

12 Managing Academic Conduct and Practice

12.1 Introduction

- 12.1.1 This Chapter is applicable for alleged academic misconduct by taught students only. It does not cover alleged academic misconduct by academic staff or students registered on research programmes who are covered by separate procedures, see [Research Misconduct](#). For guidance or advice on the procedure please contact the Student Cases Office on 01392 725810 or studentcases@exeter.ac.uk.
- 12.1.2 Students based at one of our Exeter campuses, or studying remotely, needing help with their own case **should** contact the Students' Guild Advice Unit on advice@exeterguild.com. Students based at the Penryn campus **should** contact the Students' Union (FXU) advice unit on advice@thesu.org.uk.

12.2 General Principles

- 12.2.1 The University takes poor academic practice and academic misconduct very seriously and expects all students to behave in a manner which upholds the principles of academic honesty. Academic honesty is fundamental to the values promoted by the University and no student **should** be allowed to obtain for themselves, or for another candidate, an unfair advantage. Academic honesty means never falsifying the results of any work and always giving full credit for any other persons' contributions to our own achievements.
- 12.2.2 The Student Cases Office, within Compliance Governance and Risk, **must** have oversight of all cases of academic misconduct in order that they can carry out the University's reporting requirements. This will include responding to requests for information under the Freedom of Information and Data Protection Acts.
- 12.2.3 All decisions taken under this chapter shall take full account of natural justice, fairness and equity, and all penalties **should** be applied consistently within, and between, proceedings at College Discipline level and proceedings at the University level.
- 12.2.4 When considering cases under this chapter the University will adopt the standard of proof 'on the balance of probabilities'.
- 12.2.5 This chapter shall apply to all currently registered students on taught programmes.
- 12.2.6 All students will be given the chance to submit a defence. This **must** be in writing to a Review Panel (where this relates to examination misconduct). This **may** be in writing or in person to a Committee of Academic Enquiry or proceedings at College/Discipline Level. Students cannot prevent any hearing from taking place through non-submission of a defence or non-attendance at a meeting, providing reasonable steps have been taken to give the student the opportunity to attend or to submit a statement.
- 12.2.7 Students **should** be kept informed of the progress of any case they are involved in.

- 12.2.8 When considering an allegation of academic misconduct or poor academic practice staff **should not** differentiate between formative and summative assessments.
- 12.2.9 Students found guilty of academic misconduct or severe academic misconduct **should** be penalised more severely than those who do not submit an assessment by the original deadline.
- 12.2.10 Information on proven cases of academic misconduct will be available to staff who are asked to provide references for students.
- 12.2.11 All cases of academic misconduct shall, in the outcome sent to the student, be termed as either 'poor academic practice', 'academic misconduct' or 'severe academic misconduct'. In the case of Examination Offences the outcome shall be termed as 'examination misconduct' or 'severe examination misconduct'.
- 12.2.12 The University provides guidance on the appropriate penalties. Each body which imposes a penalty has the discretion to vary the penalty it can impose within its set limitations, but **must** provide clear reasons as to why they have varied the penalty.
- 12.2.13 In all cases of academic misconduct the penalty **may not** be just limited to the module, piece of coursework or examination in which the offence took place.
- 12.2.14 Second offences of academic misconduct which occur in different assessment periods, will normally be treated more harshly than a first offence. Where it appears there is a case of suspected academic misconduct, Colleges should where possible check all relevant available summative work that counts towards the calculation of the student's degree.
- 12.2.15 In general, the University will not consider mitigation in determining whether cases of academic misconduct took place. Students who are unable to complete an assessment, through illness or other personal circumstances, **should** apply for mitigation through the appropriate channels at the time that the circumstances and/or illness occurs, and such circumstances cannot be considered as an excuse for academic misconduct. Adverse circumstances may provide context to the actions of the student, which **may** be considered by the relevant Committee at their discretion when determining the penalty to be imposed.
- 12.2.16 Students who commit academic misconduct in module components are subject to the normal programme rules for progression, i.e. these modules may be condoned.
- 12.2.17 All cases considered under this procedure should be completed within 60 calendar days of students being formally notified of the alleged offence. Where this is not possible, or where a case is deemed complex, students should be kept informed of the delay.

12.3 Definitions and Offences

- 12.3.1 Academic misconduct is defined as an act or failure to act that gives, or aims to give, an advantage if undetected or any behaviour which may deceive those setting, administering and marking a piece of work. Academic misconduct can take a number of forms including but not limited to:

- a) The use or possession of unauthorised books, notes, software, electronic devices or other materials in an examination (unless specifically permitted).
- b) Obtaining an examination paper ahead of its authorised release.
- c) Attempting to impersonate or impersonation of another individual, due to be sitting a specific assessment.
- d) Collusion, i.e. the unauthorised working with another person on a piece of work, which is then submitted as part of an assessment, without acknowledgement of the other's contribution. This differs from plagiarism where the owner of the work does not knowingly allow the use of their work.
- e) Fabrication, i.e. the creation of false data or other aspects of research or assessed work, including but not limited to documentation and participant consent with the intention of deceiving the marker to the benefit of the student.
- f) Falsification, i.e. the inappropriate manipulations and/or selection of data imagery and/or consents with the intention of deceiving the marker to the benefit of the student.
- g) Plagiarism, i.e. the act of representing work or ideas as one's own without appropriate acknowledgement or referencing. There are four main types of plagiarism, which could occur:
 - i) Direct copying of text, or illustrations, from a book, article, fellow student's essay, handout, thesis, web page or other source without proper acknowledgement.
 - ii) Claiming individual ideas derived from a book, article etc. as one's own, and incorporating them into one's work without acknowledging the source of those ideas. This includes paraphrasing a source, or altering the material taken from the source so it appears to be one's own work.
 - iii) Overly depending on the work of one or more others without proper acknowledgement of the source, by constructing an essay, project etc. by extracting large sections of text from another source, and merely linking these together with a few of one's own sentences.
 - iv) The re-submission or re-use of the student's own work in another assignment whether this was submitted at the University of Exeter or any other academic institution worldwide. (This is not intended to prevent a student from developing an academic idea over the period of a course, for example stating an argument in an essay for a particular module and then developing this argument in a dissertation, but to prevent the counting of credit twice for the same piece of work, however this operates at the discretion of the Panel considering the offence).
- h) Misrepresentation including, but not limited to, misrepresenting data, or misrepresenting the work of someone else as your own, in whole or in part. For example: copying another's bibliography and referencing, implying the research completed is the student's own.

- i) Coercion, this is where a student puts pressure on another student or member of staff to act in a particular way, or attempts to do so, with the intention of gaining an academic advantage.
- 12.3.2 Colleges **may** extend these definitions for specific subject areas and provide students with examples as appropriate. The correct referencing system for making quotations used within assessed work **should** be made available in the College/Discipline handbook, and clarification **should** be available from Personal Tutors, as well as through induction sessions within the College/Discipline.
- 12.3.3 Throughout this chapter, an examination is defined as an assessment within a formal examination room, subject to invigilation and a fixed time period for the candidate to complete the required work.
- 12.3.4 Throughout this chapter, a piece of coursework is defined as any assessed work which is not an examination. The term coursework applies equally to formative and summative work.
- 12.3.5 Throughout this Chapter at formal meetings reference is made to the Student's supporter. The Student's Supporter will normally be a member of the University, or Guild of Students/Falmouth and Exeter Students' Union and the role is defined as follows; the Supporter is there to provide moral support to the Student and to support the student with asking and answering questions during the meeting. They may also take notes of the meeting for the Student. The Student is expected to speak from themselves, and there is no automatic right for the Supporter to address the Committee. Should a Supporter act beyond this definition, then the Chair **may** suspend the meeting and ask the Supporter to leave, in the event that the Student is unable to continue the meeting in the absence of the Supporter, then the meeting will continue in the absence of the Student, based on the verbal evidence heard to date and the written documentation. Should the Supporter be asked to leave this meeting, this will not affect the attendance of others at the meeting such as the marker, any witness or College Representative.
- 12.3.6 A witness is a person who can testify their knowledge of a matter that is under investigation. A witness would not be called to provide a character reference, nor would they be able to act as the Student's supporter, as described in section 12.3.5, within the meeting. A witness would attend a meeting to testify about what they witnessed in respect of the matter under investigation, answer questions put to them by a Panel or Committee and student, and then leave. A witness would not be entitled to know the outcome of any proceedings in which they had given testimony.

12.4 Categories of Academic Misconduct

- 12.4.1 The University has developed three levels of severity for such offences, determining what category an offence falls into is an exercise of academic judgement. Where an offence is identified, then the College Cases Team or the University Cases Team **must** ensure that it is correctly categorised. There are three categories:
- a) Poor academic practice.
 - b) Academic misconduct.

- c) Severe academic misconduct.

12.5 Poor Academic Practice

- 12.4.1 Poor academic practice may arise from lack of understanding of academic protocols or a misunderstanding of expected academic conventions of the discipline.
- 12.5.2 It would not be acceptable to consider a case as “poor academic practice” where either of the following conditions applies:
 - a) There is any indication that the student intended to gain an unfair advantage or had the intention to deceive the marker.
 - b) The student had already been found guilty of an offence, a similar offence of poor academic practice, in a similar assessment, and could therefore be reasonably expected to have familiarised themselves with the academic practice of the discipline.
- 12.5.3 Poor academic practice cases are handled at College/ Discipline level.

12.6 Academic Misconduct

- 12.6.1 Academic misconduct involves behaviour which, if not detected, would have deceived those setting, administering and marking the coursework and/or could have obtained advantage on the part of the student. Examples include:
 - a) An assignment including text which is either inadequately paraphrased or directly quoted without speech marks and not referenced.
 - b) An assignment which fails to provide a reference in the text for ideas that are not the student's own.
 - c) An assignment which contains text, tables etc. which are identical, or almost identical, to that of another student or source.
 - d) An assignment which is identical or closely related to one submitted by the student at an earlier point and for which a mark has been received.
 - e) Where the student uses data which they have not collected or produced themselves and this is not referenced.
- 12.6.2 Academic misconduct cases are normally handled at College level.

12.7 Severe Academic Misconduct

- 12.7.1 Severe academic misconduct may be a second offence, or involve evidence of extensive plagiarism or cheating, or clear evidence of behaviour which is designed to deceive those setting, administering and marking the assessment and/or behaviour designed to obtain advantage on the part of the student. Examples include:
 - a) Taking notes into or using any unauthorised device in an examination.

- b) Impersonating another person during an examination or arranging for another person to impersonate any individual during an examination.
- c) An assignment that includes extensive, or otherwise significant quantity, of un-attributed or incorrectly attributed copying.
- d) Any case where a student has previously been penalised for Academic Misconduct.
- e) The use by a student of essay sites that may involve a commercial transaction, with or without the authors consent.
- f) Misconduct within a dissertation or thesis of a taught postgraduate programme. Owing to the level of study, this would normally be placed within this category.
- g) Where the College suspects that any of the underlying data used by the student has been either falsified or fabricated.

12.7.2 Suspected severe academic misconduct cases **should** be initially investigated by the College, and referred to the University level.

12.8 Responsibilities for Partner Institutions

12.8.1 All partner institutions delivering programmes validated by the University of Exeter are required to follow the procedures below, except that Associate Dean (Education) shall be taken to mean the head of the academic unit concerned, who shall keep the Principal of the partner institution and the Academic Partnership Team at the University of Exeter (partnerships@exeter.ac.uk) informed.

12.9 Responsibilities of the University

12.9.1 The University will ensure that all procedures and policies relating to academic misconduct are fit for purpose and widely available to both staff and students.

12.9.2 The University will ensure that all staff involved in handling academic misconduct cases have access to suitable training and development opportunities on academic misconduct, which they should have attended.

12.9.3 The University will support Colleges in developing methods to reduce the incidences of academic misconduct (particularly in the design of assessment and administering of examinations) and will provide staff with the appropriate tools to detect cases of plagiarism in a timely manner.

12.9.4 The University will ensure that students have access to appropriate levels of information, advice and guidance to help avoid academic misconduct, and to support students if academic misconduct is proven against them.

12.9.5 The University will provide appropriate online training for students in how to avoid academic misconduct.

12.9.6 The University will keep records of all cases of academic misconduct, providing annual reports to Faculty Boards and Senate.

12.10 Responsibilities of Colleges

- 12.10.1 All Colleges will ensure that they have appropriate arrangements in place in order to comply with the requirements set out in this Chapter. All Colleges will follow the procedures as laid out in this Chapter, when handling cases of suspected academic misconduct, including making sure that staff handling academic misconduct cases have had appropriate training
- 12.10.2 All Colleges will ensure that they have an appropriate named contact that an academic can contact if they suspect academic misconduct when marking. This should initially be the discipline Academic Misconduct Officer.
- 12.10.3 Each College will appoint as many Academic Misconduct Officers as required to ensure that each of its Disciplines or Programmes have a named member of staff who is the point of contact for any initial queries concerning Academic Misconduct. Academic Misconduct Officers should be members of the academic staff of the College. Academic Misconduct Officers will:
- a) Provide information and guidance within their College on dealing with cases of suspected academic misconduct as well as being the primary College-based source of advice on preventative measures.
 - b) Conduct Poor Academic Practice meetings.
 - c) Attend College-level meetings and act as an expert and source of advice in these matters.
 - d) Attend Committees of Academic Enquiry as committee members.
 - e) Academic Misconduct Officers should not also be the Senior Tutor or a member of staff responsible for pastoral support for the Discipline so as to prevent any conflict of interests or confusion on the part of students.
 - f) From amongst the nominated Academic Misconduct Officers the College will appoint a Senior Academic Misconduct Officer, and may appoint up to two Senior Academic Misconduct Officers. Senior Academic Misconduct Officers **should** have an overview of all academic misconduct cases within the College, and will be responsible for Chairing College Level meetings.
- 12.10.4 All Colleges will provide students with training and guidance on what constitutes academic misconduct, alongside subject-specific information on appropriate referencing, during the induction process (for all stages of entry, i.e. including those who enter mid-year or directly into the second year). This information **should** be reinforced as appropriate throughout a student's studies.
- 12.10.5 All Colleges will inform students at the start of their programme that they are required to complete the ELE (Exeter Learning Environment) module 'Academic Honesty and Plagiarism'. All students **should** have completed this prior to the submitting of their first piece of work.
- 12.10.6 All Colleges will provide students with assessment cover sheets for written work, or the opportunity to agree to a declaration for electronic submission, which certifies that their submitted work is entirely their own and appropriately referenced.

- 12.10.7 All Colleges will ensure that College/Discipline handbooks provide guidance on academic misconduct, and links to relevant University regulations on academic misconduct.
- 12.10.8 All Colleges will have appropriate mechanisms to detect academic misconduct and will provide College-specific guidance for all staff on what to do if they suspect academic misconduct when marking a student's assignment.
- 12.10.9 All Colleges will consider the issue of academic misconduct when designing assessments in order to minimise opportunities for academic misconduct.

12.11 Responsibilities of Students

- 12.11.1 Students will adopt the University's culture of academic honesty and encourage academic honesty in others.
- 12.11.2 Students will familiarise themselves with the University procedures relating to academic misconduct and their College/Discipline specific guidance on referencing and how to avoid academic misconduct. Ignorance of these procedures and guidance will not be considered to be an excuse for academic misconduct.
- 12.11.3 When submitting work for assessment, each student will certify the extent to which the work is their own.
- 12.11.4 Each student will complete the ELE (Exeter Learning Environment) module '[Academic Honesty and Plagiarism](#)' this should be completed prior to submitting their first piece of work, and will seek guidance from their Personal Tutor if further advice is required.
- 12.11.5 Students **should** regularly re-evaluate their own understanding of the principle of academic honesty, seeking additional support if required from their Personal Tutor or other relevant staff as indicated by the College in their College/Discipline Handbooks.
- 12.11.6 Each student will participate in any additional training recommended by their College, such as the academic writing course or tutorial support offered through INTO.

12.12 Delegation of Responsibility

- 12.12.1 Where the procedures refer to University officers and members of staff, it is standard practice that such procedures **may**, where appropriate, be handled through an appropriate person nominated by the stated officer/staff member to act on their behalf.
- 12.12.2 In the cases below where the University Cases Office is referenced, they are acting on the delegated authority of the Director of Governance and Compliance.
- 12.12.3 Where reference is made to the Student's Guild Vice President Education, this can mean any elected sabbatical officer of the Guild, acting as the nominee of the Vice President Education.
- 12.12.4 Where reference is made to a Dean of the Faculty, this **should** be taken to mean the Academic Dean for Students and Dean of the Faculty of Taught

Programmes, or the Dean of the Faculty of Postgraduate Research, acting on behalf of the Dean of the Faculty of Taught Programmes, or the Associate Academic Dean for Students. Where no Dean is appropriate, as both Deans have had contact with the Student, then the Dean **must** delegate their role to an Associate Dean (Education), who is not connected to the student or the student's College.

- 12.12.5 Where reference is made to the Education Business Partner, this **may** mean either the Education Business Partner or a dedicated nominee, who is responsible for academic misconduct and maintains a strategic overview of academic misconduct cases within the College.
- 12.12.6 Formal responsibility for academic misconduct, within Colleges, lies with the Associate Dean of Education and the Education Business Partner.

12.3 Managing Academic Misconduct – Procedures for Examination Offences

- 12.13.1 This procedure applies to both formal examination organised by the central exams teams, and any in class tests which are run by Colleges under examination conditions.
- 12.13.2 In cases of suspected examination misconduct discovered during formal examination conditions, the Invigilator **should** complete a report to be countersigned by all other invigilators who were witness to the suspected examination misconduct.
- 12.13.3 This report, together with any accompanying evidence, **should** be sent without delay to the University Cases Office who will inform the student in writing that they have been reported for suspected examination misconduct. The University Cases Office shall copy the Invigilator's report to the College responsible for the module under examination.
- 12.13.4 In cases where unauthorised materials were found on the student or connected with the student, then the University Cases Office will ask the College to complete a report to state whether the material was relevant to the examination in question and what advantage could have been gained by the student. Once the University Cases Office receives the report they will ensure it is provided to the student.
- 12.13.5 If it becomes apparent after an examination has finished (for instance when the work is being marked) that a student may have committed misconduct during that examination, then the same procedures are to be followed. In such cases the report shall be submitted by the College responsible for the module under examination to the University Cases Office.
- 12.13.6 In any case where a meeting of a Programme/Discipline Assessment, Progression and Awarding Committee is imminent, the College shall ensure that the Chair of the Committee receives a copy of the report which was sent to the University Cases Office. The Programme/Discipline Assessment, Progression and Awarding Committee shall consider the examinee's programme assessment profile purely on the marks available to it. Once the Programme/Discipline Assessment, Progression and Awarding Committee has reached its decision the Chair shall then inform the Committee of the receipt of a report regarding suspected examination misconduct for that candidate. The

Programme/Discipline Assessment, Progression and Awarding Committee shall not include the name of any candidate in respect of whom it has received such a report, on any class or pass list until the Chair of the Committee is notified of the outcome of the case.

- 12.13.7 Upon receipt of a report of a case of alleged examination misconduct the University Cases Office shall appoint an Investigating Officer. If the Investigating Officer determines that the offence constitutes examination misconduct, then the University Cases Office will send a warning letter to the student, copied to the College. The letter will be copied to Student Records where a note will be made in the student's electronic record. Any such warning letter will count as an examination misconduct offence and as such a first offence.
- 12.13.8 If the Investigating Officer determines that there is a case of suspected severe examination misconduct, the University Cases Office will complete the first half of the Student Allegation Form setting out the nature of the alleged offence.
- 12.13.9 The Student Allegation Form will be sent to the student for the remainder of the form to be completed. They will also be sent a link to the Assessment Handbook, a copy of the Invigilator's report, and a copy of any supporting evidence. The student will complete the form providing a statement of their version of the events plus details of any circumstances relevant to consideration of the alleged offence. The form **should** be returned to the University Cases Office within five days from the date on the accompanying letter.
- 12.13.10A Review Panel will then be established. If the student fails to return the form within the five day period the Review Panel will proceed to consider the case and make a decision without representations from the student.

12.14 Establishment of a Review Panel

- 12.14.1 A Review Panel should comprise the Investigating Officer (as nominee for the Director of Governance and Compliance), the Students' Guild Vice President for Education or nominee and the Dean of the relevant Faculty. They will consider the evidence and agree on an appropriate outcome according to the tariff in [Section 12.23](#).
- 12.14.2 The Review Panel will only consider written evidence. There will be no right of attendance in person for either the student or staff concerned. The Review Panel therefore **may** agree to meet virtually to decide the outcome.
- 12.14.3 The Review Panel will address the case as a strict liability offence. This means that where a student is found to have taken unauthorised materials or an electronic device to their desk, the student is guilty of an offence, irrespective of that student's intent either to deceive or gain advantage. Where alleged intent to gain advantage is also presented, this will be considered in addition to the strict liability offence.
- 12.14.4 The tariff sets a default penalty and if, for any reason, the panel wishes to impose a different penalty, clear reasons for this decision **should** be specified in the written decision communicated to the relevant parties. Further penalties **may** be given in addition to the default penalty if it is felt necessary, e.g. undertaking remedial work.

- 12.14.5 The Investigating Officer will ensure that a written record of the deliberations and outcome of the Review Panel is kept.

12.15 Outcomes from a Review Panel for Examination Offences

- 12.15.1 This section **should** be read in conjunction with the tariff set out in [Section 12.23 - Tariff of Penalties](#). The Review Panel has the power to impose any of the Tariffs from A to G from the Tariff of Penalties
- 12.15.2 For all penalties a record will be held within the University Cases Office.
- 12.15.3 If the allegation is proven, one of the penalties set out in [Section 12.23](#) will be applied. The Review Panel **should** consider the impact of the penalty and ensure that the outcome is not disproportionate to the offence committed.
- 12.15.4 The student shall have the right to Appeal any decision taken by a Review Panel as set out in [Section 12.22](#).

12.16 Procedures at College Level for Dealing with Suspected Poor Academic Practice, Academic Misconduct and Severe Academic Misconduct

- 12.16.1 In cases where evidence of suspected poor academic practice or academic misconduct is found, the Senior Academic Misconduct Officer for the College concerned shall deal with the matter internally in the first instance. Where possible all previous summative assessments **should** be re-checked for academic misconduct. Normally this would include all summative work for the current academic year, but it may also include any or all work that counts towards the Student's degree from year two and onwards. This would apply particularly in cases of final year students or in cases of suspected severe academic misconduct.
- 12.16.2 Should the marker of an assessment suspect Academic Misconduct then they **should** report any concerns about a piece of academic work to the named contact within their College responsible for academic misconduct (normally this would be the Discipline AMO).
- 12.16.3 The named person within the College must determine what steps are required to investigate the suspected offence. In cases of Plagiarism, or Collusion it may just be necessary to convene a meeting with the student. However in cases of suspected Fabrication or Falsification of data it may be necessary to appoint an Investigating Officer, who may possess specialist knowledge of the subject area, required to investigate the suspected offence.
- 12.16.4 After the Investigation is complete, the Senior Academic Misconduct Officer and the named person will consider all of the material gathered by the Investigation. They will then determine whether this is a case which will be heard by the College under section [12.19](#) or section [12.20](#), or whether it should be referred directly to the University Cases Team under section [12.21](#).
- 12.16.5 The student will be advised by a written letter of the nature of the suspected offence. In this letter the Senior Academic Misconduct Officer will indicate which of the following procedures will apply:

- a) Poor Academic Practice: in cases of poor academic practice, the normal procedure is for the Academic Misconduct Officer to consider. This should be in accordance with the procedure outlined in [12.19.4](#) below.
- b) Poor Academic Practice and Academic Misconduct: in these cases, the procedure is for the College to convene a formal meeting with the student to discuss the case, which should be chaired by the Senior Academic Misconduct Officer. This should be in accordance with the procedure outlined in [12.20](#) below;
- c) Severe Academic Misconduct: in cases where the College believes that severe academic misconduct may have occurred in the student's piece of work, the College can hold a College Level meeting to gather further information and evidence for the referral of the case to the University; alternatively, where it is clear that the alleged offence is sufficiently severe and evidenced the College can refer the case directly to the University Cases Office in accordance with the procedure outlined in [12.21](#) below.

12.17 Process for considering cases of Suspected Academic Misconduct within Formative Work

- 12.17.1 The University recognises the benefits of formative work, to the development of students, and therefore takes any allegation of academic misconduct within formative work seriously. However the University recognises that by its nature formative work is not credit bearing, but is an opportunity to receive valuable feedback prior to a summative attempt at a task.
- 12.17.2 Should a marker when marking formative work suspect a student of committing any of the offences listed within section 12.3 within a piece of formative work, then they should alert the Discipline AMO.
- 12.17.3 Should the Discipline AMO be referred a case of potential academic misconduct within formative work that satisfies the definitions under the definitions of offences within 12.3, then the Discipline AMO can take one of the following actions
- 12.17.4 Refer the Student to an Academic Honesty workshop, so that the Student can benefit from learning how to improve their practice, so that this will not be an issue in future summative assessments.
- 12.17.5 Proceed to meet the Student under Section 12/18, and impose either of the penalties available, so that the Student is able to correct their work, and still receive feedback.
- 12.17.6 Offences committed within formative work should always be considered poor academic practice, and should be treated as an opportunity for the student to learn. However a record of any offences committed in formative work should be made, with the understanding that if these reoccur within summative work, then these will not be treated as offences of poor academic practice, as the Student has been provide a chance to correct their practice previously.

12.18 Policy in relation to Investigations and Hearings Involving Group Work

- 12.18.1 Where a marker suspects academic misconduct in a piece of group work, they should refer the piece of work, with the names of all those within the group to the Discipline Academic Misconduct Officer.
- 12.18.2 The Discipline Academic Misconduct Officer should conduct the normal enquires into the piece of work to determine if an offence has occurred. If they confirm an offence has occurred then they should refer the case to the Senior Academic Misconduct Officer
- 12.18.3 The Senior Academic Misconduct Officer will then decide if the Procedure for dealing with Poor Academic Practice should be applied under section 12.17, or whether section 12.18 Procedure for Poor Academic Practice and Academic Misconduct should apply.
- 12.18.4 When considering cases involving group work, those investigating the offence should meet each individual of the group in sequence. No decisions should be made until the AMO, or Panel, has offered the chance to all students involved in the alleged offense to be interviewed. Once all students involved in the alleged offense have been offered an interview, the Panel should then convene in private to consider whether a) the allegation is proven and b) apply any penalties.
- 12.18.5 When considering penalties the panel should exercise their judgement, having heard from all the individuals within the group, and can either impose a penalty on a specific individual as the sole party at fault, only if the Panel or AMO is convinced this individual is the sole party at fault and has not been scapegoated by the rest of the group. The Panel may also determine that the group is at fault, and impose a collective penalty on the group; this may be more suitable if the group work was designed to produce a single piece of work with a mark in common for all members of the group.
- 12.18.6 When considering cases of group work AMOs and Panels should be mindful of the group dynamics and should use their best judgement to ensure that all members of the group are treated equitably. All group members must have the opportunity to be interviewed individually by the AMO or Panel, to allow them the opportunity to provide their explanation without influence of other group members.

12.19 Procedure for Poor Academic Practice

- 12.19.1 Where the Senior Academic Misconduct Officer refers a case of Poor Academic Practice to an Academic Misconduct Officer then the Academic Misconduct Officer should take the following steps. Staff should be proactive in addressing Poor Academic Practice to ensure that the students have the necessary information to improve their academic practice.
- 12.19.2 The Academic Misconduct Officer should invite the student to meet with them to discuss the alleged Poor Academic Practice; this is to ensure that the student is aware of why their academic practice is not meeting the discipline's requirements. This invitation should be sent at least 5 working days prior to the meeting, and include all relevant documentation.

- 12.19.3 The Academic Misconduct Officer should meet with the student along with an Administrator, who will take notes of the meeting. The Academic Misconduct Officer will discuss the alleged offence with the student. The student may be accompanied by a supporter (please see the definition of such a person in 12.3.5).
- 12.19.4 After meeting the student the Academic Misconduct Officer may apply a penalty from the Tariff of Penalties, or may find the student not guilty of the offence. If the Academic Misconduct Officer wishes to apply a penalty, then they may apply up to and including penalty B from the Tariff of Penalties in [Section 12.23](#).
- 12.19.5 The Academic Misconduct Officer should notify the student of the outcome of the meeting within ten working days of the meeting, and include a copy of the notes of the meeting with this notification.
- 12.19.6 Students are entitled to appeal the decision of the Academic Misconduct Officer per [Section 12.20](#).

12.20 Procedure for Poor Academic Practice and Academic Misconduct

- 12.20.1 When a College Level Panel meeting with the student is convened it should be chaired by the Senior Academic Misconduct Officer. The meeting will consist of a Panel of three, which will include at least one other academic member of staff of the College, or another academic misconduct officer, and either another Academic Misconduct Officer or the Education Business Partner (or nominee). The Panel must nominate a secretary (who may also be a Panel member) who will be responsible for taking a written record of the meeting, a copy of which must be sent to the student following the meeting.
- 12.20.2 The staff on a College Level Panel must not include those who are responsible for marking, moderating or supervising the assignment to which the allegation refers.
- 12.20.3 All relevant documentation should be made available to the student five working days prior to the meeting. The student may make a written statement to the Panel and may also call witness of his/her own.
- 12.20.4 The student may be accompanied by a supporter (please see the definition of such a person in 12.3.5). The use of electronic audio recording equipment will not normally be allowed and would only be permitted at the discretion of the Chair.
- 12.20.5 The student must provide the College with their written statement and any evidence that they wish to have taken into consideration by the Panel at least one whole working day ahead of the meeting along with confirmation of whether or not they will be attending. The student must state if they intend to call any witness, and whether they will be bringing a supporter with them (and if so, who the supporter is).
- 12.20.6 The student shall be entitled to be present for the duration of the meeting. However, the Panel may ask the student and their supporter to withdraw, whilst reaching a decision.

- 12.20.7 The Panel may call the marker of the piece of work or the module convenor as witness, to further explain the offence or report they have made.
- 12.20.8 If the College appointed an Investigating Officer, then their report should be made available to the student as part of the relevant documentation sent to the student five working days in advance of the meeting. The College Level Panel may call the Investigating Officer to present their findings.
- 12.20.9 The College Level Panel should then determine whether an offence has taken place. The College Level Panel should determine the exact offence the student has committed and whether this constitutes either poor academic practice or academic misconduct.
- 12.20.10 If it is determined that an offence has taken place, the student shall be informed in writing of the decision and the penalty to be imposed within ten working days of the meeting, in accordance with [section 12.20.12](#) below. The letter should include, as a minimum, the information laid out in the [*Letter B*](#).
- 12.20.11 Should the College Level Panel conclude that there has been a case of either poor academic practice or academic misconduct, then they should impose a penalty from the tariff contained in [Section 12.23](#). Colleges may impose up to and including Tariff D. College Level Panels cannot impose any penalty in the range of Tariff E to G. Where a penalty impacts on progression or the ability of the student to pass the module, the College Level Panel should give a clear reason for imposition of the penalty.
- 12.20.12 The Tariff of Penalties for application by Colleges is set out in the table in [section 12.2.13](#). When deliberating the offence College Level Panels should give regard to the level of advantage which would have been gained by the student if the act or failure to act had not been detected.
- 12.20.13 If the College Level Panel considers that none of the penalties available to them in [section 12.23](#) are appropriate then they may refer the case to the University Cases Office (see [section 12.21](#)). The College shall write to the student to indicate this. The letter should include, as a minimum, the information laid out in the [*Letter C*](#).
- 12.20.14 The student has the right to appeal against any decision taken by the College Level Panel as set out in Section 12.20. The student cannot appeal the College Level Panel's decision to refer them to the University stage of this procedure, as they are entitled to appeal the decision of the University Committee of Academic Enquiry.

12.21 Managing Academic Misconduct – Procedures at University Level for Dealing with Suspected Academic Misconduct

- 12.21.1 In cases referred to the University Cases Office after consideration at College level under Sections [12.19](#) and [12.20](#) the College must submit a report to the University Cases Office. At the same time the student must be informed of the fact that they are being reported to the University Cases Office. If the student is suspected of plagiarism or collusion then the report should clearly indicate (by cross-referencing) what sections of text have been plagiarised and from what source.

- 12.21.2 A Committee of Academic Enquiry will be convened as soon as possible following receipt of the College report. The Committee shall comprise a Dean/Associate Dean of the Faculty as Chair, who shall not be of the same Discipline of the Student, and two members drawn from nominated Academic Misconduct Officers, who shall not be of the same College as the student.
- 12.21.3 Exceptionally (in cases where the scale of offence does not warrant a Committee hearing), on receiving a report from a College, the Director of Governance, Compliance and Risk (or nominee) may, in consultation with the Dean of the Faculty, direct the College to deal with the suspected case as set out in [section 12.20](#) of these procedures.
- 12.21.4 Where a student's conduct is to be considered by a University Committee of Academic Enquiry, the University Cases Office shall inform the student in writing of the Committee's meeting which they are invited to attend. Not less than five working days ahead of that meeting, the University Cases Office shall provide the student with a copy of the report from the College, along with any other supporting evidence and a copy of these procedures. The student may make a written statement to the Committee, supply any evidence that they wish to have taken into consideration by the Committee, and may also call witnesses of their own, the details of which must be provided to the University Cases Office not later than one whole working day ahead of the Committee's meeting.
- 12.21.5 The student is entitled to attend the Committee meeting for its duration (except as detailed in [12.21.8](#) below). Should a student decide not to exercise their right of attendance, the hearing will proceed in the student's absence. Should the student subsequently, within five working days, present sufficiently exceptional mitigating circumstances explaining their absence to the Chair's satisfaction, the Committee may be reconvened to reconsider the case with the student in attendance. The student will be given five working days' notice of the Committee being reconvened. The student may be accompanied by a supporter (the definition of such a person is defined above in section 12.3.5). The use of electronic audio recording equipment will not normally be allowed and is at the discretion of the Chair. The student may direct questions to the College representative (and any witnesses called) directly in an appropriate manner. Proxies or substitutes for the student will not be permitted.
- 12.21.6 The College will be invited to send a Representative to attend for the duration of the meeting (except as detailed in [12.21.8](#) below) to present the case to the Committee. The College Representative shall have the right to call other witnesses to appear before the Committee. The University Cases Office shall be notified of these witnesses no later than one whole working day ahead of the Committee meeting. The College Representative may also call the student as a witness and may then, at the Chair's discretion, direct questions to the student directly, in an appropriate manner.
- 12.21.7 The student should be given the opportunity to address the Committee in the absence of the College representative. The Committee may recall the College Representative following the student's statement, should the need arise. Following this the Committee shall retire to consider their decision.
- 12.21.8 If the Committee determines that an offence has taken place, it shall inform the student and the College in writing of its decision and of the penalty to be imposed. This may, in the first instance, be a summary of the Committee's deliberations. This will be communicated within five working days of the meeting, with the full

report and formal outcome letter following in due course. A record of the Committee's decision will be kept both on the University's central records and by the relevant College.

- 12.21.9 The Committee of Academic Enquiry can impose any penalty from the Tariff of Penalties range A to G. If the allegation of academic misconduct is proven, one of the penalties from the tariff of penalties contained in [section 12.23](#) shall be applied. For all penalties, a record must be entered on the student's file by Student Records.

12.22 Appeals

- 12.22.1 A student shall have the right of appeal against any decision taken either by a College Level Panel, by a Review Panel or by a Committee of Academic Enquiry. The appeal must be received by the University Cases Office within ten working days of the date on the formal outcome letter informing the student of the decision. The student should submit the appropriate [Academic Misconduct Appeal Form](#) to the University Cases Office (studentcases@exeter.ac.uk), indicating the grounds of the appeal and attaching any evidence on which the appeal will rely.
- 12.22.2 The University Cases Team should normally aim to resolve an academic misconduct appeal within 30 calendar days of receipt of the appeal. If this is not possible, or if the case is complex, the University will inform the student of any expected delay.
- 12.22.3 Students should note that an appeal against a decision taken at either College Level Panel, at a Review Panel or a Committee of Academic Enquiry will only be accepted if:
- a) There is evidence of procedural irregularity.
 - b) There is evidence of bias.
 - c) The decision reached is one that no reasonable body (properly directing itself, and taking into account all relevant factors) could have arrived at.
 - d) The student submits evidence of new material circumstances, and an explanation of why this evidence could not reasonably be expected to have been submitted for consideration when the original decision was made.
- 12.22.4 A Student Cases Officer, in consultation with the Dean of the relevant Faculty (both of whom will not have had any previous involvement with the case) will establish whether, on the face of it, there is a case for consideration before a Senate Appeal Committee.
- 12.22.5 If, on the face of it, no grounds for appeal are found, the appeal will be dismissed and the student informed, in writing, of the reasons. There is no further right of appeal against such a decision. See [section 12.22.12](#).
- 12.22.6 If it is decided that, on the face of it, there is a case for an appeal, a Senate Appeal Committee shall be convened. The Senate Appeal Committee has the power to confirm, to set aside or to vary the penalty imposed by the College-level hearing or the Review Panel or the Committee of Academic Enquiry. There shall

be no further internal right of appeal against the decision of the Appeal Committee.

- 12.22.7 A Senate Appeal Committee shall comprise three members (including a student representative) of the Senate. The University Cases Office will appoint the Chair from that number. No person shall be entitled to be a member of the Senate Appeal Committee who is also associated with the appellant's Discipline(s) or who has previously been involved in the matters under appeal.
- 12.22.8 The appellant shall be informed of the date of the meeting of the Senate Appeal Committee not less than ten working days in advance. They may choose to appear before the Appeal Committee but the Committee may also hear a case in the absence of the appellant. The appellant shall be entitled to attend the Committee meeting for the duration of the hearing, but will be required to withdraw once the Committee reaches its decision. Proxies for appellants are not allowed. The student may be accompanied by a supporter, see 12.3.5 for the role of a supporter. The use of electronic audio recording equipment will not normally be allowed and where allowed is at the discretion of the Chair. The student may direct questions to the College Representative (and any witnesses called) in an appropriate manner at the discretion of the Chair.
- 12.22.9 The Appeal Committee shall call either a College Representative or the Investigating Officer and shall be empowered to call other members of the University or partner institution, as it deems necessary.
- 12.22.10 The Appeal Committee, having considered the evidence, may uphold or reject the appeal, such a decision being final.
- 12.22.11 The Appeal Committee shall minute its deliberations and decisions and submit a report to Senate. If the Committee's report includes a recommendation requiring action before the next meeting of the Senate, it shall be for the Vice-Chancellor to authorise action and then report to the Senate retrospectively.
- 12.22.12 The Secretary of the Committee shall notify the appellant in writing of the Appeal Committee's decision, giving the reasons for it.
- 12.22.13 There are no other University appeal procedures beyond those stages detailed above. If, in the opinion of a student, an appeal remains unresolved after the exhaustion of the appropriate processes, application may be made to the Office of the Independent Adjudicator (OIA) for Higher Education. For further details see <http://www.oiahe.org.uk>.

12.23 Tariff of Penalties

Guidance notes

The description of offences is not intended to be an exhaustive list of each specific offence to which that tariff can be applied, but is considered to be an illustrative summary of particular offences for which the University considered the tariff to be appropriate. Academic Misconduct Officers, College Academic Misconduct Panels, Examination Review Panels, and Committees of Academic Enquiry are encouraged to consider the case before them, and how characteristics within their case match up to the description of the offence column, to reach the appropriate penalty. Where two penalty options are given the Panel or Committee has the discretion to select the most appropriate penalty. Academic Misconduct Officer may impose up to and including penalty B (shown in blue) College Panels may impose up to and including Tariff D (shown in Green), Review Panels and Committees of Academic Enquiry may impose any tariff.

Tariff	Description of Offence	Penalty to be imposed
A	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Misunderstanding of the academic conventions of the discipline. Minor Exam Misconduct. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> The Student will be issued a warning letter. This warning letter will remain on file. May also recommend action such as taking the ELE Module, on Academic Honesty.
B	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Minor amount of poor academic practice within the piece of work such as incorrectly referencing or not following the referencing conventions of the discipline concerned. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> The student will be formally reprimanded and asked to resubmit the piece of work with the poor academic practice removed. The mark for this resubmission will not be capped.*
C	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Significant amount of poor academic practice within the piece of work. For example, this could be large amounts of unattributed material which has been incorrectly referenced, or not reference Minor amount of academic misconduct within the piece of work. Minor inappropriate manipulation of data or source material to support the piece or work. Exam Misconduct, where the student has breached the guidance for candidates, but it is deemed they have not gained an advantage. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> The student will be formally reprimanded with a mark of zero being recorded for the first attempt. The student will be asked to resubmit the piece of work with the poor academic practice or academic misconduct removed. The mark will be capped at the pass mark. This will not be considered a referral attempt, nor will it affect the right of referral should the student fail the module.* <p>Note. In the case of Exam Misconduct a mark of zero will be recorded for the examination in question. The candidate will have a right of referral but the mark will be capped at the pass mark, or at the mark achieved at the first attempt, whichever is the lower of the two marks. This is to prevent a student from gaining an advantage from committing misconduct. Non examination misconduct - once the work has been</p>

		resubmitted an Academic Misconduct Officer should check to ensure that the work now complies with the Disciplines standards and then send to the marker for marking. If the work has not been remedied to the required standard then the AMO should apply a mark of zero
D	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Significant amount of Academic Misconduct detected within the piece. • Data has been used by the student to support critical parts of their piece of work and this has not referenced • Inappropriate manipulation of data or source material to support the piece of work. • Severe Exam Misconduct, where the student has breached the guidance for candidates, and it is deemed they have gained, or had the opportunity to gain, an advantage. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • D1 The student will be formally reprimanded. The student will be given a mark of Zero for the piece of work concerned. There will be no right of referral for this piece of work. (This will not affect the Student's right to reassessment of the module where the module is reassessed by way of one 100% examination; however the student will only be able to be awarded the marks equal to the component where no misconduct was detected. i.e. the student has received a mark of zero in 1 essay worth 40% of the module, therefore would be entitled to 60% of the marks from any reassessment of the entire module) <p>Or</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • D2 The module concerned will be given a mark of zero, and the student has a right of referral for the pass mark.
E	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Severe Academic Misconduct detected within one piece of work, or across several pieces of work. • The underlying data supporting the piece of work has been fabricated, or the results of experimentation have been falsified. • Severe Exam Misconduct, where the student has breached the guidance for candidates, and it is deemed they have gained, or had the opportunity to gain, a clear advantage. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • E1 The module concerned will be given a mark of zero with no right of referral. <p>Or</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • E2 Mark of zero for the year concerned with a right of referral, the referral will be capped at the pass mark.
F	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Severe Academic Misconduct, detected within either one piece of work or within several pieces of work occurring within significant parts of the piece(s), 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • F1 A mark of zero will be recorded for the modules in which the misconduct occurred. The Student will also not be permitted to be awarded for the

	<p>or throughout a dissertation or large scale research project.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The underlying data supporting the piece of work has been fabricated, or the results of experimentation have been falsified. • Severe Exam Misconduct, where the student has breached the guidance for candidates, and it is deemed they have gained, or had the opportunity to gain, a significant advantage 	<p>degree upon which they are registered, but may be awarded a lesser award in line with the credits which they have achieved.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • F2Mark of zero for the year in question with no right of referral. Credits gained from previous years are unaffected, and may be counted towards an award from the University.
G	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Severe Academic Misconduct, across several assessments, occurring in critical parts of the pieces of work. • Widespread amounts of plagiarism or fabrication within a dissertation or large scale research project. • Evidence that the entire essay has been purchased and submitted by the student. • Severe Exam Misconduct such as impersonation. 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Expulsion from the University with no credit received.

* Where a Panel gives a Penalty B or C they should give consideration to whether the piece of work has sufficient potential for the Student to be able to demonstrate the ILOs of the assessment. Where the Panel does not consider it possible that the student can successfully demonstrate they would be meeting the ILOS of the assessment as the poor academic practice is to extensive, then they may mandate a new question

** Note: The Panel should give considerations to setting an appropriate deadline for the Student, and should give guidance on what the student should be revising. Once the work has been resubmitted an Academic Misconduct Officer should check to ensure that the work now complies with the Disciplines standards and then send to the marker for marking. If the work has not been remedied to the required standard then the AMO should apply a mark of zero

Appendix A – Statement on the Use of Proof Reading Services

This statement is intended to clarify to students the scope of any proof reading support they may choose to engage. This statement is applicable to all undergraduate, postgraduate taught and postgraduate research students. The University does not expect students to use any form of proof reading service. However, the University does understand that for theses and dissertations students may wish to have their work proofread as these form substantive bodies of work.

Nothing in this statement of policy should prevent students from sharing ideas and working together in the Exeter learning environment where appropriate. Should students have any questions about proof reading they should contact their personal tutor, module lead or supervisor in the first instance.

1. Definition of Proof Reading

- 1.1 The University defines proof reading as reviewing student work prior to submission to help with structure, fluency, presentation and to highlight errors in spelling, punctuation and grammar.
- 1.2 Proof readers can be a friend or colleague, or someone paid by the student to provide a proof reading service.
- 1.3 Proof reading should not include any assistance in relation to the content of the essay, nor should it involve any tutoring on the part of the proof reader. The proof reader should confine themselves to the structure, fluency, presentation and to highlight errors in spelling, punctuation and grammar. If a proof reading service is offering to check the academic content of a written assignment, then this is not a legitimate proof reading service. If a Student persists in using such a service this may open the Student to an allegation of academic misconduct. (For the University's procedures on academic misconduct or research misconduct please see the following links: (Taught Students <http://as.exeter.ac.uk/academic-policy-standards/tqa-manual/aph/managingacademicmisconduct/>) (Research Students <http://as.exeter.ac.uk/academic-policy-standards/tqa-manual/pgr/researchmisconduct/>)
- 1.4 Prior to engaging a Proof Reader, a Student should ensure that their work conforms to the guidance given by their Discipline, in terms of style and presentation, in the appropriate module or discipline handbook, or in the case of Post Graduate Research Students, the information contained within [Chapter 11 – Presentation of Theses/Dissertations for Degrees in the Faculty of Graduate Research: Statement of Procedures.](#)
- 1.5 This statement does not preclude members of Academic Staff from providing appropriate supervision, through the reading of drafts of material produced by students, as part of supervising a theses or dissertation.

2. Checking whether proof reading is appropriate

- 2.1 Students should always check with either the Module Leader, or their Supervisor as to whether it is appropriate to have a piece of work professionally proof read. Certain professional programmes assess students on clarity of communication as a key competency, and therefore in these circumstances, it would not be appropriate to have work professionally proof read.

3. Scope of Proof Reading

- 3.1 A third party may be used to assist the student in the following :

- That appropriate English spelling and punctuation is being used.
- That the work is appropriately formatted and that the footnotes and endnotes are consistent.
- That the work follows the conventions of grammar and syntax of written English.
- Shortening long sentences and paragraphs.
- Ensuring that the page numbers and any header or footer is consistent across the piece of work.
- Improving the positioning of tables and illustrations and the clarity of grammar spelling and punctuation of any text in or under tables and illustrations.

3.2 A third party cannot be used to assist the student with the following:

- To change any part of the text of the work so as to clarify ideas and/or to develop the ideas and arguments.
- To reduce the length of the work so that it falls within the stated word limit.
- To provide any assistance with referencing.
- To correct information within the work.
- To change the ideas and argument put forward by the Student
- To translate the work into English.
- To provide comments to the Student on how well the work answers the question.

4. Owning the Corrections

4.1 The Proof Reader should make all corrections either on a hard copy of the student's work, or in track changes on an electronic document. The Proof Reader should make sure that all changes are visible to the Student.

4.2 The expectation is that the Proof Reader will highlight to the Student where corrections are necessary and the Student will then review the suggested changes and make changes to the master copy of their work, should they choose to. Students should take care to check all of the suggested corrections, as Proof Readers may suggest corrections to the style or layout which do not confirm with the University's guidance. In the case of electronic track changes, Students should not just click accept all, they should check all the suggested corrections. The Student should retain the copy of the work they receive from the Proof Reader in case they are asked to supply this at a later date.

4.3 It is the Student's responsibility to choose whether or not to implement suggested changes, and it is the Student that is held accountable for standard of their work.

5. Drafts

5.1 The expectation is that the Proof Reader will only see the final version of the Student's work, i.e. the work is in its final form ready for submission to the best of the Student's ability. The Proof Reader will then see this version and conduct their work only on this version. The Student will then receive this version from the proof reader and review the suggested corrections as above in section 4.2.

6. Agreeing the Scope of Work

6.1 Students should agree the scope of the work with a Proof Reader well in advance of the deadline. Students should use the agreement (download here [Proof Reading Template agreement](#)) to ensure that the individual they have engaged to undertake proof reading is aware of this policy and is not offering a service which in anyway breaches this policy and retain a copy of this for their records.

7. Disclaimer

7.1 This document is intended to provide all students, members of staff and third party proof readers' guidance for good ethical practice in relation to student work being proof read and then assessed. Both the Proof Reader and the Student have a duty to ensure that the proof reading process follows the guidance within this document. However it is imperative that students bear in mind that any adjustment to student work which is then submitted for assessment is ultimately the responsibility of the Student.

Appendix B - Managing Academic Conduct and Practice – Policy on the use of Turnitin, Academic Honesty Workshops and Academic Misconduct Officers

1 Context

- 1.1 Academic Misconduct is a growing issue within the higher education sector, one that is becoming an increasing focus for both Government and the Media. This policy has been drafted to provide practical guidance on the use of Turnitin and to supplement the University's formal procedure for dealing with cases of academic misconduct found within Chapter 12 of the Assessment Progression and Awarding Handbook.

2 Introduction

- 2.1 This guidance outlines the best practice use of Turnitin, to ensure that the University is using Turnitin in a way which is appropriate and consistent across Disciplines to ensure that students are being treated equitably. It also outlines the purpose of Academic Honesty Workshops and provides role descriptors for Academic Misconduct Officers and Senior Academic Misconduct Officers.
- 2.2 Turnitin is a similarity checking tool, which has an extensive database of material with which it checks for similarities. Turnitin does not prove academic misconduct, and academic judgement is required to interpret any reports it produces.

3 General Principles

- 3.1 The University seeks to address student misunderstanding around referencing and academic conventions as early as possible. The University aims to do this in a constructive and non-punitive way that allows for the Student to learn.
- 3.2 The University seeks to do this as it recognises that allegations of academic misconduct can have a disproportionate impact of students as they progress through the University, for these reasons the University seeks to take an early interventionist approach. This is made easier through the use of plagiarism checking software for all assignments.

4 Use of Turnitin*

- 4.1 Turnitin should be being used routinely at the point of submission for all essays, dissertations and final reports submitted to the University for marking.
- 4.2 Disciplines may choose to use Turnitin for learning purposes and allow multiple submissions prior to the deadline. This allows students to identify whether there are potentially problematic parts of their work and make suitable amendments to this prior to submission.
- 4.3 It should be the responsibility of Module Convenor within the Discipline to check the overview of Turnitin reports. This does not prevent individual markers from exercising their academic judgement if they have concerns about a piece of work. The checking of outliers will be assured through the moderation process.

- 4.4 The marker or module convenor should refer any cases where they have a concerns about any work, having reviewed the Turnitin Report, to the Discipline Academic Misconduct Officer for investigation.
 - 4.5 Turnitin is not an infallible system and requires academic judgement to interpret report, for example a student who has relied heavily on quotations may have a high percentage score, but with all of those properly referenced, another student may have a lower score but with extensive paraphrasing which is not referenced, and thus more problematic. It is for these reasons that Disciplines must not set a minimum or maximum threshold for investigating a case.
 - 4.6 The use of Turnitin allows for the identifying of Student's who are struggling to understand referencing and the academic conventions of the Discipline. This means the University can take a corrective approach to this behaviour early. The risk is that this behaviour is allowed to continue and is picked up in the third year this can often then place their degree at risk.
- 5 Process for when potential Academic Misconduct is identified
- 5.1 It is the responsibility of the Module convenor to check Turnitin reports in ELE. If a module convenor identifies a concern then they should refer this to the Discipline Academic Misconduct Officer. The Discipline Officer, marker and relevant professional service staff should be notified to remove the script from marking.
 - 5.2 If a marker spots something that is suspicious when marking they should stop marking and refer this to the Module convenor who follows the process as identified in section 5.1.
 - 5.3 The Discipline Academic Misconduct Officer will consider the Turnitin Report, and checked the work to ascertain whether there is an issue of Academic Misconduct. They may also consult with the Senior Academic Misconduct Officer and Professional Service Staff as required.
 - 5.4 The Discipline Academic Misconduct Officer, can either refer the case back to the Module Convenor for marking as following checking there is no concern, the marking process will then resume as normal. Or, the Discipline Academic Misconduct Officer may find there is a concern and the work needs to be considered further.
 - 5.5 If there is a concern then the Discipline Academic Misconduct Officer may recommend to the Senior Academic Misconduct officer that either the Student is required to attend a mandatory Academic Honesty workshop or that the concern is sufficiently serious that the formal academic misconduct procedure be implemented.
 - 5.6 The Senior Academic Misconduct Officer then considers the case and agrees with the recommendation of the Discipline Academic Misconduct Officer or directs the case to be dealt with as they see fit.
- 6 Academic Honesty Workshops
- 6.1 Using Turnitin highlights a wider range of Poor Academic Practice cases, whereby students' approaches to writing, or the way they have undertaken referencing is concerning, but not enough to warrant a formal misconduct hearing. However such practices, if unaddressed, may lead to further instances of poor academic practice, which may in turn lead to an allegation of academic misconduct.

- 6.2 Once the investigation has concluded the AMO or Senior AMO may decide the Discipline should offer Academic Honesty workshops, in place of an individual meeting (as per 12.19). This may be facilitated by the the Discipline Academic Misconduct Officer or another suitable academic, such as the module convenor. There will be no penalty for students who attend an Academic Honesty workshop, as the workshop is an alternative way of resolving the issue. The idea is to hold a corrective session for students who do not warrant formal investigation, but their practice is concerning and requires improvement. A record of learning interventions will be kept by the College Cases Team.
- 6.3 Academic Honesty Workshops should cover why the students have been called to the workshop in general terms then talk through how to reference according to discipline conventions and how to avoid poor practice in the future. Thus moving the emphasis away from punishment towards prevention and education.
- 6.4 Disciplines should normally schedule Academic Honesty workshops at least once a term after significant submission periods.
- 6.5 Students who fail to attend or engage with their scheduled mandatory workshop will not be invited to a further workshop. It will be deemed as a learning opportunity, even if a Students fails to attend a workshop and this will be taken into consideration if the Student commits further offences.
- 7 Structure within Colleges for Dealing with Academic Misconduct
 - 7.1 All Colleges will have at least an Academic Misconduct Officer per discipline, for large disciplines it may be necessary to have multiple academic misconduct officer's dependant on caseload.
 - 7.2 All Colleges will have a Senior Academic Misconduct Officer, who is responsible to the Associate Dean Education, for the management of academic misconduct cases within the College.
- 8 Role Descriptors for Academic Misconduct Officers
 - 8.1 The role of the Academic Misconduct Officer has been drafted with the Senior Academic Misconduct Officers forum as role descriptions for the Discipline Academic Misconduct Officers and the Senior Academic Misconduct Officers respectively
 - 8.2 Discipline Academic Misconduct Officers will:
 - a) Act as a as point of contact for any initial queries concerning Academic Misconduct within their Discipline and ensure they are familiar with the regulations as defined in the TQA Manual: <http://as.exeter.ac.uk/academic-policy-standards/tqa-manual/aph/managingacademicmisconduct/#colleges>
 - b) Provide information and guidance within their Discipline on dealing with cases of suspected academic misconduct as well as being the primary discipline-based source of advice on preventative measures.
 - c) To act as an investigating officer for cases within their discipline which may involve fabrication or falsification of records.
 - d) To assist support staff with finding materials to support plagiarism cases.
 - e) Help formulate Academic Misconduct guidance material for use within their discipline (in conjunction with other Academic Misconduct Officers and Professional Service staff across the College)
 - f) Consider any suspected cases of Poor Academic Practice or Academic Misconduct from within their Discipline and advise on the appropriate course

of Action and refer the case to the relevant support staff and/or Senior Academic Misconduct Officer as required

- g) Conduct Poor Academic Practice meetings for their discipline. (with appropriate admin support)
- h) Conduct Academic Honesty workshops for their discipline (with appropriate admin support)
- i) Attend College-level plagiarism hearings and act as an expert and source of advice in these matters.
- j) Attend Committees of Academic Enquiry as Committee members.
- k) Represent their discipline at Committees of Academic Enquiry as required.
- l) Attend College Academic Misconduct Officers meetings and any other meeting relating to academic misconduct matters.

8.3 There should be a link between the Academic Misconduct and the Director of Education, to ensure that there is an ongoing dialogue about the types and trends of academic misconduct being experienced. This is to ensure the data on types of cases is used to positively improve the student experience and where possible used to plagiarism proof future assignments.

8.4 The attachment of hours to the Academic Misconduct Officer role has been discussed, and it has proven to be challenging to attach a finite number to the role, due to the different sizes and caseloads of Disciplines, therefore the Senior Academic Misconduct Officers forum would recommend a bandwidth of hours between 50 to 150. This can be determined by discussion between the Academic Misconduct Officers and Director of Education, or Head of Discipline, to ensure that the Academic Misconduct Officers is given enough hours to undertake the role.

9 Role Descriptors for Senior Academic Misconduct Officers

9.1 Senior Academic Misconduct Officers will:

- a) Act as a point of contact for any queries regarding Academic Misconduct for the College, in line with the regulations within the TQA Manual: <http://as.exeter.ac.uk/academic-policy-standards/tqa-manual/aph/managingacademicmisconduct/#colleges>
- b) With the responsible support staff, determine what steps are necessary to investigate cases which are reported to the College.
- c) With the responsible support staff determined whether a case should be considered under the Poor Academic Practice process within a Discipline, or whether the case should be considered a College level, or whether the case is sufficiently serious to warrant being referred straight to University level.
- d) To Chair College level meetings, and to ensure that such hearings are conducted in a consistent manner, and that the penalties being applied are being applied consistently to similar cases.
- e) To ensure that cases heard within the College are being treated consistently and fairly.
- f) To represent the College as a College Representative at Committee of Academic Enquiries
- g) To attend Committee of Academic Enquires as a Panel member.
- h) To attend the termly Senior Academic Misconduct Officers forum, to ensure cases within each College are being considered consistently across the University.
- i) To co-ordinate meetings of the Colleges Academic Misconduct Officers to ensure the sharing of best practice and consider the College approach to academic misconduct. This is to also ensure that Disciplines are considering cases consistently.

9.2 The attachment of hours to the Senior Academic Misconduct Officers role has been discussed, and it has proven to be challenging to attach a finite number to the role, due to the different sizes and caseloads of Disciplines, therefore the Senior Academic Misconduct Officers forum would recommend a bandwidth of hours between 50 to 150. This can be determined by discussion between the Senior Academic Misconduct Officers and Head of Discipline, to ensure that the AMO is given enough hours to under the role. Please note that if the Senior Academic Misconduct Officers is also acting as the Discipline Academic Misconduct Officers this is cumulative with their allowance for a Discipline Academic Misconduct Officers, as the roles are distinct.

* Turnitin is used throughout this policy to refer to Plagiarism Checking Software.