attend the Board of Inquiry, having had notice of the time and place, the Board of Inquiry may base its review on any written submission by the student and other records of the University concerning that student during their attendance at the University.
- 8.6 The student will be provided with any written evidence presented by witnesses seven calendar days before the hearing. The student (and any friend or adviser) has the right to be

present throughout the hearing until asked to withdraw while the Board of Inquiry discusses the case. The student may ask questions of the Board of Inquiry.

- 8.7 The Chair, in consultation with members of the Board of Inquiry will have discretion to decide at what point any witnesses will be invited to attend the Board of Inquiry and at what point they will be asked to withdraw.
- 8.8 The Chair of the Board of Inquiry shall advise the student on procedural matters. The student (and any friend or adviser) and any witnesses shall be invited to present written and oral evidence. The student (and any friend or adviser) and any witnesses shall be given an opportunity to ask questions of, and respond to questions from the Board of Inquiry. The student (together with any friend or adviser) and the witnesses will withdraw while the Board of Inquiry discusses the case.
- 8.9 In accordance with the provisions of Statute 28, no papers, minutes or other records which relate to reserved areas of business shall at any time be made available to a student, except insofar as the papers, minutes or other records constitute the student's personal data. Reserved areas of business include those concerning decisions on the academic assessment of individual students. In case of doubt, the Chair of the Board of Studies shall decide whether a matter falls into a reserved area of business or not, and the Chair's decision shall be final. Guidance on the disclosure of papers by the Board of Inquiry is available on the University's [Data Protection website](#). Further advice is also available from the University's Legal Adviser.
- 8.10 The formal record of the Board of Inquiry should include a summary of the arguments put forward by all parties, a summary of the Board of Inquiry's discussion including any counter arguments, a record of the findings and decisions, including (where appropriate) any recommendations for further action.
- 8.11 Except in the case of a research student (see paragraph 7.8 above) where the Board of Inquiry finds evidence of an offence having been committed, it will,
- make a decision to impose any penalty or penalties as indicated in Groups 2 or 3 of Appendix 2;
- or**
- recommend that a hearing of the Disciplinary Committee be convened and provide an indication of appropriate penalties;
- or**, in relation to the *relevant* programme:
- recommend that the procedures under the Fitness to Practise policy be invoked;
 - A student may not be subjected to both a Disciplinary Committee hearing and a Fitness to Practise Panel hearing.

The Board of Inquiry will report the outcomes briefly to the Board of Studies and the University Secretary will be informed of any recommendation to proceed to a Disciplinary Committee (see Section 9). The Board of Studies will report the outcome of the inquiry to Senate.

- 8.12 The outcome of the Board of Inquiry's deliberations will be communicated to the student immediately after the Board of Inquiry and will be confirmed in writing within seven calendar days. Details of the review procedures open to the student should be included. The outcome shall be recorded in the student's file and the Director of Academic Registry notified.
- 8.13 A student may apply to the Director of Academic Registry for a review of a Board of Inquiry's decision. This request must be submitted within fourteen calendar days of receipt of the written notification of the outcome of the Hearing. The criteria for appeal are as follows:
- that the proceedings of the Board of Inquiry were not carried out in accordance with the procedures

- that fresh evidence can be presented which was not or could not reasonably have been made available to the Board of Inquiry
- that the finding of the Board of Inquiry was against the weight of the evidence.

8.14 The Director of Academic Registry shall determine whether a new Board of Inquiry should consider the matter. The composition of a new Board of Inquiry shall be at the discretion of the Director of Academic Registry. The student shall be notified of the decision of the Director of Academic Registry within twenty-eight calendar days of receipt of the request for a review.

9 Disciplinary Hearing

9.1 The University Secretary will determine under Regulation 8.1 (b) (i) whether there is a *prima facie* case for formal disciplinary action.

9.2 If the University Secretary determines that there is no *prima facie* case, any remaining stages of the assessment or examination process will take place as normal (see [QA7](#) in relation to Research Degrees).

9.3 If the University Secretary determines that formal disciplinary action should be taken, s/he will decide whether the case should be considered at a hearing by the Vice-Chancellor (Regulation 8.2(e)) or by the Disciplinary Committee (Regulation 8.2 (f)). The Disciplinary Committee will follow the provisions of Regulation 8 including that for Appeals (Regulation 8.3).

9.4 The outcomes from a disciplinary hearing under Regulation 8 in relation to Assessment Offences may include, but will not be limited to, the following possible decisions:

In relation to any student:

- to rescind a decision to make an award
- to recommend to Senate that the student be expelled.

In relation to research students:

- to take no disciplinary action; any remaining stages of the examination process would take place. The Board of Studies would reach a decision based solely on the academic criteria, i.e. ignoring the offence
- to allow the student a period of time to correct the offending text (e.g. plagiarised material); if the student conforms to the requirements, any remaining stages of the examination process would take place and the Board of Studies would reach a decision based on the recommendation of the Board of Examiners
- to determine that the student's thesis would not be examined further and that the student would in consequence, receive no award.

9.5 Where plagiarism is alleged after an award has been made, such allegations shall be reported to the University Secretary for investigation and appropriate action. If the allegation is upheld, Council (acting on the recommendation of Senate) under Sections 17.9 and 19.18 of the University Statutes has the power to deprive a person of any award conferred by the University and withdraw all privileges connected therewith.

10 Monitoring and Review

10.1 Faculty/School Learning, Teaching and Quality Committees are responsible for preparing and considering an annual report summarising qualitative and quantitative information on every proven case, including the actions taken. The basis of the report will be the records of offences made by Directors of Studies and Faculty and Programme Administrators in the form prescribed for the annual report. The report should contain a commentary evaluating

trends in offences compared to prior years (when available) and any issues of consistency. An assessment of the operation and effect of the mandatory training and test (or alternative tests) should be included. The summary report should be sent to Academic Registry who will prepare a composite report for University Learning, Teaching and Quality Committee identifying any institutional issues.

- 10.2 The University Learning, Teaching and Quality Committee may make recommendations to address Departmental, School, Faculty or Institutional issues.
- 10.3 These procedures will be monitored and reviewed by the University Learning, Teaching and Quality Committee.

Statement Details		
Issue Version:	3.7	
Date:	August 2019	
Antecedents:	Working Group Report on Plagiarism	
	<i>Senate</i>	Minutes 11123, 11496 14 April 2010, Minute 13110; 1 December 2010, Minute 13219
	<i>Senate (NFAAR)</i>	9 April 2008, Minute 12740; 11 June 2008, Minute 12782;
	<i>Quality Assurance Committee</i>	Minutes 297, 315d, 335, 491(d), 623(1), 1 July 2008, Minute 857(7)(8) 3 July 2009, Minute 976(7) 13 July 2010, Minute 1097
	<i>University Learning Teaching & Quality Committee</i>	8 September 2010, Minute 4b 9 November 2010, Minute 25 24 May 2011, Minute 92 iv) 6 November 2012 Minute 334 9 July 2013 Minute 428 8 July 2014 Minute 552 7 July 2015 Minute 671 11 July 2017 Minute 940 6 Nov 2018 Minute 1103 16 July 2019 Minute 1197
	<i>Learning and Teaching Committee</i>	Minute 61 (3/2/09)
Related Documentation:	University Regulations , paras 7 & 8 University Rule 2: Conduct of Examinations New Framework for Assessment (NFA) QA28 Conduct of Examinations Individual Mitigating Circumstances Regulations (IMCs)	
Authors:	Academic Registry Office of the University Secretary	

Appendix 1: Examples of Offences¹

1. These groups of typical offences are in ranked order and are intended to be followed normally by default, broadly matching the three ranges of penalties (see Appendix 2).
2. However, where the evidence exists, an alternative categorisation of an offence may be considered appropriate in the particular circumstances.

Group 1: Minor or Technical Misconduct

This is essentially poor academic practice, which the initial training and test is designed to help eliminate, particularly in the early stages of a student's study career in the University. For this reason, further support to ensure clear understanding of the rules of good academic writing practice should always be offered where appropriate.

Typical instances would include:

where there is a very small and/or relatively insignificant case of:

- poor referencing
- incorrect (or an absence of) attribution for copied work inserted in an assignment
- a small amount of work copied from another student
- paraphrasing without adequate attribution.

The following case would not normally be considered Minor or Technical:

- where the circumstances suggest that the student did intend to obtain unfair advantage.

Group 2: 'Moderate' Academic Misconduct

This heading covers misconduct which would, had it remained undetected, have resulted in the student's dishonesty misleading the assessor or others involved in setting or reviewing assessments and results.

The volume and significance of the unacceptable elements in the submission are key factors - but not necessarily the only factors in determining the level of the offence.

Examples would be an assignment that contains:

- text, laboratory results, reported research etc. identical or with significant similarities to that of another student, whether the other student is aware, or not, of the copying (except for instance, where identical or very similar presentation of results such as in a complex table or graphic derived from the group's activity, is explicitly permitted in a group assignment brief)
- ideas or concepts which appear to originate from the student but are in fact the work of others, e.g. are not fully referenced, cited or otherwise acknowledged, as required
- text that is inappropriately paraphrased or directly quoted without speech marks and is not referenced
- identical or closely related text and ideas to another assignment previously submitted by the student for which marks or credit have already been given and will contribute to the marks record for the student – but which the student fails to acknowledge to the assessor as previously submitted and assessed ideas/work

¹ Acknowledgement is made of the Codes of Practice/Regulations of the following institutions which were consulted in drawing together the relative ranking of these offences:

Aston University	Birkbeck College	University of Bristol
University of East London	University of Exeter	Imperial College
University of Keele	Loughborough University	Southampton University

Report from Plagiarismadvice.org on HEIs views of importance and relative ranking of offences and appropriate penalties (Benchmark Plagiarism Tariff P Tennant and G Rowell, 2009-2010).

or

a minor infringement of the examination venue rules as set out in [QA28 Conduct of Examinations](#) and University [Rule 2](#).

Group 3: Severe Academic Misconduct

This heading includes second offences of academic misconduct or those involving evidence of extensive plagiarism or cheating, or clear evidence of intent to deceive or gain substantial advantage. Cheating in examinations will almost always fall in this category (see [QA28 Conduct of Examinations](#) and University [Rule 2](#)):

Typically (but not exhaustively):

- having or using any form of unauthorised communication, reference material or device during an examination
- impersonating another person or being impersonated by another person in any examination or for any assessment
- plagiarism in *extensive* and/or *significant* portions of a submission, whether ideas, hypotheses, text, code, graphics, tabulated data or other elements e.g. failure to attribute every such incidence; significant portions of coursework reproduced in collusion with others
- a second offence of any form of plagiarism including collusion
- use of an essay mill, commercial organisation or the services of another person to commission or purchase a piece of work
- Fabrication of laboratory results e.g. reporting on experiments never performed or data never collected
- plagiarism in work submitted for assessment as a thesis, dissertation, case study or other form of final submission required for any postgraduate research degree
- intent to cheat demonstrated where there is deliberate manipulation of sections of work presented for assessment, to avoid plagiarised elements being recognised as such by an automated detection system e.g. Turnitin.

Appendix 2: Penalties

In all cases:

In all cases **considered proven**, the Board of Inquiry:

- will issue a formal written reprimand to the student, and
- will record the case in the student's file, and
- will apply one or more of the following penalties.

Noting that:

- a more severe penalty may be applied for a second or subsequent offence;
- a more serious penalty may be applied for a student the further the student has progressed through their studies
- a group 3 offence may occasionally draw on a Group 2 penalty in appropriate cases
- penalty "P": Boards of Inquiry dealing with proven cases involving students on postgraduate taught programmes should include in their considerations whether such students should be entitled to receive an award with a grade of merit or distinction, should their overall results in due course indicate such an outcome.

Claims of inadvertence or ignorance will not be accepted as a basis for mitigation of a penalty.

Type	Penalty	Group 1 Offences Type	Group 2 Offences Type	Group 3 Offences Type	
A	Require the student immediately to undertake or retake and successfully complete the mandatory skills training and test or any other form of training and test of understanding that the Head of Department may determine as more appropriate in the circumstances.	A	A		
B	Issue a strong verbal warning to the student, and place a note of the warning on the student's file.	B	B		
C	Require the student to resubmit the affected item of work as if at a first attempt.	C	C		
D	Reduce the mark for the affected item of work according to the seriousness of the offence.		D		
H	Assign the minimum pass mark for the unit.		H		
K	Where the offence is committed in the first assessment attempt cap the mark between 0% and 34% and require the student to retrieve failure at supplementary assessment if permitted by the Programme Regulations.			K	
L	Assign a mark of zero or 'fail' grade with no credit for the unit or units, the Board of Inquiry acknowledging that retrieval may require retaking the units or year according to the assessment regulations pertaining to the particular programme of study.			L	
M	In relation to an undergraduate final award, downgrade the degree classification of an undergraduate award, where available.			M	
N	In relation to an undergraduate final award, award an unclassified honours degree, an ordinary degree (where permitted by the programme regulations) or a lower award (DiplHE or CertHE).			N	
P	In relation to a taught postgraduate final award, downgrade the level (e.g. from MSc to PGDip or PGCert), or the grade (e.g. from a Distinction to Merit or Pass).			P	
Q	Terminate the programme with no award			Q	
X	Refer the case for consideration under the Disciplinary procedures as set out in University Regulations 7 & 8, in particular in a case where the appropriate penalty may be severe. The Hearing may include a recommendation of a specific penalty. <u>OR, in relevant cases,</u> refer the case for a hearing by the Fitness to Practise Panel			X	

Notes:

- 'Fail' grades apply in the case of assessments where only a 'pass' or 'fail' grade is given.
- Normal mark scheme rules apply: e.g. UG students retain original failing mark after successful reassessment; postgraduate students achieve a maximum of 40% after successful reassessment.
- The consequences of penalties will vary depending on the level of programme, the year of study, whether the affected item of work is the only assessment for a unit, and the status of the unit within the programme.
- It is important that in determining the penalty/ies to be applied the Department/Board is mindful of the potential impact of the penalty on the programme level progression and/or outcome.
- Penalties M, N and P may be applied only in the final year of the student's programme of study.
- Where penalty C is combined with penalty D, the student must be informed of the reduction in marks to be applied before the item of work is undertaken.
- Penalty X may be applied in addition to another penalty.