



[Home](#) > [Our departments](#) > [Education and Student Experience](#) > [Academic Policy & Standards](#) > [TQA Manual](#) > [Assessment, Progression and Awarding: Taught Programmes Handbook](#) > [12 - Academic conduct and practice](#)

Teaching Quality Assurance Manual

Chapter 12 - Academic conduct and practice

This chapter is now updated for the 2021/22 academic year. If you are looking for the version of this chapter applying for the 2020/21 academic year, you will find it here: [Chapter 12 Managing Academic Conduct and Practice academic year 2020/21](#)

12 - Academic conduct and practice

- [12.1 Introduction](#)
- [12.2 General Principles](#)
- [12.3 Definitions and Offences](#)
- [12.4 Categories of Academic Misconduct](#)
- [12.5 Poor Academic Practice](#)
- [12.6 Academic Misconduct](#)
- [12.7 Severe Academic Misconduct](#)
- [12.8 Responsibilities for Partner Institutions](#)
- [12.9 Responsibilities of the University](#)
- [12.10 Responsibilities of Faculties](#)
- [12.11 Responsibilities of Students](#)
- [12.12 Delegation of Responsibility](#)
- [12.13 Procedures at College Level for Dealing with Suspected Poor Academic Practice, Academic Misconduct and Severe Academic Misconduct](#)
- [12.14 In cases where the Senior Academic Conduct Officer determines that the Poor Academic Practice should be seen at an Academic Honesty Workshop](#)
- [12.15 In cases where the Senior Academic Conduct Officer determines that the Poor Academic Practice should be seen at a Department Level Meeting](#)
- [12.16 In cases where the Senior Academic Conduct Officer determines that the Poor Academic Practice should be seen at a College Level Meeting](#)
- [12.17 Arrangements for Department and College Level Meetings](#)
- [12.18 Manageing Academic Misconduct - Procedures at University Level for dealing with Suspected Poor Academic Practice, Academic Misconduct and/or Severe Academic Misconduct](#)
- [12.19 Tariff of Penalties](#)
- [12.20 Managing Academic Misconduct - Procedures for Examination Offences](#)
- [12.21 Establishment of a Review Panel](#)
- [12.22 Outcomes from a Review Panel for Examination Offences](#)
- [12.22 Appeals](#)

[Appendix A - Structure within Colleges and Role Descriptors](#)

[Appendix B - Process for considering cases of Suspected Academic Misconduct within Formative Work](#)

[Appendix C - Policy in relation to Investigations and Hearings involving Group Work](#)

12. Academic conduct and practice

12.1 Introduction

12.1.1 This Chapter is applicable for alleged academic misconduct by 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 relevant Faculty Cases Office:

- Faculty of Environment, Science and Economy - ESE-Facultycases@ex.ac.uk
- Faculty of Humanities, Arts and Social Sciences - HASS-Facultycases@ex.ac.uk
- Faculty of Health and Life Sciences - HLS-Facultycases@ex.ac.uk
- For students based at our Penryn Campus - Penryn-Facultycases@ex.ac.uk
- For all Postgraduate Research appeals - pgr-student-cases@exeter.ac.uk

12.1.8 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 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 and never falsifying the results of any work, amongst other things.

12.2.2 The Student Cases Office, within Corporate Services, **must** have oversight of all cases of academic offences 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 Information on proven cases of academic misconduct or severe academic misconduct will be available to staff who are asked to provide references for students.

12.2.4 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 Faculty/Department level and proceedings at the University level.

- 12.2.5 When considering cases under this chapter the University will adopt the standard of proof 'on the balance of probabilities'.
- 12.2.6 This chapter shall apply to all currently registered students on taught programmes.
- 12.2.7 All students will be given the chance to submit a defence. See section on meeting arrangements.
- 12.2.8 Students **should** be kept informed of the progress of any case they are involved in.
- 12.2.9 When considering an allegation of academic misconduct or poor academic practice staff **should not** differentiate between formative and summative assessments (although they may do so in applying a penalty).
- 12.2.10 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'.
- 12.2.11 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.
- 12.2.12 In all cases of academic offence it is possible that the appropriate penalty may impact or be applied to more than just the module, assessment or examination in which the offence took place.
- 12.2.13 Second occurrences of academic offence, which occur in different assessment periods, will normally be treated more harshly than a first offence.
- 12.2.14 In general, the University will not consider mitigation in determining whether cases of academic offence 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 offences. Adverse circumstances may provide context to the actions of the student, which may be considered by the relevant body at their discretion when determining the penalty to be imposed.
- 12.2.15 Students who commit academic offences are subject to the normal programme rules for progression, i.e. where programmes permit, affected modules may be condoned.
- 12.2.16 All cases considered under this procedure should be completed within 60 calendar days of the student 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 An academic offence is defined as an act or failure to act that if undetected gives, or aims to give, an advantage over other students, or any behaviour which may deceive those setting, administering and marking a piece of work. Academic offences can take a number of forms including but not limited to:
- a. Plagiarism, i.e. the act of representing work or ideas as one's own without appropriate acknowledgement or referencing. For instance:
 - i. Direct copying of text, or illustrations, from a book, article, fellow student's essay, handout, thesis, web page, AI-generated content, 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 properly acknowledging the source of those ideas. This includes, among many other things, insufficiently paraphrasing a source, or altering the material taken from the source so it appears to be one's own work, or mirroring the structure of the argument of another writer without correct attribution.
 - iii. Overly depending on the work of others by constructing a significant part of an assessment by extracting large sections of text from another source.
 - iv. Self-plagiarism: 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 without citing the previous work. (This is not intended to prevent a student from developing an academic idea over the course of their studies, 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, or sections of work, however this operates at the discretion of the Panel considering the offence).
 - b. Collusion, i.e. the unauthorised working with another person, whether in person or via electronic device, on a piece of work, which is then submitted as part of an assessment, without acknowledgement of the other's contribution.
 - c. 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. Where this is initially investigated as collusion it will be possible for the outcomes and penalties applied to differ between the parties involved. It is also possible for an outcome to be reached for one party ahead of the final outcome for the student alleged to have coerced another.
 - d. The use or possession of unauthorised books, notes, software, electronic devices or other materials in an examination or assessment (unless specifically permitted. This includes material obtained from essay sites, also known as 'Essay Mills').
 - e. Obtaining or sharing an examination paper or assessment question ahead of its authorised release. Or obtaining or sharing another student's answer to an examination paper.
 - f. Attempting to impersonate or impersonation of another individual, due to be sitting a specific assessment.
 - g. 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 forms with the intention of deceiving the marker. The inclusion of fabricated references.
 - h. Falsification, i.e. the inappropriate manipulations and/or selection of data imagery and/or consents with the intention of deceiving the marker.
 - i. Misrepresentation including, but not limited to, misrepresenting data, or misrepresenting the work of someone else, or from an AI-generated source, as your own, in whole or in part. For example: disguising the authorship of the work through the use of electronic devices to conceal the extent to which the work is not the student's own; using source material originally in another language and translating this into English without attributing the work to the original author, or using synonyms throughout copied material; copying another's bibliography and referencing, implying the research completed is the student's own. This may also include the presence of hidden characters (white text) within the work which may have been included to manipulate the word count, to avoid source matches or to otherwise mislead the marker. Note, evidence of an attempt to disguise any of the forms of plagiarism listed above (which might involve the use of paraphrasing systems or translation systems, or a translator or third party who acts as more than a proof-reader under the University's regulations) will normally be treated more severely than plagiarism alone.

j. Contract Cheating involving a student requesting a third-party to complete an assessment, or part of an assessment, on their behalf, which may or may not involve a commercial transaction. This can include arranging for another student or individual to complete an assessment, paying a company to provide an assignment or using artificial intelligence or chatbots to complete all or part of an assessment.

- 12.3.2 Faculties (or delegated Schools) **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 indicated in the Faculty/Department handbook, alongside a link to the university approved guidance: <https://libguides.exeter.ac.uk/referencing>. Clarification **should** be available from Personal Tutors, as well as through induction sessions within the Faculty/Department. Students are responsible for ensuring they reference correctly, in accordance with the referencing style chosen by the department in which the assessment was set. Lack of awareness of the referencing conventions will not be deemed an excuse for academic offences.
- 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. These procedures can be seen in section 12.20.
- 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 Any other assessment such as timed exams undertaken in non-invigilated conditions, will be seen under the procedures outlined for the consideration of coursework, not the procedures for examinations.
- 12.3.6 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 Faculty Representative.
- 12.3.7 A witness is a person who can testify their knowledge of a matter that is under investigation. A witness may not be called to provide a character reference, nor would they be able to act as the Student's supporter, as described in section 12.3.6, within the meeting. A witness can be called by the Panel or Committee or by the Student. A witness may attend a meeting to testify about what they witnessed in respect of the matter under investigation, or as an expert in the subject matter of the assignment(s) being discussed in the meeting. At the discretion of the Chair of the Panel, a witness may direct questions to the Student. A witness will answer questions put to them by the Panel, Committee and Student. A witness would not usually attend for the entirety of the meeting and 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 Faculty Cases Team or the University Cases Team **must** ensure that it is correctly categorised. There are three categories:
- Poor academic practice.
 - Academic misconduct.
 - Severe academic misconduct.

12.5 Poor Academic Practice

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

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, or another student.
- 12.6.2 Academic misconduct cases are normally handled at Faculty 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:
- Taking notes into or using any unauthorised device in an examination.
 - Impersonating another person during an examination or arranging for another person to impersonate any individual during an examination.
 - An assignment that includes extensive, or otherwise significant quantity, of un-attributed or incorrectly attributed copying.
 - Any case where a student has previously been penalised for Academic Misconduct.
 - The use by a student of essay sites that may involve a commercial transaction, with or without the authors consent.
 - 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.
 - Where the Faculty 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 Faculty (or delegated School), and referred to the University level at the Senior Academic Conduct Officer's discretion.

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 Pro-Vice Chancellor (APVC) (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 offences 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 cases of suspected academic offences have access to suitable training and development opportunities on academic conduct, which they should have attended.

12.9.3 The University will support Faculties (or delegated School) in developing methods to reduce the incidences of academic offences (particularly in the design of assessment and administering of examinations).

12.9.4 The University will ensure that students have access to appropriate levels of information, advice and guidance.

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

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

12.10 Responsibilities of Faculties

12.10.1 All Faculties (or delegated Schools) will ensure that they have appropriate arrangements in place in order to comply with the requirements set out in this Chapter. All Faculties (or delegated Schools) will follow the procedures as laid out in this Chapter, when handling cases of suspected academic offence, including making sure that staff handling academic offence cases have had appropriate training.

12.10.2 All Faculties (or delegated Schools) will provide evidence which clearly demonstrate where a suspected offence may have occurred. Where an offence is suspected, but the evidence is not sufficient enough to demonstrate this the Faculty (or delegated School) may use the procedures set out in Chapter 3.12 'Dealing with suspected Examination Offences' and 5.4 'Viva Voce' of the Assessment, Progression and Awarding Handbook to investigate the matter further and gather evidence. All investigations should be timely, fair, proportionate and non-persecutory.

All Faculties (or delegated Schools) will ensure that they have an appropriate named member of staff that an academic can contact if they suspect academic offences when marking. This should initially be the department Academic Conduct Officer(s), who will act in line with the role descriptor detailed in Appendix A. A list of Officers can be found [here](#).

12.10.3 In addition to appointing a named member of staff in each department, the Faculty (or delegated School) will appoint a Senior Academic Conduct Officer, and may appoint additional Senior Academic Conduct Officers if caseload requires it. Senior Academic Conduct Officers should have an overview of all academic offence cases within the Faculty (or delegated School), and will act in line with the role descriptor detailed in Appendix A.

12.10.4 All Faculties (or delegated Schools) 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.

12.10.5 All Faculties (or delegated Schools) will provide students with assessment cover sheets for written work, or the opportunity to agree to a declaration for electronic submission, which certifies that their submitted work is entirely their own and appropriately referenced.

12.10.6 All Faculties (or delegated Schools) will ensure that Faculty/Department handbooks provide guidance on academic offence, and links to relevant University regulations on academic conduct and honesty.

12.10.7 All Faculties (or delegated Schools) will consider the issue of academic offences when designing assessments in order to minimise opportunities for academic offences, as per paragraph 2.1.2 of [Chapter 2 Setting and submission of assessments](#) of the Assessment, Progression and Awarding: Taught Programmes Handbook.

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 conduct, their Faculty/Department choice of referencing style and how to avoid academic offences in their work. Ignorance of these procedures and guidance will not be considered to be an excuse for academic offences.
- 12.11.3 When submitting work for assessment, each student will certify 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 Faculty (or delegated School) in their Faculty/Department Handbooks.
- 12.11.6 Each student will participate in any additional training recommended by their Faculty (or delegated School), such as the academic writing course or tutorial. International students and non-native speakers can get specialist support through the University's Insessional English Language Skills Development programme, delivered by 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 for Taught Students, this **should** be taken to mean the Dean for Taught Students or the Dean of Graduate Research, acting on behalf of the Dean for Taught Students. Where no Dean is appropriate, as both Deans have had contact with the Student, then the Dean **must** delegate their role to an APVC (Education), who is not connected to the student or the student's Faculty (or delegated School).
- 12.12.5 Where reference is made to the Faculty Education PS Lead (or nominee), this **may** mean either the Senior Education Business Partner or a dedicated nominee, who is responsible for academic conduct and maintains a strategic overview of academic offence cases within the Faculty (or delegated School).
- 12.12.6 Formal responsibility for the implementation of this procedure, within Faculties (or delegated Schools), lies with the APVC (Education) and the Senior Education Business Partner.

12.13 Procedures at Faculty Level for Dealing with Suspected Poor Academic Practice, Academic Misconduct and Severe Academic Misconduct

- 12.13.1 Should the marker, module convenor or other member of a marking team of an assessment suspect or identify evidence of a possible conduct offence in a student's assignment then they **should** stop marking and should report any concerns about a piece of academic work to the named contact within their Faculty (or delegated School) responsible for academic conduct (normally this would be the Department Academic Conduct Officer). In doing so they may wish to also inform the module convenor if they are not them.
- 12.13.2 The Department Academic Conduct Officer will consider the Assignment, and checked the work to ascertain whether there is an issue of Academic offence. They may also consult with the Senior Academic Conduct Officer and Professional Service Staff as required.
- 12.13.3 The Department Academic Conduct Officer, as a trained member of staff, will then form an academic judgment about the suspicions raised with them. They may determine that there is no evidence of an offence in the work and that no concerns need be pursued, in which case they should refer the case back to the marker or Module Convenor who will resume marking under the normal marking process. Or, the Department Academic Conduct Officer may find there is a concern and the work needs to be considered further, in which case the Department Academic Conduct Officer must make a formal referral of the case to their Senior Academic Conduct Officer, and the relevant professional services team (details for the Faculty Cases Team can be found here)
- 12.13.4 In cases where evidence of a suspected offence is found, the Senior Academic Conduct Officer for the Faculty (or delegated School) concerned shall be responsible for the matter in the first instance.
- 12.13.5 Under the guidance of the Senior Academic Conduct Officer the relevant professional services team will retrieve all previous summative assessments deemed to be relevant to the case in question, and the Department Academic Conduct Officer should re-checked these for academic offences. 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. Any assessments in which possible offences are identified can then be subject to investigation under the formal process and will form part of the ongoing case.
- 12.13.6 The Senior Academic Conduct Officers then considers the case and either agrees with the recommendation of the Department Academic Conduct Officer or makes their own recommendations. They then direct the case to be dealt with in one of the following ways, at which point the student will be advised by a written letter of the nature of the suspected offence and informed which of the following procedures will apply:
 - a. That the Student is requested to attend an Academic Honesty workshop.
 - b. That the case is to be heard at Department Level for suspected Poor Academic Practice.
 - c. That the case is to be heard at Faculty Level for suspected Academic Misconduct and / or Poor Academic Practice.
 - d. That the concerns raised are sufficiently serious to refer the case directly to the University Cases Team under section 12.18 for suspected Severe Academic Misconduct: in cases where the Faculty (or delegated School) believes that severe academic misconduct may have occurred in the student's piece of work, the Faculty (or delegated School) can hold a Faculty 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 Faculty (or delegated School) can refer the case directly to the University Cases Office in accordance with the procedure outlined in 12.18 below.
- 12.13.7 Examples of circumstances in which Academic Conduct Officers may be required to apply additional consideration to these steps of the process are outlined in Appendices B and C below.

12.14 In cases where the Senior Academic Conduct Officer determines that the Poor Academic Practice should be seen at an Academic Honesty Workshop

- 12.14.1 This concludes the investigation and the Student's work can be returned for marking and feedback release as soon as possible within the department (note, this is no longer subject to the three week marking turnaround).
- 12.14.2 The offer of an Academic Honesty Workshops, in place of an individual meeting (as per 12.19), allows the Department Academic Conduct Officer (or other suitable academic) to address the students' approaches to writing, or the way they have undertaken referencing, where it is concerning but not sufficiently bad to warrant a formal conduct hearing. It recognises that such practices, if unaddressed, may lead to further instances of poor academic practice, which may in turn lead to further allegations of an academic offence. This workshop is therefore corrective and educational in nature and acts as an alternative to penalties as a way of resolving the issues.
- 12.14.3 The workshop may be facilitated by the Department Academic Conduct Officer or another suitable academic, such as the module convenor.
- 12.14.4 A record of this learning intervention will be kept by the Faculty Cases Team. It is not likely that a workshop would be offered as an outcome to an investigation of a second academic offence.
- 12.14.5 The 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 department conventions and how to avoid poor practice in the future. Thus moving the emphasis away from punishment towards prevention and education.
- 12.14.6 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 Student fails to attend, and this will be taken into consideration if the Student commits further offences.

12.15 In cases where the Senior Academic Conduct Officer determines that the Poor Academic Practice should be seen at a Department Level Meeting

- 12.15.1 Where the Senior Academic Conduct Officer refers a case of Poor Academic Practice to a Department Level Meeting then the Academic Conduct Officer will be supported by the relevant Professional Services team to take the following steps.
- 12.15.2 The Student should be invited to meet with an Academic Conduct Officer 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 department's requirements.
- 12.15.3 The Academic Conduct Officer must not be a member of academic staff responsible for marking, moderating or supervising the assignment to which the allegation refers.
- 12.15.4 The Academic Conduct Officer should meet with the student along with an administrator who will take notes of the meeting. The Academic Conduct Officer will discuss the alleged offence and, if in attendance, will offer the student the opportunity to ask for further clarifications.
- 12.15.5 After the discussion, the Academic Conduct Officer will make a judgement on the case. They may apply a penalty from the Tariff of Penalties, or may find the student not guilty of the offence. If the Academic Conduct Officer wishes to apply a penalty, then they may apply up to and including penalty B from the Tariff of Penalties in section 12.19.
- 12.15.6 Exceptionally, where additional evidence is identified within the meeting, which leads the Academic Conduct Officer to consider that none of the penalties available to them in section 12.9 are appropriate then they may refer the case to a Faculty Level Meeting (see section 12.16). The Academic Conduct Officer will provide a report to the Senior Academic Conduct Officer explaining why they were unable to reach a decision, a copy of which will be provided to the Student prior to the Faculty Level Meeting. The Academic Conduct Officer shall not sit on the Faculty Level Panel, but may be called as a witness. The Faculty (or delegated School) shall write to the student to indicate that the Academic Conduct Officer has referred the case to a Faculty Level Meeting.
- 12.15.7 The student should be notified of the Academic Conduct Officer's judgement and the outcome of the meeting within ten working days of the meeting. A copy of the notes of the meeting will be included with this notification.
- 12.15.8 Students are entitled to appeal the decision of the Academic Conduct Officer per section 12.23 with the exception of a decision to refer the case to a Faculty Level Meeting (see 12.15.8 below).
- 12.15.9 The student cannot appeal the Academic Conduct Officer's decision to refer them to a Faculty Level Meeting, as they will be entitled to appeal the decision of the subsequent Faculty Level Panel.

12.16 In cases where the Senior Academic Conduct Officer determines that the Poor Academic Practice and / or Academic Misconduct should be seen at a Faculty Level Meeting

- 12.16.1 When the Senior Academic Conduct Officer determines that a case should be heard at a Faculty Level meeting, they will be supported by the relevant Professional Services team to take the following steps.
- 12.16.2 The Student should be invited to meet with a Panel of staff, to discuss the alleged offences in their work.
- 12.16.3 The Panel will consist of three members, at least two of whom will be academic members of staff. It should be chaired by the Senior Academic Conduct Officer, and will include either other Academic Conduct Officers, or academics from within the department concerned, or the Senior Education Business Partner (or nominee).
- 12.16.4 The Panel must nominate a secretary (who may also be a Panel member) who will be responsible for taking notes of the meeting.
- 12.16.5 The staff on a Faculty Level Panel must not include those who are responsible for marking, moderating or supervising the assignment to which the allegation refers.
- 12.16.6 The Panel will discuss the alleged offence and, if in attendance, will offer the student the opportunity to ask for further clarifications.
- 12.16.7 After the discussion, the Panel will deliberate and make a judgement on the case.
- 12.16.8 The Panel should then determine whether an offence has taken place. The Faculty Level Panel should determine the exact offence the student has committed and whether this constitutes either poor academic practice or academic misconduct. When deliberating the offence faculty 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.
- 12.16.9 They may apply a penalty from the Tariff of Penalties, or may find the student not guilty of the offence. Should the 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 12.19. They may impose up to and including Tariff D. Where a penalty clearly impacts on progression or the ability of the student to pass the module, the Faculty Level Panel should give a clear reason for imposition of the penalty.
- 12.16.10 The student should be notified of the Panel's judgement and the outcome of the meeting within ten working days of the meeting. A copy of the notes of the meeting will be included with this notification.

- 12.16.11 Students are entitled to appeal the decision of the Faculty Level Panel as per section 12.23 with the exception of a decision to refer the case to the University Cases Office (see 12.16.13 below).
- 12.16.12 If the Faculty Level Panel considers that none of the penalties available to them in section 12.19 are appropriate then they may refer the case to the University Cases Office (see section 12.18) so that the case can be considered under the University stage of the procedure. The Faculty (or delegated School) shall write to the student to indicate this.
- 12.16.13 The student cannot appeal the Faculty Level Panel's decision to refer them to the University Cases Office as they are entitled to appeal the decision of the subsequent University Committee of Academic Enquiry.

12.17 Arrangements for Department and Faculty Level meetings

- 12.17.1 The invitation to a meeting should be sent at least 5 working days prior to the meeting. The student has the right to appeal against any decision taken by the Faculty Level Panel as set out in Section 12.23.
- 12.17.2 All relevant documentation should be made available to the student five working days prior to the meeting.
- 12.17.3 If the Faculty (or delegated School) 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 Panel may call the Investigating Officer to present their findings but must notify the Student of their intention to call a witness at least one working day before the meeting.
- 12.17.4 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 12.3.6, within the meeting. A witness can be called by the Panel or Committee or by the Student. If the Student intends to have a witness present they must notify the relevant team at least one working day prior to the meeting.
- 12.17.5 The student may be accompanied by a supporter (please see the definition of such a person in 12.3.6) but will be asked and expected to respond to questions themselves in the meeting. If the Student wishes for a supporter to attend the meeting with them, they will need to arrange this themselves. The student must state whether they will be bringing a supporter with them (and if so, who the supporter is) and must notify the relevant team at least one working day prior to the meeting.
- 12.17.6 Should a student not attend their meeting this will not affect the attendance of others at the meeting such, with the exception of the Student's supporter; the supporter may not attend in the Student's absence. If a student is not in attendance consideration of the case will take place in their absence and the outcome will be communicated to them as normal.
- 12.17.7 Students have the right to submit a defence. This **may** be in writing or in person, but is not a requirement. However, 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. The student must provide the Faculty (or delegated School) 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.
- 12.17.8 Meetings will only be rescheduled in the event of the Student providing evidence of exceptional circumstances preventing them from engaging with the procedure. Such circumstances might include hospitalisation.
- 12.17.9 The student shall be entitled to be present for the duration of the meeting. However, they are not entitled to be present for the Panel's deliberations and therefore the Chair may ask the student and their supporter to withdraw, whilst reaching a decision.
- 12.17.10 Normally, the decision of the Panel and outcome of the case will not be given verbally on the day of the meeting but will be communicated in writing within 10 working days of the meeting.
- 12.17.11 The use of electronic audio recording equipment will not normally be allowed and would only be permitted at the discretion of the Chair.

12.18 Managing Academic Misconduct – Procedures at University Level for Dealing with Suspected Poor Academic Practice, Academic Misconduct and/or Severe Academic Misconduct

- 12.18.1 In cases referred to the University Cases Office after consideration at Faculty level under Sections 12.15 and 12.16 the Faculty (or delegated School) 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.
- 12.18.2 A Committee of Academic Enquiry will be convened as soon as possible following receipt of the Faculty (or delegated School) report. The Committee shall comprise a Dean as Chair, who shall not be of the same Department of the Student, and two members drawn from nominated Academic Conduct Officers, who shall not be of the same Faculty (or delegated School) as the student.
- 12.18.3 Exceptionally (in cases where the scale of offence does not warrant a Committee hearing), on receiving a report from a Faculty (or delegated School), the Divisional Director of University Corporate Services (or nominee) may, in consultation with the Dean for Taught Students, direct the Faculty (or delegated School) to deal with the suspected case as set out in section 12.16 of these procedures.
- 12.18.4 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 Faculty (or delegated School), 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.
- 12.18.5 The student is entitled to attend the Committee meeting for its duration (except as detailed in 12.18.8 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 12.3.6). 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 Faculty (or delegated School) representative (and any witnesses called) directly in an appropriate manner. Proxies or substitutes for the student will not be permitted.
- 12.18.6 The Faculty (or delegated School) will be invited to send a Representative to attend for the duration of the meeting (except as detailed in 12.18.8 below) to present the case to the Committee. The Faculty (or delegated School) 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 Faculty (or delegated School) 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.

- 12.18.7 The student should be given the opportunity to address the Committee in the absence of the Faculty (or delegated School) representative. The Committee may recall the Faculty (or delegated School) Representative following the student's statement, should the need arise. Following this the Committee shall retire to consider their decision.
- 12.18.8 If the Committee determines that an offence has taken place, it shall inform the student and the Faculty (or delegated School) 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 Faculty (or delegated School).
- 12.18.9 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 12.19 shall be applied. For all penalties, a record must be entered on the student's file by Student Records.

12.19 Tariff of Penalties

- 12.19.1 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 Conduct Officers, Faculty Academic Conduct 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 Officer, Panel or Committee has the discretion to select the most appropriate penalty. Academic Conduct Officers may impose up to and including penalty B, Faculty Panels may impose up to and including Tariff D, Review Panels and Committees of Academic Enquiry may impose any tariff.
- 12.19.2 Where a Penalty B or C is awarded the Officer, Panel or Committee 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 too extensive, then they may mandate a new question.
- 12.19.3 Where a Penalty B or C is awarded for coursework the Officer, Panel or Committee should give consideration 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 Conduct Officer should check to ensure that the work now complies with the Department's standards and then send to the marker for marking. If the work has not been remedied to the required standard then the Academic Conduct Officer should apply a mark of zero.
- 12.19.4 Tariff of Penalties for Coursework and examinations sat in non-invigilated conditions. (For the tariff of Penalties applying to invigilated exams only please see 12.22.5 below.)

Tariff	Description of Offence	Penalty to be imposed for offences identified in coursework	Penalty to be imposed for offences identified in non-invigilated examinations (typically sat remotely and submitted online)
A	Misunderstanding of the academic conventions of the department	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.	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	Minor amount of poor academic practice within the piece of work	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 removed. The mark for this resubmission will not be capped. This will not be considered a referral attempt, nor will it affect the right of referral should the student fail the module.	The student will be formally reprimanded and a mark of zero will be recorded for the examination in question. The candidate will be permitted a fresh attempt at this assessment in the next appropriate assessment period. This will be deemed to be a deferral and will not be capped.
C	Significant amount of poor academic practice within the piece of work Minor amount of academic misconduct within the piece of work Minor inappropriate manipulation of data or source material to support the piece of work	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.	The student will be formally reprimanded and a mark of zero will be recorded for the examination in question. The candidate will be permitted a fresh attempt at this assessment in the next appropriate assessment period but the mark will be capped at the pass mark. This is to prevent a student from gaining an advantage from committing misconduct. This will not be considered a referral attempt, nor will it affect the right of referral should the student fail the module.
D	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	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). Or D2 The module concerned will be given a mark of zero, and the student has a right of referral for the pass mark.	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). Or D2 The module concerned will be given a mark of zero, and the student has a right of referral for the pass mark.
E	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	E1 The module concerned will be given a mark of zero with no right of referral. Or E2 Mark of zero for the year concerned with a right of referral, the referral will be capped at the pass mark.	E1 The module concerned will be given a mark of zero with no right of referral. Or E2 Mark of zero for the year concerned with a right of referral, the referral will be capped at the pass mark.

F	Severe Academic Misconduct, detected within either one piece of work or within several pieces of work occurring within significant parts of the piece(s), or throughout a dissertation or large scale research project The underlying data supporting the piece of work has been fabricated, or the results of experimentation have been falsified	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 degree upon which they are registered, but may be awarded a lesser award in line with the credits which they have achieved. Or F2 Mark 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.	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 degree upon which they are registered, but may be awarded a lesser award in line with the credits which they have achieved. Or F2 Mark 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	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	Expulsion from the University with no credit received.	Expulsion from the University with no credit received.

12.20 Managing Academic Misconduct – Procedures for Examination Offences

- 12.20.1 This element of the procedure applies to both formal invigilated examinations that are completed in examination venues under timed restrictions, and in class tests which are run by Faculties (or delegated Schools) under invigilated examination conditions.
- 12.20.2 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.
- 12.20.3 In cases of suspected examination misconduct discovered during formal invigilated examination conditions, the Invigilator **should** complete a report to be countersigned by all other invigilators who were witness to the suspected examination misconduct.
- 12.20.4 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 Faculty (or delegated School) responsible for the module under examination.
- 12.20.5 In cases where unauthorised materials were found on the student or connected with the student, then the University Cases Office will ask the Faculty (or delegated School) 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.
- 12.20.6 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 invigilated examination, then the same procedures are to be followed. In such cases the report shall be submitted by the Faculty (or delegated School) responsible for the module under examination to the University Cases Office.
- 12.20.7 In any case where a meeting of a Programme/Department 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/Department Assessment, Progression and Awarding Committee shall consider the examinee's programme assessment profile purely on the marks available to it. Once the Programme/Department 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/Department 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.
- 12.20.8 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 Faculty (or delegated School). 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.
- 12.20.9 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.
- 12.20.10 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.
- 12.20.11 A 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.

12.21 Establishment of a Review Panel

- 12.21.1 A Review Panel should comprise the Investigating Officer (as nominee for the Divisional Director of University Corporate Services), 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.

- 12.21.2 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.
- 12.21.3 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.
- 12.21.4 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.
- 12.21.5 The Investigating Officer will ensure that a written record of the deliberations and outcome of the Review Panel is kept.

12.22 Outcomes from a Review Panel for Examination Offences

- 12.22.1 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
- 12.22.2 For all penalties a record **will** be held within the University Cases Office.
- 12.22.3 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.
- 12.22.4 The student shall have the right to Appeal any decision taken by a Review Panel as set out in section 12.22.
- 12.22.5 Tariff of penalties for Examination Misconduct.

Tariff	Description of Offence	Penalty to be imposed for offences identified in invigilated examinations (sat in person in invigilated examination halls)
A	Minor Exam Misconduct	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	Repeated Minor Exam Misconduct	The student will be formally reprimanded and a mark of zero will be recorded for the examination in question. The candidate will have a right of deferral and the mark will not be capped at the pass mark. However, they are not permitted to attain a mark higher than that achieved at the first attempt. This is to prevent a student from gaining advantage from committing misconduct.
C	Exam Misconduct, where the student has breached the guidance for candidates, but it is deemed they have not gained an advantage	The student will be formally reprimanded and 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 advantage from committing misconduct.
D	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	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). Or D2 The module concerned will be given a mark of zero, and the student has a right of referral for the pass mark.
E	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	E1 The module concerned will be given a mark of zero with no right of referral. Or E2 Mark of zero for the year concerned with a right of referral, the referral will be capped at the pass mark.
F	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	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 degree upon which they are registered, but may be awarded a lesser award in line with the credits which they have achieved. Or F2 Mark 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	Severe Exam Misconduct such as impersonation	Expulsion from the University with no credit received.

12.23 Appeals

- 12.23.1 A student shall have the right of appeal against any decision taken either by a Departmental Level Panel, by a Faculty 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.
- 12.23.2 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.
- 12.23.3 Students should note that an appeal against a decision taken by a Departmental Level Panel, by a Faculty Level Panel, by a Review Panel or by a Committee of Academic Enquiry will only be accepted if:
- 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.
- 12.23.4 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.
- 12.23.5 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 12.23.13.
- 12.23.6 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 Faculty-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 Senate Appeal Committee.
- 12.23.7 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 Department(s) or who has previously been involved in the matters under appeal.
- 12.23.8 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 12.3.6 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 Faculty (or delegated School) Representative (and any witnesses called) in an appropriate manner at the discretion of the Chair.
- 12.23.9 The Appeal Committee shall call either a Faculty (or delegated School) Representative or the Investigating Officer and shall be empowered to call other members of the University or partner institution, as it deems necessary.
- 12.23.10 The Appeal Committee, having considered the evidence, may uphold or reject the appeal, such a decision being final.
- 12.23.11 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.
- 12.23.12 The Secretary of the Committee shall notify the appellant in writing of the Appeal Committee's decision, giving the reasons for it.
- 12.23.13 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>.

, alongside a link to the university approved guidance:

Appendix A - Structure within Faculties (or delegated Schools) and Role Descriptors

1. Structure within Faculties (or delegated Schools) for Dealing with Academic Misconduct

1.1 All Faculties (or delegated Schools) will have at least an Academic Conduct Officer per department, for large departments it may be necessary to have multiple Academic Conduct Officer's dependant on caseload.

1.2 All Faculties (or delegated Schools) will have Senior Academic Conduct Officers, who are responsible to the APVC (Education), for the management of academic misconduct cases within the Faculty (or delegated School).

2. Role Descriptors for Academic Conduct Officers

2.1 Each Faculty (or delegated School) will appoint as many Academic Conduct Officers as required to ensure that each of its Departments or Programmes have a named member of staff who is the point of contact for any initial queries concerning Academic Misconduct. Academic Conduct Officers should be members of the academic staff of the Faculty (or delegated School). Academic Conduct Officers will:

- a) Provide information and guidance within their Faculty (or delegated School) on dealing with cases of suspected academic misconduct as well as being the primary Faculty-based source of advice on preventative measures.
- b) Conduct Department Level meetings.
- c) Attend Faculty-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 Conduct Officers should not also be the Senior Tutor or a member of staff responsible for pastoral support for the Department so as to prevent any conflict of interests or confusion on the part of students.

2.2 The role of the Academic Conduct Officer has been drafted with the Senior Academic Conduct Officers forum as role descriptions for the Academic Conduct Officers and the Senior Academic Conduct Officers respectively.

2.3 Academic Conduct Officers will:

- a) Act as a as point of contact for any initial queries concerning Academic Misconduct within their Department and ensure they are familiar with the regulations as defined in section 12.10.
- b) Provide information and guidance within their Department on dealing with cases of suspected academic misconduct as well as being the primary department-based source of advice on preventative measures.
- c) To act as an investigating officer for cases within their department 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 department (in conjunction with other Academic Conduct Officers and Professional Service staff across the Faculty (or delegated School)).
- f) Consider any suspected cases of Poor Academic Practice or Academic Misconduct from within their Department and advise on the appropriate course of Action and refer the case to the relevant support staff and/or Senior Academic Conduct Officer as required.

- g) Conduct Poor Academic Practice meetings for their Department. (with appropriate admin support).
- h) Conduct Academic Honesty workshops for their department (with appropriate admin support).
- i) Attend Faculty-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 department at Committees of Academic Enquiry as required.
- l) Attend Faculty Academic Conduct Officers meetings and any other meeting relating to academic misconduct matters.

2.4 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.

3. Role Descriptors for Senior Academic Conduct Officers

3.1 Senior Academic Conduct Officers will:

- a) Act as a point of contact for any queries regarding Academic Misconduct for the Faculty (or delegated School), in line with the regulations within section 12.10.
- b) With the responsible support staff, determine what steps are necessary to investigate cases which are reported to the Faculty (or delegated School).
- c) With the responsible support staff determined whether a case should be considered under the Poor Academic Practice process within a Department, or whether the case should be considered a Faculty level, or whether the case is sufficiently serious to warrant being referred straight to University level.
- d) To Chair Faculty 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 Faculty (or delegated School) are being treated consistently and fairly.
- f) To represent the Faculty (or delegated School) as a Faculty Representative at Committee of Academic Enquiries.
- g) To attend Committee of Academic Enquires as a Panel member.
- h) To attend the termly Senior Academic Conduct Officers forum, to ensure cases within each Faculty (or delegated School) are being considered consistently across the University.
- i) To co-ordinate meetings of the Faculty (or delegated School's) Academic Conduct Officers to ensure the sharing of best practice and consider the Faculty (or delegated School's) approach to academic misconduct. This is to also ensure that Departments are considering cases consistently.

Appendix B - Process for considering cases of Suspected Academic Misconduct within Formative Work

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.
2. Should a marker when marking formative work suspect a student of committing any of the offences listed within section 12.3, then they should alert the Department Academic Conduct Officer.
3. The Academic Conduct Officer should consider the suspicions raised and apply their academic judgement as above, in section 12.16. However, as the formative work does not carry a mark and the access to feedback is paramount in order for formative assignments to inform subsequent summative work, cases where potential academic offences are found within formative work should be seen at an academic honesty workshop only. The Academic Conduct Officer should 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. The exception to this rule is where a Student is suspected of an academic offence in formative work having already been referred previously for offences in summative submissions. In which case, the Academic Conduct Officer should proceed to meet the Student under section 12.18.
4. 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 provided a chance to correct their practice previously.

Appendix C - Policy in relation to Investigations and Hearings Involving Group Work

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 Academic Conduct Officer.
2. The Academic Conduct 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 Conduct Officer and the standard process should be followed for each of the Students involved.
3. If, in considering the case, the Senior Academic Conduct Officer determines that there is evidence of an academic offence, then they should proceed with the process as detailed in section 12.16.
4. When hearing cases involving group work, those investigating the offence should meet each individual of the group in sequence. No decisions should be made until the Academic Conduct Officer, or Panel, has offered the chance to all students involved in the alleged offence to attend a meeting. All group members must have the opportunity to be interviewed individually by the Academic Conduct Officer or Panel, to allow them the opportunity to provide their explanation without influence of other group members.
5. Once all students involved in the alleged offence have been offered an interview, the Panel should then convene in private to consider whether a) the allegation is proven and b) it is necessary to apply any penalties. This may vary between the different members of the group, depending on the evidence presented to the Academic Conduct Officer or Panel, and they should be mindful of the group dynamics and should use their best judgement to ensure that all members of the group are treated equitably.
6. When considering each case, the Academic Conduct Officer or Panel should exercise their judgement and reach an outcome based on the balance of probabilities, noting that they may reach a different judgement for each student concerned. The Panel can either impose a penalty on a specific individual as the sole party at fault, or may determine that the group as a whole 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.

[Back to top](#)