

Academic Offences Procedures 2017-18

- A. [Academic Offences & General Information](#)
- B. [Investigating an Academic Offence](#)
- C. [Determining an Academic Offence and Applying a Penalty](#)
- D. [Implications of an Academic Offence](#)
- E. [Academic Offence Appeals](#)
- F. [Reporting on Academic Offences and Appeals](#)

[Guidelines for Penalties \(Undergraduate and Postgraduate Taught\)](#)

[Academic Integrity Tutorials](#)

[Subsequent Offences](#)

A. Academic Offences & General Information

A1.

The University, the Students' Union and the University's Partner Institutions expect all students:

- to behave with honesty and integrity in relation to coursework, examinations and other assessed work;
- to be familiar and act in accordance with the conventions of academic writing including appropriate referencing of sources and acknowledgement of assistance;
- to show understanding of ethical considerations and be compliant with the relevant University Procedures.

A student who does not comply with any of these requirements (either intentionally or by negligence) may be charged with having committed an academic offence.

A2.

The following are some examples of academic offences and do not constitute an exhaustive list:

- a. plagiarism, that is, using or copying the work of others (whether written, printed or in any other form) without proper acknowledgement in any assignment, examination or other assessed work;
- b. self-plagiarism, that is, using or copying one's own work that has previously been submitted for assessment, at the University or elsewhere, without proper acknowledgement in any assignment, examination or other assessed work, unless this is explicitly permitted;
- c. false authorship, that is the submission of work for assessment that has been written wholly or in part by a third party and presented as one's own original work;
- d. collusion, that is, submitting work produced collaboratively for individual assessment, unless this is explicitly permitted and acknowledged;
- e. falsifying data or evidence;
- f. unethical academic practice, for example, conducting research without obtaining ethical approval from the University where such approval is required, or the unauthorised use of information that has been confidentially acquired;
- g. introducing, or attempting to introduce, any written, printed or electronically accessible information into an examination, other than material explicitly permitted in the instructions for that examination;
- h. copying, or attempting to copy, the work of another candidate in an examination;
- i. communicating, or attempting to communicate, with another person, other than an invigilator, during an examination.

A3.

A student suspected of helping another student commit an academic offence may be investigated and dealt with in accordance with the University's *Code of Student Conduct*.

DEFINITIONS OF TERMINOLOGY

A4.

An examination is to be defined as any assessment under controlled conditions.

A5.

A unit of assessment is to be defined as any element of a module which contributes to a final module mark.

B. Investigating an Academic Offence

B1.

Departmental Adjudicators are responsible for the initial investigation of all alleged academic offences within the Department. The Departmental Adjudicator is the Head of Department or a nominee approved by the Executive Dean of the appropriate Faculty, or his/her Deputy or the Dean of Partnerships or his/her Deputy. All allegations of an academic offence must be referred to a Departmental Adjudicator (except for formal examinations), and be investigated and dealt with on a formal basis. Individual members of academic staff are not permitted to make decisions about any case of suspected plagiarism and must refer these to the Departmental Adjudicator. Head of Department shall also be taken to include the Head, Dean or Director of a Department, School, Centre, Institute or equivalent, or a nominated academic for a partner institution.

B2.

Faculty Adjudicators are responsible for considering:

- a. cases that have been referred to the Faculty by the Departmental Adjudicator;
- b. cases relating to formal examinations;
- c. cases where the student is completing a research degree.

The role of Faculty Adjudicator will be undertaken by the Executive Dean, Deputy Dean (Education) or Deputy Dean (Postgraduate Research Education). For partner institutions, the role of Faculty Adjudicator will be undertaken by the Dean of Partnerships or his/her Deputy. Additional Faculty Adjudicators must be approved by the Executive Dean of the appropriate Faculty or the Dean of Partnerships.

B3.

Academic Offences Committees are responsible for considering cases that have been referred by the Faculty.

B4.

Adjudicators and Academic Offences Committees are required to:

- a. provide written notification to the student that an allegation is being formally investigated, with confirmation of the module and unit of assessment that is being investigated;
- b. check for any previous academic offences before making a final decision;
- c. consider whether the allegation is in breach of the *Code of Student Conduct* (see B6);
- d. provide each student an opportunity to respond to the allegation (see B20 to B27);
- e. provide written confirmation to the student, the Department and the Student Progress Team of the decision made. The written confirmation will include a summary of the allegation, a summary of the student's response and the reasons for the decision, as well as a notification of the student's right of appeal;
- f. for cases handled by the Faculty or an Academic Offences Committee, notify the Department of the final decision.

B5.

Adjudicators and Academic Offences Committees are appointed on behalf of Senate in accordance with the Academic Offences Procedures.

B6.

Where the alleged offence involves an alleged breach of the University's *Code of Student Conduct*, the Departmental Adjudicator must first consult with the Proctor before proceeding with the investigation. The Proctor will consider how best to proceed on a case by case basis and advise the Initial Adjudicator accordingly.

B7.

Adjudicators and Committees will be required to obtain evidence in finding an allegation to be proven and determining a penalty. Examples of suitable evidence include, but are not limited to, the use of plagiarism detection software, obtaining and annotating allegedly plagiarised material, questioning students on the content of the assignment, inspecting material taken into an examination without authorisation, and comparing a student's work with other work that the student has previously submitted. Students may also be asked to provide notes, rough working and any previous drafts of their work.

ADDITIONAL INVESTIGATIVE RESPONSIBILITIES: UNDERGRADUATE AND POSTGRADUATE TAUGHT STUDENTS

B8.

The Departmental Adjudicator is responsible for the investigation of alleged academic offences relating to coursework submitted by any student undertaking a module in his or her department. Where a student is charged with committing an offence on a module which is not run by a Department, School or Centre, the Department responsible for the student's degree programme shall investigate the allegation.

B9.

The Departmental Adjudicator should not be involved in the investigation of allegations for modules for which they are responsible for. In such cases a substitute Departmental Adjudicator should be appointed in accordance with B1 of the Academic Offences procedures.

B10.

The Departmental Adjudicator can take decisions about all suspected academic offences relating to coursework where the offence, if confirmed, will result in a penalty that it is within the Department's power to impose.

B11.

The Departmental Adjudicator will refer to the Faculty any such case where:

- a. the nature or severity of the alleged offence would warrant a more serious penalty than those that the Department can apply (see Section D);
- b. the offence is alleged to have occurred in a formal examination;
- c. the student is student studying towards a Postgraduate Certificate in Higher Education Practice.

B12.

A Faculty Adjudicator of the appropriate Faculty will consider all cases referred to the Faculty.

B13.

The Faculty Adjudicator will refer to an Academic Offences Committee any such case that is suspected to warrant a more severe penalty than those than the Faculty can apply.

ADDITIONAL INVESTIGATIVE RESPONSIBILITIES: POSTGRADUATE RESEARCH STUDENTS

B14.

The Departmental Adjudicator is responsible for the initial investigation of alleged academic offences relating to preliminary drafts of chapters or to papers submitted to a Supervisory Panel or for consideration by a Research Students' Progress Board produced by a research student in his or her own department.

B15.

All allegations relating to work submitted for assessment by a Supervisory Panel or Research Student's Progress Board shall be considered for formal investigation. The Departmental Adjudicator may dismiss allegations where it is deemed that the work has been submitted for formative assessment only.

B16.

Where an offence is alleged by an Examiner during the examination process for a research degree, the examination must be suspended and the allegation referred to a Faculty Adjudicator. If plagiarism is alleged before the viva takes place, then the viva should be held over until the investigation has been completed. If plagiarism is identified during the viva, the Examiners should inform the candidate and suspend the viva. In both cases, the Examiners should prepare a written report for the Faculty Adjudicator. All allegations brought after the thesis has been submitted will be considered by an Academic Offences Committee.

B17.

The Departmental Adjudicator should not be involved in the investigation of allegations where they are the student's supervisor or a member of the Supervisory Board. In such cases a substitute Departmental Adjudicator should be appointed by the Head of Department and approved by the Executive Dean or Deputy Dean (Postgraduate Research Education).

B18.

The Departmental Adjudicator will refer all allegations of an academic offence for a Postgraduate Research Student to the Faculty. An appropriate Faculty Adjudicator will consider all cases referred to the Faculty.

B19.

The Faculty Adjudicator will refer to an Academic Offences Committee any such case that is suspected to warrant a more severe penalty than those that the Faculty can apply.

RIGHT TO REPLY

B20.

A student has the right to reply to any allegation and must be given the opportunity to meet with the relevant Adjudicator or Academic Offences Committee, before a final decision about the allegation is made.

B21.

Normally, students should be given advanced notice of the scheduled meeting, and access to the relevant documentation, at least one week in advance. A meeting may proceed in the absence of the student (or a written statement) if the Adjudicator or Chair of the Academic Offences Committee is satisfied that due notice has been given to the student.

B22.

A penalty cannot be decided upon by an Adjudicator or Academic Offences Committee unless a meeting has been scheduled and due notice has been given. Cases may be referred to the Faculty or to an Academic Offences Committee without scheduling a meeting with the student.

B23.

Student attendance at a meeting is not compulsory but is strongly advised. If the student attends, they may be accompanied by a student or member of staff of the University or Students' Union to help them in presenting their case. If the student does not wish to attend, they may submit a written response in advance of the meeting.

B24.

At any meeting to discuss an alleged academic offence, or by way of a written statement being provided instead, the student will be given an opportunity to respond to the allegation by way of defence and/or disclose any extenuating circumstances that they wish to be considered in the context of the allegation, or an admission to the charge. Students should ensure that any extenuating circumstances they wish to present are submitted to the relevant adjudicator at the time the case is considered.

B25.

In some instances, such as allegations relating to collusion or group submissions, it may be necessary and appropriate for the Adjudicator or Academic Offences Committee to see more than one student at a time.

B26.

If an allegation of an academic offence has been proven, the student will be invited to disclose any further cases which they wish to be taken into consideration as part of the same offence. Students are warned that all undisclosed offences which come to light will be treated as subsequent offences, potentially carrying heavier penalties.

B27.

All meetings conducted by Faculty Adjudicators and meetings of the Academic Offences Committee will be serviced by a Secretary, acting on behalf of the Academic Registrar. The Secretary of the Committee will notify the student in writing of the time and place in which the case will be heard. During the meeting, the Secretary will take notes, taking particular care to record the reasons for the decision and the deliberation concerning the imposition of any penalty and the alternatives from the set of possible penalties that were considered.

ACADEMIC OFFENCES COMMITTEE

B28.

Academic Offences Committees shall consist of a Faculty Adjudicator in the chair, and two members of staff from outside of the student's department approved by the Executive Dean or his/her Deputy, and who have no connection with the case in question. If the Faculty Adjudicator has previously made a judgement relating to the allegation in question, then another Faculty Adjudicator must chair the Committee.

B29.

A representative of the Department in which the alleged offence has occurred (normally the Departmental Adjudicator) will attend the meeting of the Committee to set out evidence relating to the alleged offence. The Departmental Representative should not present any extenuating circumstances on behalf of the student unless they relate to the Department's procedures or teaching. The Departmental Representative is not a member of the Committee should not propose or comment on any penalty that might be imposed, and is not permitted to ask questions of the student during the meeting except through the Chair.

B30.

Only members of the Committee and the Secretary shall be present while the Committee is reaching a decision. The student is entitled to be present at all times that the Departmental Representative is in attendance at the meeting.

B31.

The Chair of the Committee shall have the authority to determine the order of proceedings and exclude any material which appears irrelevant to the case.

B32.

The usual pattern of proceedings is:

- a. The members of the Committee have a preliminary discussion without the student, the student's representative or the Departmental Representative being present;
- b. The student, the student's representative and the Departmental Representative enter the room and the Chair introduces all those present;
- c. The Chair checks that the student has received details of the case and any supporting documentation;
- d. The Chair explains the order of proceedings to the student;
- e. The evidence relating to the alleged offence is then presented by the Departmental Representative, and members of the Committee, the student and the student's representative are invited to put questions to the Departmental Representative;

- f. The Chair then invites the student to put forward a case orally if he or she wishes to do so including any extenuating circumstances or other mitigation, and members of the committee (but not the Head) are invited to put questions to the student;
- g. The Chair invites the student's representative to put forward any additional statement;
- h. The Chair invites the student to make any final response;
- i. The student, the student's representative and the Departmental Representative are then asked to leave the room;
- j. The Committee then deliberates and comes to a decision as to whether an offence has been committed;
- k. The Committee then determines the appropriate penalty from the set of penalties available to it, clarifying the reasons for the choice of penalty;
- l. The student and the student's representative are then recalled to the room to be told the decision as to whether the alleged offence is confirmed and, if so, the penalty and the reasons why this is the appropriate penalty. The Departmental Representative may be present during this final stage.

B33.

The Committee may choose to adjourn in order to enable the student or the student's representative to be present, or where this is necessary to obtain further information. The Committee shall meet to consider an adjourned case as soon as it is feasible and not later than three months after the adjournment, although the case need not be determined at the resumed meeting. If necessary, the Executive Dean, or the appropriate Deputy Dean of the relevant Faculty, may co-opt additional members to replace any member not able to attend the reconvened meeting, including a new chair. If there are two new members, the reconvened meeting shall proceed as a new hearing. If there is one new member, the student may request that the meeting proceed as a new hearing.

WITHDRAWN STUDENTS

B34.

Where an academic offence has been alleged and a student has withdrawn, or been required to withdraw, from the University for reasons not related to the allegation; the Academic Offences Procedures will be completed. If the student is found to have committed an academic offence, a notional penalty will be allocated and a record made of the outcome. The outcome will be communicated to the student in writing.

B35.

Where an allegation of an academic offence arises after the degree has been conferred, the Faculty Adjudicator must consult the Vice-Chancellor who shall determine the procedures to be used in dealing with the case.

C. Determining an Academic Offence and Applying a Penalty

C1.

Adjudicators and Academic Offences Committee are expected to determine whether an academic offence has been proven, before deciding which penalty to apply. Where a professional body (or similar) may be concerned with the intentionality of the offence, a judgement has to be made as to whether the offence was intentional or not.

C2.

A student may be found guilty of an academic offence whether or not there has been any intention to deceive; that is, a judgement that negligence has occurred is sufficient to determine guilt.

C3.

Any allegation can be dismissed before or after a meeting with the student has been held. The Departmental Adjudicator may determine that no offence has been committed at any point of their investigation, but not after a case has been referred to the Faculty. The Faculty Adjudicator may determine that no offence has been committed at any point after a case has been referred to them by the Department, but not after the case has been referred to an Academic Offences Committee. In all cases where formal proceedings have begun, such a decision should be confirmed to the student in writing and noted on the student's record.

C4.

In determining an appropriate penalty, the Adjudicator or Academic Offences Committee will take the following into account:

- a. the degree of severity of the offence;
- b. whether it is a first or subsequent offence, and, if applicable, the nature and severity of the previous offence;
- c. the academic stage the student has reached (first year undergraduate, Masters, etc.);
- d. any extenuating circumstances;
- e. the status of the module enrolment (ie core, compulsory or optional).

C5.

The Adjudicator or Academic Offences Committee should not take a student's array of marks into consideration when allocating a penalty.

C6.

When more than one offence is considered at the same time the offences will normally all be considered as a first offence if the student has not previously been found guilty of an academic offence. A subsequent offence may occur from the point at which a student is found guilty of a first offence.

C7.

If an academic offence is proven, the Adjudicator or Academic Offences Committee shall apply a penalty and may, in addition, require the student to complete an Academic Integrity Tutorial, attendance at which will be considered compulsory. Attendance at an Academic Integrity Tutorial cannot replace a penalty. Failure to attend the Academic Integrity Tutorial will be noted should the student commit any subsequent offences and shall not be considered as a valid claim of mitigation, unless exceptional extenuating circumstances have prevented the student from attending.

PENALTIES FOR UNDERGRADUATE AND POSTGRADUATE TAUGHT STUDENTS

C8.

The following penalties may be applied by Departmental Adjudicators, Faculty Adjudicators and Academic Offences Committees:

- Penalty 1: A formal written warning only;
- Penalty 2: Resubmit unit of assessment with minor amendments only, as determined by the Adjudicator (such as correct referencing, paraphrasing or striking out), for an uncapped mark.
- Penalty 3: Resubmit unit of assessment with minor amendments only, as determined by the Adjudicator (such as correct referencing, paraphrasing or striking out) for a capped mark.
- Penalty 4: Mark of zero to be given for the unit of assessment, reassessment available to the Board of Examiners.

The following penalties may be applied by Faculty Adjudicators and Academic Offences Committees:

- Penalty 5: Mark of zero to be given for the unit of assessment, with no resubmission or reassessment permitted.

The following penalties may be applied by Academic Offences Committees only:

- Penalty 6: Mark of zero to be awarded for the module, with no resubmission or reassessment permitted;
- Penalty 7: No longer eligible for full award: Mark of zero to be awarded for the module with no resubmission or reassessment permitted and the student may complete currently enrolled credits for an exit award only;
- Penalty 8: Required to withdraw immediately and no longer eligible for full award: A mark of zero to be awarded for the module no resubmission or reassessment permitted and the Examination Board to be invited to consider the student only for an exit award on the basis of credits already achieved;
- Penalty 9: Required to withdraw immediately with no qualification awarded: A mark of zero to be awarded for the module no resubmission or reassessment permitted and the Examination Board to be invited to ratify credits that have already been achieved for recording purposes.

PENALTIES FOR POSTGRADUATE RESEARCH STUDENTS

C9.

For allegations that have occurred prior to the student's submission for final assessment, the following penalties may be applied by Faculty Adjudicators and Academic Offences Committees only:

- Penalty 1: A formal written warning only;
- Penalty 2: Specified section of submission to be referenced correctly, rewritten or removed, and resubmitted for assessment.

For allegations that have occurred prior to submission for the student's final assessment, the following penalties may be applied by Academic Offences Committees only:

- Penalty 3: No longer eligible for full award: the student's registration shall be downgraded and they will be considered for a lesser award only.
- Penalty 4: Required to withdraw with no qualification awarded.

C10.

For allegations that have occurred after the submission of the student's final assessment, the following penalties may be applied by Academic Offences Committees only:

- Penalty 1: Formal written warning only;
- Penalty 2: The Examiners shall be instructed to consider the non-plagiarised sections of the final submission, for the degree for which it has been submitted;

- Penalty 3: No longer eligible for full award: The Examiners shall be instructed to consider the non-plagiarised sections of the final submission for a lesser award only;
- Penalty 4: Required to withdraw with no qualification awarded.

C11.

For research students where the form of assessment is more akin to taught assessment (as determined by the Adjudicator or Academic Offences Committee), a penalty from those available for Postgraduate Taught students may be applied.

D. Implications of an Academic Offence

D1.

An academic offence may lead to a student:

- being prevented from continuing their studies, either as a direct result of a penalty, or by the further application of the rules of assessment after a penalty has been applied;
- being prevented from studying abroad under the Study Abroad Scheme;
- being prevented from completing a work placement as part of their course;
- being prevented from receiving accreditation from a Professional Body;
- having their scholarship terminated by the Executive Dean (or his/her Deputy) of the relevant Faculty
- being subject to the *Fitness to Practise Procedure* (applicable for students on a relevant course of study only);

On each occasion, the student will be notified separately as part of the relevant process or procedure.

D2.

All information relating to suspected academic offences and their outcomes will be recorded on the academic offences database and in the student's file.

D3.

Academic Offences are not explicitly recorded on academic transcripts or the Higher Education Achievement Record. However details of an academic offence, such as the nature of the offence and the penalty applied, may be passed on to third parties as deemed appropriate, such as professional accreditors, placement providers, educational sponsors (including embassies) and organisations approved by the student in order to provide a professional or character reference.

D4.

Details of the allegation (including evidence presented by the student's Department) may be passed on to other University services if deemed appropriate, such as the University Proctor, the Talent Development Centre or a Professional Suitability Group. On such occasions, students will be notified and informed of the reason why.

ACADEMIC OFFENCES & THE RULES OF ASSESSMENT

D5.

A Board of Examiners may not overturn any decision on a penalty given in relation to an academic offence by a Departmental Adjudicator, a Faculty Adjudicator or an Academic Offences Committee.

D6.

If reassessment for the module is not on a like-for-like basis then the allocated penalty will be applied to the overall module mark in proportion to the weighting of the penalised unit of assessment. Where a student is awarded Penalty 3 and/or Penalty 4 given in C8 of the Procedures, and also submits a claim of extenuating circumstances to the Board of Examiners, the Board will however have limited discretion and should act in accordance with the relevant guidance.

D7.

In cases where the module mark is determined by either the aggregate of coursework and examination or examination only, whichever is the higher, then any penalty applied to an element of the coursework component will result in the student's final module mark being determined by the aggregate of coursework and examination: the student will not be entitled to have their module mark determined by examination only.

D8.

In cases where a module mark is determined by the best grades of a student's work (for example the best three out of four units of assessments) the unit(s) of assessment to which a penalty has been applied must be included in the final aggregate. The student will not be entitled to have the module mark determined by discounting any such penalties.

D9.

Where a student has a penalised mark for work as a result of an academic offence, the penalty will not be carried forward if the student repeats a year. However, the record of the offence is kept on the student's record and the academic offences database and any further offences will be classified as subsequent offences.

RESUBMITTED WORK

D10.

Where a student is entitled to resubmit work with the correct referencing applied following an academic offence:

- if the student does not take up the opportunity to resubmit the work by the given deadline, a mark of zero will be awarded for consideration by the Board of Examiners;
- any allegations made about the resubmitted piece of work will be treated as a subsequent offence;
- no other changes may be made to the original submission except for the minor amendments as determined by the Adjudicator. Any unauthorised changes made to the assignment will be treated as a subsequent offence.

E. Academic Offence Appeals

E1.

A student shall have the right of appeal to an Academic Offences Appeal Committee against any decision of a Departmental Adjudicator, Faculty Adjudicator or Academic Offences Committee (hereafter 'the Initial Adjudicator') on the following grounds:

- a. that there is material evidence now available, which could not have reasonably been made available to the Initial Adjudicator and is of such a nature as to cause reasonable doubt as to whether the result might have been different had the material been available;
- b. that the Initial Adjudicator departed from the provisions of the Academic Offences Procedures in a manner prejudicial to the interests of the student and causing reasonable doubt as to whether the result might have been different had this not occurred;
- c. that the facts set out in the findings of the Initial Adjudicator do not warrant the resolution that there was an academic offence as charged;
- d. that the penalty imposed by the Initial Adjudicator was unreasonable having regard to all the circumstances of the case.

LODGING AN APPEAL

E2.

A student who wishes to appeal against the outcome of these procedures should submit an academic offences appeal form to the Academic Registrar setting out the grounds of the appeal in detail. Students must appeal within ten working days of the date on which the final decision was confirmed to the student in writing. Students are strongly encouraged to contact SU Advice for advice and guidance before completing the form. If the student can show that circumstances beyond his or her control prevented this time limit being adhered to and that injustice would result from adhering to it, the Academic Registrar may extend the time limit in which an appeal may be lodged normally up to the period of twenty working days from the date on which the final decision was confirmed to the student in writing.

E3.

On receipt of an Appeal, the Initial Adjudicator whose decision the appeal is made against is asked to write a Statement of the Case, normally within five working days, which shall include:

- the details of the charge(s) in respect of which the decision that was made;
- a brief summary of the evidence and of the relevant findings;
- the decision, including the details of any penalty imposed;
- a brief comment as to the reason for such findings, decision and penalty;
- any further information that may be deemed to be relevant.

Where the Initial Adjudicator was an Academic Offences Committee, the Chair of the Committee will normally provide the statement.

DUTIES OF THE APPOINTED DEAN

E4.

An Executive Dean or his/her deputy who has no previous involvement with the case (hereafter the Appointed Dean) is appointed to deal with the appeal.

E5.

The Appointed Dean shall consider whether or not in his or her judgement the request discloses a proper ground for an appeal, normally within five working days of the receipt of the Initial Adjudicator's report. Where it is agreed that the appeal does have valid grounds, the case shall be referred to an Academic Offences Appeals Committee.

ACADEMIC OFFENCES APPEALS COMMITTEE

E6.

The Academic Offences Appeal Committee will have the same authority, and be composed in the same way, as an Academic Offences Committee (see B5 and B20 to B33) but will operate with the following differences:

- a. The Appointed Dean chairs the Academic Offences Appeal Committee.
- b. The Initial Adjudicator will normally attend the meeting of the Appeals Committee instead of the Departmental Representative, and, in regards to their role at the meeting, will be bound by the same requirements. The Initial Adjudicator is not a member of the committee. The Secretary shall be responsible for providing the Initial Adjudicator with the relevant documentation. Where the Initial Adjudicator is an Academic Offences Committee, a member of the Academic Offences Committee (normally the Chair) will normally undertake this role;
- c. Where a Committee has adjourned and it is necessary to co-opt additional members, these must be approved by the Appointed Dean or the Pro-Vice-Chancellor (Education);
- d. The student will not normally be given a further opportunity to disclose any further cases which they wish to be taken into consideration as part of the same offence.

E7.

An Academic Offences Appeal Committee shall have the power to:

- a. rescind a resolution of the Initial Adjudicator that the student has committed an offence and rescind all consequential penalties;
- b. confirm a resolution of the Initial Adjudicator that the student has committed an academic offence;
- c. confirm or amend (increasing or decreasing) the penalty allocated by a the Initial Adjudicator, provided that any amendment is consistent with the powers of the original authority.

E8

An Academic Offences Appeal Committee can only apply a more serious penalty where evidence or information is provided by the student as part of the appeal, or where new evidence is submitted by the Department or Initial Adjudicator at the request of the Appeals Committee that indicates that the offence is more severe.

E9.

The student may withdraw an appeal at any time before the meeting of the Committee.

FURTHER APPEALS

E10.

Any appeal following the formal conclusion of the appeals procedures set out above may be made on the grounds of procedural irregularities in the appeals process only. A student who wishes to appeal against the outcome of these procedures should write to the Academic Registrar within twenty working days of the Appeal hearing setting out in detail the nature of the evidence to support the claim that there were procedural irregularities in the appeals process. The claim will be reviewed by a Pro-Vice-Chancellor who will determine whether there were any procedural irregularities in the appeals process in which case the appeal will be referred to a new Appeals Committee for consideration.

E11.

The Office of the Independent Adjudicator for Higher Education (OIA) provides an independent scheme for the review of student complaints or appeals. When the University's internal procedures for dealing with complaints and appeals have been exhausted, the University will issue a Completion of a procedures letter. Students wishing to avail themselves of the opportunity of an independent review by the OIA must submit their application to the OIA within twelve months of the issue of the Completion of Procedures letter. Full details of the scheme are available on request and will be enclosed with the Completion of Procedures letter.

F. Reporting on Academic Offences and Appeals

F1.

The Executive Dean is responsible for providing an annual report of the number of cases dealt with by Departments, Faculties, Academic Offences Committees and Partner Institutions to the Academic Quality and Standards Committee.

F2.

The number of cases dealt with by an Academic Offences Appeals Committee under these procedures shall be reported by the Academic Registrar to Senate on an annual basis.

GUIDELINES FOR PENALTIES (UNDERGRADUATE AND POSTGRADUATE TAUGHT)

The Bands presented below are guidelines only, whilst the Penalties are fixed. Adjudicators should always take the evidence with which they have been provided, including any extenuating circumstances, into account.

Band A – Minor Offence / Unacceptable Academic Practice		Penalties available to Departments (coursework only), Faculties and Academic Offence Committees:
Maximum Suggested Penalty:	Penalty 3	
Coursework: <ul style="list-style-type: none">The academic offence relates to a failure to understand or apply the University's academic conventions in regards to proper referencing and acknowledging source material, but where an attempt to do so has been made.The student is completing a unit of assessment that is early in their studies, or has no previous experience of the particular referencing style (including self-plagiarism), and there has been a failure to understand the University's academic conventions.		<ul style="list-style-type: none">Penalty 1: A formal written warning onlyPenalty 2: Resubmit unit of assessment with minor amendments only, as determined by the Adjudicator (such as correct referencing, paraphrasing or striking out), for an uncapped mark.Penalty 3: Resubmit unit of assessment with minor amendments only, as determined by the Adjudicator (such as correct referencing, paraphrasing or striking out), for a capped mark.Penalty 4: Mark of zero to be given for the unit of assessment, with reassessment available to the Board of Examiners.
Examination: <ul style="list-style-type: none">The student is found to have contravened the rules of the examination as a result of human error or a misunderstanding, and it is agreed that they have not gained an unfair advantage.		
Band B – Intermediate Offence		Penalties available to Faculties and Academic Offence Committees only
Maximum Suggested Penalty:	Penalty 5	
Coursework: <ul style="list-style-type: none">A significant portion of the work submitted by a student is not original text and has not been referenced properly, either where the student has made no attempt to acknowledge the source material, or where the student would reasonably be expected to have a full understanding of the academic conventions.The work submitted includes references that are false or incongruous, (ie it appears that the student has not consulted works to which reference is made) but the concern does not relate to false authorship.		<ul style="list-style-type: none">Penalty 5: Mark of zero to be given for the unit of assessment, with no resubmission or reassessment permitted.
Examination: <ul style="list-style-type: none">The student is found to have contravened the rules of the examination by introducing and/or attempting to access a small amount of material to aid their attempt at the examination.The student is found to have had access to the internet or to have communicated with someone other than an invigilator during an examination.		
Band C – Severe Offence		Penalties available to Academic Offence Committees <u>only</u>
Maximum Suggested Penalty:	Penalty 9	
Coursework: <ul style="list-style-type: none">The majority of the work submitted by the student is not original or has not been referenced properly, either where the student has made no attempt to acknowledge the source material, or where the student would reasonably be expected to have a full understanding of the academic conventions.The student has submitted work that has been written or created by a third party, either wholly or in part.		<ul style="list-style-type: none">Penalty 6: Mark of zero to be awarded for the module, with no resubmission or reassessment permitted;Penalty 7: No longer eligible for full award - Mark of zero to be awarded for the module with no resubmission or reassessment permitted and the student may complete currently enrolled credits for an exit award only;Penalty 8: Required to withdraw immediately and no longer eligible for full award - A mark of zero to be awarded for the module no resubmission or reassessment permitted and the Examination Board to be invited to consider the student only for an exit award on the basis of credits already achieved;Penalty 9 - Required to withdraw immediately with no qualification awarded: A mark of zero to be awarded for the module no resubmission or reassessment permitted and the Examination Board to be invited to ratify credits that have already been achieved for recording purposes.
Examination: <ul style="list-style-type: none">The student is found to have contravened the rules of the examination by introducing and/or attempting to access a significant amount of material to aid their attempt at the examination.The student is found to have accessed the internet, or communicated with someone other than an invigilator during an examination, about the content of the module.The student has arranged for the examination to be attempted by a third party on their behalf.		

Academic Integrity Tutorials

In addition to a penalty, a student who is found to have committed an Academic Offence may be required to complete an Academic Integrity Tutorial.

Failure to attend the Academic Integrity Tutorial will be noted should the student commit any subsequent offences and shall not be considered as a valid claim of mitigation, unless exceptional extenuating circumstances have prevented the student from attending.

Subsequent Offences

Escalation of Penalties

A subsequent academic offence will generally result in a more severe penalty, particularly when the student has made little or no attempt to understand the University's academic conventions since the first or previous offence.

- Where a student is found to have committed successive offences at Band A, or where one of the offences is Band B, it would normally be appropriate for Penalty 4 to be considered the minimum available penalty;
- Where the student has been found to have committed successive offences at Band B or higher, or where one of the offences is Band C, it would normally be appropriate for Penalty 7 to be considered the minimum available penalty;

Exceptions

The only occasions when the penalty need not necessarily be escalated (or escalated so severely) are where the Adjudicator has deemed that:

- The academic offence is of a different nature
AND/OR
- there was no intent to deceive in either offence;
AND/OR
- the student has made a suitable effort to resolve all and any concern(s) that arose following their previous academic offence(s)
AND/OR
- there are exceptional extenuating circumstances in the latest academic offence.

Further information:

[Academic offences and academic integrity](#)

[Code of Student Conduct](#)

[The Office of the Independent Adjudicator for Higher Education \(OIA\)](#)