



University of
Salford
MANCHESTER

Student Academic Integrity Policy and Academic Misconduct Procedure

Version Number 4.5

Effective from 1 August 2025

Author: Student Casework Manager


Quality Management Office

Contents

1.0	Academic Integrity	5
2.0	Purpose of the Procedure	5
3.0	Scope	5
3.1	Who Does the Procedure Apply to?	5
3.2	What is Academic Misconduct?	6
	i) <i>Plagiarism</i>	6
	ii) <i>Self-plagiarism (or double submission)</i>	6
	iii) <i>Collusion</i>	6
	iv) <i>Falsifying experimental or other investigative results</i>	7
	v) <i>Falsification of authorship</i> which includes:	7
	a. <i>Contracting another to write a piece of assessed work / Writing a piece of assessed work for another</i>	7
	b. <i>Unauthorised use of Generative Artificial Intelligence</i>	7
	c. <i>Using means to disguise or alter the content of an assessment</i>	7
	vi) <i>Breaching the University Examination Rules</i> , which includes:	8
	a. <i>Taking unauthorised material (including electronic devices) into an examination.</i>	8
	b. <i>Copying from, or communicating with, another examination candidate during an examination</i>	8
	vii) <i>Bribery</i>	8
	viii) <i>Failure to correctly obtain necessary approval</i>	8
	ix) <i>Other.</i>	8
3.3	Preventative Measures Against Academic Misconduct	8
	i) <i>Getting help from others / helping others</i>	9
	ii) <i>Use of Readers/Note Takers</i>	9
	iii) <i>Referencing</i>	9
3.4	Repeat Offences	9
3.5	Staff Disciplinary Procedure	10
3.6	Witnesses and Support and Representation at Meetings and Hearings, including legal representation	10
3.7	Recording of Proceedings	10
3.8	Standard and Burden of Proof	10
3.9	Covert Recordings as Evidence	10
3.10	Verification of Submitted Evidence	10
3.11	Student Status Pending Hearing – Issuing of Marks and Progression	10
3.12	Data Protection	11
3.13	Related Documentation	11
3.14	Governance and Management	12

Academic Misconduct Procedure	13
4.0 Timeline for consideration	13
5.0 Reports from Examinations including Apprenticeship End-Point Assessments (EPAs)	13
6.0 Reports from assessment not completed as part of an Examination	13
7.0 Personal Mitigating Circumstances.....	14
8.0 Review Stage	14
9.0 Acknowledgement of Academic Misconduct by Students.....	15
10.0 Dealing with Academic Misconduct: Referral to School Level.....	16
11.0 School Hearing	16
12.0 Attendance at School Hearings	17
13.0 Dealing with Academic Misconduct: Referral to University Level	17
14.0 Academic Sanctions – Taught Programmes	18
15.0 Retrospective Sanctions/Removal of Credit and Award	19
16.0 Academic Sanctions – Research Programmes	19
17.0 Entitlement to Reassessment/Retaking.....	19
18.0 Request for a Review (Appeal) of Outcome.....	20
19.0 External Review	21
Appendices.....	21
Appendix A - Guidelines on When to Refer Cases to University Level Hearings.....	22
Appendix C – Indicative Guidance for the Application of Sanctions	25

Flowchart – Academic Misconduct Procedure



1.0 Academic Integrity

- 1.1.1 The University takes the academic integrity of its programmes seriously, and seeks to promote good academic practice, and to minimise, and respond appropriately to, the use of unfair means (academic misconduct) in assessment.
- 1.1.2 Academic integrity means honesty in academic work, which involves acknowledging the work of others and giving credit where other people's ideas have been used, and being fair, open and honest about academic work submitted for assessment, including information on research methods and data used. It also means avoiding any means which will give a student unfair advantage over other students completing that or similar assessments.
- 1.1.3 Academic integrity is central to the role and purpose of the University. It should be ingrained into everything students do.
- 1.1.4 University of Salford is a signatory of the QAA Academic Integrity Charter
<https://www.qaa.ac.uk/membership/membership-areas-of-work/academic-integrity>.

2.0 Purpose of the Procedure

- 2.1.1 The purpose is to outline the Academic Misconduct Procedure, types of activity that constitute academic misconduct, and how such matters will be dealt with by the University.

3.0 Scope

3.1 Who Does the Procedure Apply to?

- 3.1.1 The document applies to all students registered on programmes or modules which lead to University of Salford award or credit, including those following programmes of study at partner institutions which lead to University of Salford award or credit. It applies to students on all programmes.
- 3.1.2 Where students are undertaking 'accredited study abroad', or similar forms of study where assessment is undertaken at a partner institution, and the credit is imported to the University of Salford award, the relevant procedure at the partner shall apply for all assessment taken with them. Where allegations are of the 'most serious nature', the University may also take action through the Student Misconduct or Fitness to Practise Procedures.
- 3.1.3 This Procedure can apply to work previously submitted, where credit or an award has been ratified by the University. As such, the Procedure can be applied to assessment previously completed by current and former students.
- 3.1.4 For students registered on programmes at collaborative partners which lead to the University's qualifications, the Procedure may be subject to agreed and approved changes.
- 3.1.5 Should a student withdraw partway through the process, prior to any final outcome, then the Dean of School (or nominee), on the advice of the Quality Management Office (QMO), may choose not to proceed with any future hearing. Any such cases must be reported for information to QMO and a note made on the student's record.
- 3.1.6 Any student found to have aided others to commit any act of academic misconduct will be considered to have breached the University's Student Misconduct Procedure and/or Fitness to Practise Procedure. Examples may include:
 - a) being party to impersonation where another person sits an examination or other assignment in the place of the actual student;
 - b) provision to another student, or assistance in the provision, of evidence or knowledge or understanding in an examination or other assignment;
 - c) provision of work, such as assignments, to external websites or other external services which could be used for academic misconduct.

- 3.1.7 Where concerns are raised in relation to suspected academic misconduct, concerns about general student misconduct may also apply. For example, should one student access another's student's University account without permission, then this may also be reported in parallel via the appropriate procedure, such as the Student Misconduct Procedure, Fitness to Practise Procedure, and Information Security ICT Acceptable Use Policy.

3.2 What is Academic Misconduct?

- 3.2.1 Academic misconduct occurs in University assessment and involves an action which gains, attempts to gain, or assists others in gaining or attempting to gain, unfair academic advantage, or which puts others at an unfair disadvantage.
- 3.2.2 As the Procedure requires all cases to be considered as strict liability, the action does not require intent on behalf of the student or other party. In all cases, it is the action, not the intention, that is of concern.
- 3.2.3 Acts of academic misconduct can take many forms. These are likely to fall into, but are not restricted to, one or more of the following categories:

i) *Plagiarism*

Plagiarism involves taking the work of another person or source and using it as if it were one's own. The source of the original material is hidden from the marker by not referencing it properly, or by paraphrasing it without acknowledgement, or by not using quotations correctly, or by not mentioning it at all.

Work includes, but is not restricted to, written work, ideas, musical compositions, computer programs, laboratory or survey results, diagrams, graphs, drawings and designs.

Plagiarism may occur in all forms of assessment, including written examinations. Where one student takes the work of another (without proper acknowledgement) this is also potentially an act of collusion (see iii) below.

ii) *Self-plagiarism (or double submission)*

Self-plagiarism (or double submission) is resubmitting previously submitted work on one or more occasions (without proper acknowledgement) for separate blocks of credit and/or award. This may include the re-use of text, research data, or other information, without specific reference between one assessment and another. It will not normally include work submitted for reassessment/re-take within the same assessment.

Self-plagiarism may also occur where content which has previously appeared in published articles or similar where this has not been acknowledged. This is particularly relevant for students on Postgraduate Research Awards (see Code of Practice for the Conduct of Postgraduate Research Degree Programmes).

iii) *Collusion*

Collusion occurs when, unless with official approval (for example, in some forms of group projects), two or more students collaborate in the preparation and production of work which is ultimately submitted by each in an identical, or similar, form and/or is represented by each to be the product of their individual efforts.

Collusion also occurs where there is unauthorised co-operation between a student and another person in the preparation and production of work which is presented as the student's own (see also contracting another, below).

The act of one student allowing another access to their own work is considered an act of collusion by both parties, regardless of intent.

Where one student uses the work of another (without proper acknowledgement), this is potentially an act of plagiarism (see i) above.

iv) *Falsifying experimental or other investigative results*

This could involve a range of means that make it appear that information has been collected by scientific investigation, the compilation of questionnaire results, interviews etc. whereas, in reality, it has been made up or altered. Where data has been acquired from another source without acknowledgement this could also be treated as plagiarism, self-plagiarism and/or collusion (see above).

v) *Falsification of authorship* which includes:

a. *Contracting another to write a piece of assessed work / Writing a piece of assessed work for another*

This involves any means whereby work (in whole or in part) is completed on behalf of another which is then submitted for assessment. It includes assessments done for someone else in full or in part by a fellow student, a friend, or family member, as well as “commercial services” (for example “Essay Mills”).

It includes someone sitting an examination for someone else.

It also covers obtaining material from internet ‘cheat sites’ or other sources of work.

In cases where one student of the University undertakes work for another, the ‘commissioned’ student will be subject to referral to the Student Misconduct Procedure. Sanctions will normally apply to both students.

The contracting, or seeking to contract, of another to produce work, or producing work for another, may be considered an act of misconduct under the Student Misconduct Procedure/Fitness to Practise Procedure, whether or not the work is submitted for assessment.

b. *Unauthorised use of Generative Artificial Intelligence*

Using Generative Artificial Intelligence (Gen AI) or other computer-based process to generate work which is then submitted in whole or in part towards credit or award.

This could include work which is written using Gen AI where that use is not permitted even when subsequently edited by the student. It could include the use of paraphrasing software and technology that rewrites text even when subsequently edited by the student (these are also covered in c. below).

c. *Using means to disguise or alter the content of an assessment*

This might include the use of ‘text in an image’ (that is text that is in an image file which may disguise it from text matching software), paraphrasing software or other means used to disguise part or all the content of assessment in any way which could give an unfair advantage. These actions are often aggravating

factors in other forms of academic misconduct and could be considered misconduct in their own right.

vi) *Breaching the University Examination Rules*, which includes:

a. *Taking unauthorised material (including electronic devices) into an examination.*

This involves taking materials, notes or electronic devices of any sort, other than those specifically permitted, into any examination, whether or not they could be used to gain advantage and whether used or not.

It includes any 'smart' devices, or devices with a 'memory' function, and any written material, not previously and specifically exempted, which could be used to give an unfair advantage during the examination. It is not dependent on the actual use of, or an intention to use, any material or device that may have been taken into an examination.

It would also include a student having access to additional material/information within accepted material, such as notes within a permitted book in an 'open book examination', or accessing material that is not expressly permitted such as via a computer/laptop where one is used as either part of the examination or as part of a Reasonable Adjustment Plan.

b. *Copying from, or communicating with, another examination candidate during an examination*

A student must not communicate in any way with another student during an examination, must not disturb other students, nor copy from them during an examination.

vii) *Bribery*

A student must not offer or give any member of academic or professional service staff money, gifts or any other advantage which is intended to induce or reward impropriety in the marking and/or processing of the student's examination or assessment.

Bribery is morally wrong and a criminal offence. It exposes the University and its employees to the risk of prosecution, fines and imprisonment, as well as endangering the University's reputation. As such, all cases will involve a non-academic misconduct element and must be considered by a Student Misconduct Panel or Fitness to Practise Procedure.

viii) *Failure to correctly obtain necessary approval*

Failure to gain necessary approval before undertaking an assessment, where such failure offers potential unfair advantage. For example, starting or progressing with research for a dissertation/major project without necessary ethical approval (at any level of study).

ix) *Other.*

Exceptionally, other forms of academic misconduct may be considered. In such instances, the details of the concerns, and the reasons that they are considered academic misconduct, must be clearly stated in the notification of a case and in all records of formal consideration of that case.

3.3 Preventative Measures Against Academic Misconduct

3.3.1 Academic integrity and good practice need to be embedded in all programmes of study and signposted throughout a student's time at the University, from induction onwards, and included in programme handbooks and assignment briefs.

3.3.2 Students are advised to take particular care in respect of the following:

i) *Getting help from others / helping others*

Students are encouraged to discuss and share ideas and information. However, those who assist others to commit academic misconduct, whether or not for payment, (that is by giving another student the opportunity to copy part or all of a piece of work, by providing copies of assessments, or by providing bespoke assignments to another student) will be subject to the same sanctions as those who use unfair means (see *collusion* above).

Students are personally responsible for ensuring that they protect their own work, submit it themselves and do not allow other students to use their work, for example by allow others to have access to a laptop, memory stick, emailing and/or printing off work on their behalf.

ii) *Use of Readers/Note Takers*

Students with individual needs who require the services of readers or note takers are advised to use appropriately trained individuals. Further advice can be obtained from the Disability Inclusion Service webpages

<https://www.salford.ac.uk/askus/topics/disability-inclusion-service>

iii) *Referencing*

Students using work which has been produced by other people within an assignment will need to ensure that they acknowledge or reference the source of the work. It is not just quoted text which needs to be referenced, but any use of another's works/ideas. Where another person's text is used this must be quoted correctly. Students should check with their Schools to confirm the specific referencing requirements for their programme of study.

Marks may be lost (not awarded) for poor referencing. If poor referencing is extensive throughout a piece of work, it could appear that the student is trying to claim credit for the work of others and the student may be deemed to have committed plagiarism. Guidance on good referencing practice is available from schools or may be provided through research training programmes. The Library provides detailed information on referencing and broader information literacy skills via its website <https://www.salford.ac.uk/skills>.

Students are advised that paraphrasing of another's work should be used to demonstrate engagement with and understanding of that work, and the source should always be referenced. Paraphrasing must not be used to 'hide' the source of material from text matching software such as Turnitin.

3.3.3 The Assessment Handbook provides guidance for academic staff on how to develop types of assessment which minimise the opportunity for academic misconduct.

3.4 Repeat Offences

3.4.1 Previous offences are not considered when determining if academic misconduct has occurred, but are used in deciding upon sanctions once academic misconduct is established.

3.4.2 Where students have been found to have committed repeat offences, later offences will be treated more severely than the first offence when sanctions are applied.

- 3.4.3 A repeat offence can only be described as such when any previous case has been considered at a hearing and the formal outcome notified to the student. Where this is not the case, such an offence should be considered a possible concurrent offence, that is where a student submits two assignments where there are concerns in the same time period and has no prior offences.
- 3.4.4 Repeat offences, except at levels 3, 4 and for second offences at level 5 will normally be considered at University level, at a Student Misconduct Panel, and students subject to the full range of sanctions available through that procedure as well as those available through this Procedure.

3.5 Staff Disciplinary Procedure

- 3.5.1 Where the student is also a member of staff, guidance should be sought from Human Resources and QMO as any allegation could be considered under a separate specific procedure, or an agreed amended procedure for example the constitution of a Panel hearing may be amended.

3.6 Witnesses and Support and Representation at Meetings and Hearings, including legal representation

- 3.6.1 Information on supporters, representatives and witnesses is available from the university webpage <https://www.salford.ac.uk/governance-and-management/student-facing-policies-and-procedures>.
- 3.6.2 Legal Representation will not normally be approved for meetings held as part of an investigation, nor for School level hearings.

3.7 Recording of Proceedings

- 3.7.1 The audio recording of meetings and hearings held under this Procedure is prohibited, subject to such reasonable adjustment as may be agreed by the University where required to comply with the Equality Act 2010.
- 3.7.2 Where adjustments have been agreed, the student is asked to inform the Secretary in good time prior to the hearing to allow the University to ensure suitable facilities are available.

3.8 Standard and Burden of Proof

- 3.8.1 The burden is on the University to prove the allegation(s) of academic misconduct. In deciding whether the student has committed academic misconduct; the standard of proof shall be 'the balance of probabilities', that is on the evidence, the student is more likely than not to have committed academic misconduct.

3.9 Covert Recordings as Evidence

- 3.9.1 The University will not normally accept the use of covert audio or video recordings (recordings made without the knowledge of another individual) as evidence to support a case.

3.10 Verification of Submitted Evidence

- 3.10.1 Where evidence related to third parties is submitted in evidence (including GP letters, hospital communications etc), the University reserves the right to seek to confirm the authenticity of the evidence including, but not restricted to, contacting those third parties named.

3.11 Student Status Pending Hearing – Issuing of Marks and Progression

- 3.11.1 Where a member of academic staff marking a piece of assessment believes that academic misconduct may have occurred, they should normally not continue to mark that work, but should prepare a case and refer assessment concerned to the AMP.

- 3.11.2 Where work has been marked prior to the identification of possible academic misconduct, and where the Assessment Board which makes decisions on progression/award meets prior to the hearing to hear the case, the student may be informed of the unratified mark for the module(s). It must be made clear that this mark will not be ratified, and the case has been referred under the Procedure. This will allow that the student to make an informed decision about resubmission/resit of the module(s).
- 3.11.3 Should no sanction be imposed through the Procedure, marks will be ratified by an Assessment Board.
- 3.11.4 If during the resit period there is no outcome to a case under this Procedure, the student maybe permitted to register at the previous level of study in order to have access to University facilities. The student may also attend classes at the next level informally until there has been an outcome from the academic misconduct process. If the outcome is failure in the module(s), the student may have to step off the programme to redeem the module(s) at the next most appropriate point in time.

3.12 Data Protection

- 3.12.1 All processing of personal data is undertaken in accordance with the General Data Protection Regulation (GDPR) 2017. For more information on University data management policy please go to <https://www.salford.ac.uk/privacy>.
- 3.12.2 In following this procedure, students' personal data will be shared within the University to the persons and departments named and with the Students' Union where appropriate.
- 3.12.3 This information will relate to specific occurrences of academic misconduct and will include only information deemed relevant to the case. The information will be used only for the purposes outlined in this procedure. Where it is determined that there is no case to answer, no details shall be held on a student's record. Otherwise, details of the incident and outcome shall be retained on a student's record. Records of all cases will be retained by QMO.
- 3.12.4 Where a student requests a review from the Office of the Independent Adjudicator, relevant information shall be disclosed to that office for the review to take place.
- 3.12.5 Findings of academic misconduct, and sanctions imposed, may be referred to in references which are requested for students.
- 3.12.6 Where cases are referred to a Student Misconduct Panel, the data protection guidance associated with those procedures will apply.
- 3.12.7 Where a sanction of suspension or expulsion is imposed via a relevant procedure, the University will inform the Home Office (UK Visas and Immigration) as required.
- 3.12.8 Where empowered to do so by approved agreements, the University may refer outcomes to employers, sponsoring bodies, partner institutions or Professional Statutory & Regulatory Bodies (PSRBs).

3.13 Related Documentation

The following documents can be found on the University webpages:

Case work procedures via <https://www.salford.ac.uk/governance-and-management/student-facing-policies-and-procedures>,

- Student Misconduct Procedure (SMP),
- Fitness to Practise Policy & Procedure (FtP).

Academic regulations via <https://www.salford.ac.uk/governance-and-management/academic-handbook>,

- Academic Regulations for Taught Programme
- Academic Regulations for Research Awards Regulations

Information Security ICT Acceptable Use Policy via https://testlivesalfordac.sharepoint.com/sites/Uos_Students/SitePages/Your-responsibilities.aspx

- 3.13.1 Supporting documentation for staff relating to the procedure can be found on the Academic Misconduct Procedure Team site and via the QMO staff hub at <https://testlivesalfordac.sharepoint.com/sites/QEO/SitePages/StudentFacingPolicies.aspx> <https://www.salford.ac.uk/governance-and-management/student-facing-policies-and-procedures> and <https://testlivesalfordac.sharepoint.com/sites/QMO/SitePages/Academic-Handbook.aspx>

3.14 Governance and Management

- 3.14.1 The Head of Academic Quality Management is responsible for the Academic Misconduct Procedure and has delegated responsibility for the implementation and communication of the Procedure to the Assistant Quality Standards Manager within QMO.
- 3.14.2 The Student Casework Manager is responsible for administration of the Academic Misconduct Procedure. General enquiries from staff about the Procedure can be made to Richard Clemens or Annette Cooke, e-mail studentconduct@salford.ac.uk.
- 3.14.3 General information to students on the operation of the Academic Misconduct Procedure is available from AskUS, e-mail askus@salford.ac.uk.
- 3.14.4 Advice on good academic practice is available from relevant schools (usually via the Academic Progress Tutor).
- 3.14.5 Support regarding good academic practise is available from the Library Skills service via the website <https://www.salford.ac.uk/skills>.
- 3.14.6 Individual independent advice to students is available from the Students Union Advice Centre via the website <https://www.salfordsu.com/advice/>.

Academic Misconduct Procedure

4.0 Timeline for consideration

- 4.1.1 Below is the normal timeline by which the University will seek to complete consideration of cases for course work. In cases where work has already been marked and/or ratified before concerns arise then initial stage will commence when the concerns are reported. In some complex cases, for example case of alleged 'contracting', the evidence gathering process may take substantially longer. Students should be informed of any delays to expected timescales.
- 4.1.2 Initial referral of case and notification of concerns should be made in line with the timescales for feedback in the Assessment and Feedback Policy.
- 4.1.3 Where students are referred under the Procedure, Schools should arrange for contact to be made to them to ensure the student is aware of the support available. Details of how this is done will depend on the needs of the specific discipline and the organisational structure of the School, but could, for example include contact being made by Student Progression Administrators (SPA) or Academic Progressions Tutors.
- 4.1.4 Review by Academic Misconduct Officers should normally be completed within one calendar month.
- 4.1.5 Where the Academic Misconduct Officers refers a case to a hearing the student will normally receive confirmation within 10 working days.
- 4.1.6 Cases should normally be heard within one calendar month of referral from the Academic Misconduct Officer. Students must be given 10 working days' notice of the date of a hearing.

5.0 Reports from Examinations including Apprenticeship End-Point Assessments (EPAs)

- 5.1.1 In the case of suspected academic misconduct in an examination including Apprenticeship End-Point Assessments, the Senior Invigilator (or for EPAs, the Independent Assessor) should follow the procedure set out in the "Essential Information for Invigilators" handbook and must report the incident to the student's school office by completing an academic misconduct report form. The School office will forward the details of the incident to an AMO. Where appropriate, any evidence of alleged misconduct should be recorded with relevant documentation at the time of the examination.

6.0 Reports from assessment not completed as part of an Examination

- 6.1.1 All cases of suspected academic misconduct must be supported by evidence documented by the person(s) who suspects the academic misconduct. For example, in a case of possible plagiarism, a marker of the assignment would highlight those passages which are unattributed, should provide a note of the sources from which these passages come and should indicate the extent of plagiarism as a percentage of the assessment in question. Those reporting suspected instances must use the Notification proforma - for cases of suspected academic misconduct (available for the QMO pages on the staff hub).
- 6.1.2 Where a member of academic staff marking a piece of assessment believes that academic misconduct has occurred, they should not normally continue to mark that work, but should prepare a case and refer to the School's Academic Misconduct Officer (AMO). Staff can still 'mark' work, if it assists with informal feedback to students, but marks should not be entered into the assessment system at this point. (See 4.11 above.)

- 6.1.3 Where there are possibilities of more than one type of academic misconduct, for instance, in some alleged collusion cases, a decision of plagiarism may be found against a student, then all possible types should be identified. Similarly, using another's data without correct citation may be considered plagiarism and falsifying experimental evidence.
- 6.1.4 Where the concern relates to collusion, then cases for each student involved should be prepared and considered together.
- 6.1.5 A matching report from a text matching service (for example Turnitin) is not, on its own, evidence of academic misconduct, even where the proportion of matching text is high. The notification form should include an explanation as to why the text matching may indicate academic misconduct and the original sources, where identifiable, should be referred to, the nature of the assignment provided (for example include an assessment brief), and the detail of the matched text, should also be considered. Where a source is not available then an explanation of why the text matching as confirmed by the text matching service is likely, on the balance of probabilities, to be because of academic misconduct should be provided.
- A finding of academic misconduct may be made even if there is an absence of matching text, for example, where words have been amended to avoid being detected by a text matching service but over evidence is available.
- 6.1.6 Where submission by the student via the text matching tool is not required in cases of suspected academic misconduct, the University may submit such work through the text matching tool to aid any investigation.
- 6.1.7 When a member of staff suspects academic misconduct in a piece of assessed work a student may be interviewed by an appropriate member of academic staff, for example see guidance on "Bought Work" and "unauthorised use of GenAI" (available for the QMO pages on the staff hub). A written note of this interview may be submitted as part of the evidence for consideration by a hearing.

7.0 Personal Mitigating Circumstances

- 7.1.1 Students citing mitigating circumstances should be advised that such matters are, for taught students, dealt with at School level at the appropriate point in time under the University's Exceptional Circumstances (EC) Policy by the School's EC Reviewers and cannot be taken into account through the Academic Misconduct Procedure and must not be considered by the hearing. For Postgraduate Research students, routes to notify the University of personal mitigating circumstances are outlined in the Code of Practice for the Conduct of Postgraduate Research Degree Programmes and these routes should be followed.

8.0 Review Stage

- 8.1.1 The Dean of School must appoint at least two members of staff who have appropriate knowledge and experience of the assessment process to act as the School's Academic Misconduct Officers (AMO). The role of the AMO is to review a case and the evidence provided, they are not expected to undertake investigations into whether misconduct occurred, by may provide guidance and feedback to staff reporting cases.
- 8.1.2 All cases of suspected academic misconduct are reported via the School office to a relevant AMO with supporting evidence provided by the reporting member of staff.
- 8.1.3 The AMO has responsibility for preliminary consideration of such cases. In determining whether there is a case to answer, the AMO should refer to the guidance available - Preventative Measures Against Academic Misconduct (available for the QMO pages on the staff hub).

- 8.1.4 The AMO will consider the extent of the alleged academic misconduct, the level and prior experience of the student and the conventions of the discipline and, using their academic judgement, will decide on one of the following steps:
- there is no case to answer (in which case, notification will be provided to enable University-wide statistics about cases to be compiled, beyond this, all records relating to the case will be deleted);
 - it is a matter of poor academic practice;
 - there is evidence to indicate that academic misconduct may have occurred which requires further investigation.
- 8.1.5 Poor academic practice is a term used when students badly prepare a piece of work for assessment, for example the work may be referenced and cited, but not using the correct format or system. It may include some paraphrasing which only slightly alters the original source or incorporate so many reference texts that there is very little evidence that the student has engaged with the topic in question. Whilst such scenarios might not reflect academic misconduct, they show a lack of engagement with assessment criteria or engagement with the teaching a student has received and should therefore be sanctioned by using the normal assessment criteria. They are likely to be Level specific, with more allowance made for poor academic practice for students at Levels 3 and 4, than at Levels 6 and 7. It would normally be likely that Level 4 and Level 5 Apprentices taking an End-Point Assessment (EPA) should be meeting the expected levels of academic practice.
- 8.1.6 Where the AMO review finds poor academic practice, the student should be informed of this in writing and be invited to discuss this with an appropriate member of academic staff (such as the Academic Progression Tutor) at the earliest possible opportunity. The student should be given support the steps they should; take to prevent a recurrence of this poor practice. Any student who, without good reason, refuses or fails to attend a such meeting will still be provided direction for further guidance and support, but such a refusal or failure to attend will be noted on the student's record. Students should also be referred to other available resources, such as through Skills in the Library.
- 8.1.7 Where the AMO finds that academic misconduct may have occurred, the student will be informed in writing that the matter is referred either to a hearing within the School, or in the most serious cases, the University's Student Misconduct Panel. See below and Appendix B.
- 8.1.8 Given the level of study and the application of appropriate sanctions, all suspected cases of academic misconduct in postgraduate research awards must be reported to the University's Student Misconduct Panel.
- 8.1.9 Except where any alleged academic misconduct is referred to the Student Misconduct Panel, each instance of alleged academic misconduct will be considered by the home School for the module where such alleged misconduct has been identified. Where an individual student faces multiple concurrent cases of academic misconduct from modules across more than one school then normally all the concurrent cases should be considered by a single school (the choice of school to be determined by the University not the student).
- 8.1.10 In all instances, the AMO must complete the relevant section of the Notification proforma for cases of suspected academic misconduct (available for the QMO pages on the staff hub).

9.0 Acknowledgement of Academic Misconduct by Students

- 9.1.1 After AMO review, if there is a case to answer (and no aggravating factors such as previous or concurrent cases) student at Levels 3, 4 and 5 may be offered three options, students at 6, 7 and 8 two options:
1. Acknowledge the academic misconduct and have the minimum academic sanction applied. Students should also be referred to support as in cases of Poor Academic Practice. Not available for students at Levels 6, 7 or 8.
 2. Contest the academic misconduct and ask for a hearing by documentation/paperwork only (see below).
 3. Contest the academic misconduct and ask for a hearing by meeting (see below).
- 9.1.2 Where there are other aggravating factors, for example prior or concurrent cases, use of 'essay mills', dishonesty or coercion in accessing work then option 1 will not apply. The decision in such cases will be that of the AMO.
- 9.1.3 For collusion cases where there are no aggravating issues, such as possible coercion or dishonesty in accessing work by any party, if all parties do not agree to option 1 then all parties will be referred to a hearing. This means a student cannot accept academic misconduct has occurred, and not got to a hearing, should another party in a collusion case not also acknowledge the academic misconduct.
- 9.1.4 Where, given the option, a student does not respond the matter will be considered by a hearing.

10.0 Dealing with Academic Misconduct: Referral to School Level

- 10.1.1 The Dean of School shall identify suitably experienced nominees from the School to be responsible for making decisions as allowed by the Procedure (referred to from here on in as the Chair). The nominee must receive University training in the operation of this Procedure before taking up the role.
- 10.1.2 The AMO will compile the paperwork and forward to the Secretary.
- 10.1.3 Students will be given the option for the case to be considered in person or by the submission of documentation only.
- 10.1.4 The student will be given a minimum of 10 working days' notice in writing by an email to a University email address (where one is available) before the meeting of the hearing except where the student has agreed in writing that a shorter notice is acceptable. The 10 working days will be counted from the date of the notification. The student will be informed, in writing, of the nature of the allegations and be provided with all the evidence to be considered.
- 10.1.5 The Notification form must include details of any previous proven cases of academic misconduct made against the student. These must be separated by the Secretary prior to referral to the Chair hearing the case.

11.0 School Hearing

- 11.1.1 The purpose of the hearing is to determine whether an offence of academic misconduct has been committed and to determine and impose sanctions.
- 11.1.2 Where the Chair has been involved in the assessment of a student whose case is being heard, the Dean of School will identify a substitute alternative trained member of staff.
- 11.1.3 The School will provide secretarial support for the hearing and a Record of Consideration of the hearing will be sent to the student and copied to QMO. Further details on the School level hearing can be found in Appendix C.
- 11.1.4 Students whose cases are to go to a School hearing will have two options:

1. for a case to be considered by documentation only, neither the student nor the AMO will present to the hearing. The outcome will be confirmed by the Chair to the Secretary and the necessary Record of Consideration and outcome notification completed.
2. for a case to be considered by a hearing with meeting (see section 10.1.1 above).

- 11.1.5 Where, given the option, a student does not respond the matter will be considered by a documentation only.
- 11.1.6 The student may submit written evidence to the hearing with meeting and this must be received at least 5 working days before the date of the hearing. The Chair may choose to discount any documentation received after this point.
- 11.1.7 Where there is a hearing with meeting the Chair, the AMO and the student may call witnesses. Any witness called must have testimony pertinent to the specific matter to be addressed, for example character witnesses should not be called (see guidance). The University must notify the student of any witnesses called at least 10 working days before the hearing. A student must notify the University, via the Secretary, of any witnesses they intend to call at least 5 working days before the hearing.

12.0 Attendance at School Hearings

- 12.1.1 A student may be accompanied by one person of their choosing at any stage in the Academic Misconduct Procedure, subject to the requirements see guidance in this Word document <https://www.salford.ac.uk/sites/default/files/2023-04/GuidanceSupportersRepresentativesWitnesses.docx>.
- 12.1.2 An AMO will normally be expected to attend to present the case to the hearing.
- 12.1.3 Where a student chooses not to attend, the AMO may be asked to provide answers to specific technical questions, for instance relating to the operation of the assessment.
- 12.1.4 Most hearing will be held via MS teams or similar software. A student may request to attend the hearing in person where they have a compelling reason, such as requirements of a Reasonable Adjustment Plan (RAP). In such cases, the student must make the request in writing at least 5 working days prior to the hearing. It may be necessary to reschedule the hearing to allow all participants to be in attendance in person.
- 12.1.5 If the student or the AMO, to whom proper notice of a meeting has been given, does not appear at the meeting, the Chair may proceed to consider the case in their absence. However, if reasonable grounds for non-attendance have been provided by a student (for example the student is unwell) the Chair has the discretion to adjourn.
- 12.1.6 If the student's chosen supporter is unable to accompany the student at the hearing for any reason, the meeting will not normally be adjourned; a substitute may need to be found by the student.
- 12.1.7 Where a student requests a "hearing by meeting" and does not attend and there is no notification of non-attendance by the student, the AMO may remain to present the case and answer questions as required by the Chair.
- 12.1.8 The Chair shall reach a decision on every case presented to them, save only where the Chair considers it would be contrary to the interests of natural justice to reach a decision, in which case the Chair shall adjourn the case to a future meeting, clearly recording the reasons for its decision and report this decision in writing to the student, the AMO and QMO.

13.0 Dealing with Academic Misconduct: Referral to University Level

- 13.1.1 In the most serious cases, where the AMO considers that the sanctions available to the AMP are insufficient the AMO will refer such cases to the University's Student Misconduct Panel (see the Student Misconduct Procedure) on one or more of the following grounds:
- where a student has already graduated from the programme of study;
 - there are prior proven offences of academic misconduct;
 - there are concurrent allegations of more than one instance of academic misconduct involving substantial amounts of total credit volume of the programme of study;
 - the offence is at an advanced level of study (for example the offence has been committed at Level 7 after the first 60 credits of the programme of study);
 - in the event of an allegation of academic misconduct in the taught element of a research award (for example as part of a DProf), the matter will be referred to the University Student Misconduct Panel.
 - the academic misconduct is compounded by deliberate deception or lying (for example purchasing an essay from a cheat site; stealing work from another student), such case may also consider matters of broader student misconduct brought in parallel;
 - other students' assessment has been disrupted or affected in some way by the student's academic misconduct;
 - there is an allegation of bribery;
 - other serious aggravating factor;
 - where given the specific nature of the alleged academic misconduct, or the unusual nature of the assessment, an institutional view would be beneficial.
- 13.1.2 All students on research awards alleged to have engaged in academic misconduct will have their cases referred to the University Student Misconduct Panel.
- 13.1.3 In line with the principles of natural justice and the avoidance of instances of 'double jeopardy', a case, once considered at a School hearing, should not be reheard by a University level hearing, however linked issues related to student misconduct or fitness to practise may be addressed through relevant procedures (see below).
- 13.1.4 Where it becomes apparent that a case originally raised as a case of suspected academic misconduct and considered through this procedure may also relate to potential breaches of another procedure, a case may then be raised under the alternative procedure. In doing this, the AMO should liaise with the relevant member of staff nominated for that procedure and the student informed in writing of any change. Guidance on this is available from QMO on a case-by-case basis.
- 13.1.5 The University Student Misconduct Panel will have recourse to the range of academic sanctions available from this Procedure and sanctions permitted by the Student Misconduct Procedure.
- 13.1.6 The process for hearing cases at a University Student Misconduct Panel will be similar to that for School level hearings, although the process for the operation of the hearing will be that in the Student Misconduct Procedure.

14.0 Academic Sanctions – Taught Programmes

- 14.1.1 In deciding which academic sanction to impose, the hearing shall take into consideration, amongst other matters, admission of academic misconduct by the student, the seriousness, and the extent of the misconduct.

- 14.1.2 The hearing must apply one of the following two sanctions in the event of the student being found to have committed academic misconduct:
- a) a mark of 0 or grade of F is awarded for the component of assessment in question;
 - b) a mark of 0 or grade of F is awarded for the component in question and the module mark kept at the minimum pass mark
- 14.1.3 Any student found to have committed academic misconduct will be directed, in addition to the above, to undertake appropriate study skills. These requirements should be set out in the formal notification of outcome.
- 14.1.4 Demonstrated/upheld cases will be referred back to the Assessment Board/Postgraduate Research Award Board for implementation of the sanction according to the relevant academic regulations. The Assessment Board/Postgraduate Research Award Board will inform the student of its decision in the normal way and of any academic requirements following the implementation of the sanction.

15.0 Retrospective Sanctions/Removal of Credit and Award

- 15.1.1 Where academic misconduct has been found to have occurred after the results have been ratified by an Assessment Board/Postgraduate Research Award Board, the sanctions will be retrospectively imposed, so necessitating the removal of previously awarded modules or credits.
- 15.1.2 The decision to rescind academic credits or awards is made by the Assessment Board or the Postgraduate Research Award Board on the recommendation of hearing held under this Academic Misconduct Procedure. It must be recorded in the minutes of the board, plus in the formal record of the hearing held under the Academic Misconduct Procedure.

16.0 Academic Sanctions – Research Programmes

- 16.1.1 Any finding of academic misconduct at level 8 will normally result in the expulsion of the student from the University.
- 16.1.2 However, in exceptional cases, where the nature of the misconduct is marginal and there are significant, compelling and evidenced exceptional circumstances (please note mitigating circumstances should normally be reported at the time via appropriate routes), then for a student at Interim Assessment (IA) or Internal Evaluation (IE) the Student Misconduct Panel may set a sanction of 'fail' for that assessment. Additionally, there will be a requirement that the student undertakes further training on academic good practice and provide a personal written reflective statement on academic good practice and academic misconduct in no less than 20 working days from the date of the issuing of the written notification. This written submission will be signed off by the Postgraduate Research Director or Associate Dean Research & Innovation and the Chair of the relevant Student Misconduct Panel prior to recommencement of study, and in no less than 20 working days from the date of receipt.
- 16.1.3 In such exceptional circumstances, the Panel must provide and record a clear and explicit rationale, recorded in the minutes of the hearing, as to why a sanction other than expulsion was determined.

17.0 Entitlement to Reassessment/Retaking

- 17.1.1 Where a component mark of 0 or grade of fail has been awarded as a sanction for academic misconduct, a student shall be permitted the normal entitlement of further opportunities to pass the assessment/module, the opportunities which remain will depend on the point in the academic cycle at which the 0/Fail has been awarded).

18.0 Request for a Review (Appeal) of Outcome

- 18.1.1 The student shall be allowed 10 working days from the date on the formal outcome notification (either the outcome from a School hearing or a Panel hearing) to provide written notice of a Request for Review and relevant supporting evidence to QMO. Where, exceptionally, the Record of Consideration or minutes of the hearing are delayed then the deadline for appeal will be extended until 10 working days from the date of the availability of the Record of Consideration/minutes.
- 18.1.2 Requests for a review should be submitted using the provided form, available via <https://www.salford.ac.uk/governance-and-management/student-facing-policies-and-procedures>, listed under this procedure)
- 18.1.3 The Request for Review must identify one or more of the three following grounds it is being submitted in relation to:
- A: that new and relevant evidence is available which, for good and reasonable cause, was not available to an earlier stage of the Procedure (as the case may be). (Exceptional circumstances are needed to explain why any evidence could not have been made available);
 - B: that there was a relevant and significant defect, error or mistake in the conduct of the earlier stage of this Procedure which casts reasonable doubt on the decision reached by the Dean of School or Panel hearing (as the case may be) in that the decision might have been different if the defect, error or mistake had not occurred;
 - C: that the decision reached at the earlier stage of this Procedure is manifestly unreasonable. In this context, unreasonable will be taken to mean perverse, i.e., the decision was not one that a similar process might have reached.
- 18.1.4 A request from a student for a rehearing is not a valid ground of review.
- 18.1.5 The student must not only state a ground or grounds for the review, but must also provide evidence to substantiate those grounds.
- 18.1.6 Requests for Review must normally be submitted using the form provided.
- 18.1.7 Where a student requires additional time to gather supporting evidence, they should submit the completed form within the 10 working days, state that they are requesting additional time to obtain evidence and the evidence they are seeking to provide, as well as an estimated timeline for acquiring the evidence.
- 18.1.8 The Head of Academic Quality Management (or nominee) shall, in all cases, and normally within 5 working days, determine whether the request for review has been received within the appropriate timescale and discloses a valid ground for review.
- 18.1.9 The Head of Academic Quality Management (or nominee) shall reject any request for review which does not disclose a valid ground for review; does not evidence a ground or grounds or is out of time. In such instances, the student shall be formally notified by a Completion of Procedures Letter.
- 18.1.10 If the request for review is accepted as valid by the Head of Academic Quality Management (or nominee), depending on the ground(s) for review, they may refer the case back to an earlier stage of the Procedure or to a Student Misconduct Appeal Panel as appropriate.
- 18.1.11 The Chair of the Student Misconduct Panel, where requested, shall have power to defer the operation of a non-academic sanction where a review is pending against a decision of the Panel to suspend a student, to withdraw an award or to expel a student pending that appeal. However, such a decision will not apply where a student would be expected

to attend a placement, clinical practice or other direct interaction with the public without agreement of the relevant nominee of the Dean of School.

- 18.1.12 The process for Student Misconduct Appeal Panels is included in the Student Misconduct Procedure.

19.0 External Review

- 19.1.1 The Office of the Independent Adjudicator for Higher Education (OIA) runs an independent scheme to review student complaints. The University of Salford is a member of this scheme. If a student is unhappy with the outcome, they may be able to ask the OIA to review their complaint. More information about making a complaint to the OIA, what it can and cannot look at and what it can do to put things right are available on the OIA website <https://www.oiahe.org.uk/students>.
- 19.1.2 A student's case will normally need to have completed the Academic Misconduct Procedure before submitting a complain to the OIA. The University will send a letter called a "Completion of Procedures Letter" when a student has reached the end of our processes and there are no further steps which can be taken internally. If an appeal is made against a formal decision taken under this Procedure is not upheld, the University will issue a Completion of Procedures Letter automatically. If an appeal is upheld or partly upheld, a student can ask for a Completion of Procedures letter. More information about Completion of Procedures Letters and when a student should expect to receive one on the OIA webpage <https://www.oiahe.org.uk/providers/completion-of-procedures-letters>.

Appendices

Appendix A Guidelines on When to Refer Cases to University Level Hearings.

Appendix B School Hearings.

Appendix C Indicative Guidance for the Application of Sanctions.

Appendix A - Guidelines on When to Refer Cases to University Level Hearings

The underlying principle is that a case is referred to a Student Misconduct Panel (that is a University level hearing) where a sanction over and above those which can be applied by a School Hearing **may** be applied. Sanctions which can be applied through School Hearings are:

- a) a mark of 0 or grade of F is awarded for the component of assessment in question;
- b) a mark of 0 or grade of F is awarded for the component in question and the module mark kept at the minimum pass mark

Sanctions which can be applied by a Student Misconduct Panel are set out within the Student Misconduct Procedure include written undertakings, suspensions and expulsion.

The following are examples of cases which would normally be referred to a University Student Misconduct Panel.

- Where a student has already graduated from the programme of study.
- Any case which is accompanied by aggravating factors which would normally be considered through the Student Misconduct Procedure.
- Any case involving a student studying at Level 8.
- Any case in the Level 7 in the dissertation/final project.
- Any case in Level 7 after the first 60 credits of study.
- Any repeat case where the second, or subsequent, case is at Level 6 or Level 7.
- Any third repeat case, regardless of Level.
- Any case, or *parallel/concurrent* cases, which involve alleged academic misconduct at level 7 which in total affects more than 30 credits, or at level 6 which affects more than 40 credits. At lower levels of study multiple concurrent cases may be reviewed on a case-by-case basis.
- Commissioned work at Level 7.

It may also be reasonable to refer cases where, given the specific nature of the alleged academic misconduct, or the unusual nature of the assessment, an institutional view would be beneficial. Advice on such cases can be obtained from the Quality Management Office email studentconduct@salford.ac.uk.

It may also be reasonable to refer cases where there is a significant impact on other students. This may relate to disruption to others taking a timed assessment, or where a student has accessed and used the work of others without their knowledge, thus putting that second person's credit/award at risk.

Fitness to Practise Procedure (FtP)

If academic misconduct concerns arise in relation to a student on a programme leading to registration with a professional body, consideration may need to be given to referral to consider the professional consequences via the Fitness to Practise Procedure once the consideration under this procedure has been completed. That is academic misconduct cases should be considered through this procedure, when completed consideration should then be given as to whether the case also raises concerns about a student's fitness to practise.

On relevant programmes of study, where there is a finding of academic misconduct, the School Academic Misconduct Officers are advised to discuss such cases with the Dean (or nominee).

Appendix B - School Hearings

- The Dean of School shall identify a suitably experienced member of staff (referred to here as the Chair) from the School to be responsible for making decisions as allowed by the Procedure.
- The Chair must receive appropriate training before taking up the role.
- The Chair will approve the Record of Consideration.
- A Secretary from the school who will provide administrative support, ensure timely notifications and circulation of documentation, completing and having approved a Record of Completion and circulation of written notification of the outcome to the student.

Both of the above will attend School hearings.

For the part of the hearing receiving the evidence (i to ix in the Order of Proceedings) the below may also attend:

- student whose case is under consideration, plus one representative.
- school Academic Misconduct Officer (AMO) who will present the case.

Observers

An officer of QMO may attend any School hearing as observer, provided notice is given to the school in advance.

Other members of staff, or officers from the Student's Union, may also attend as observers subject to the agreement of the Chair and the student whose case is being considered. Requests to observe a hearing should be submitted to the secretary before the final deadline for the circulation of papers (5 working days before the hearing). Normally no more than one observer will be present at any single hearing.

Remit of the School Hearing

The remit of the School hearings is to determine whether academic misconduct has occurred. If the Chair determines that academic misconduct has occurred, they must apply a sanction from the range permitted within the procedure.

The Chair must not have been directly involved in the assessment of cases being heard by the School hearing. Deans will therefore need to identify additional suitably experienced and senior members of staff to act as alternates should the Chair be unable to hear a case due to prior involvement.

The School will provide secretarial support and maintain a Record of Consideration following the meeting. A copy of the Record of Consideration must be sent to the student, and copied to QMO, normally with the outcome notification. The secretary will be responsible for ensure timely receipt of Records of Consideration by the student and QMO.

Conduct of the School Hearing

The School hearing will consider a student's case in accordance with the procedure and will determine an appropriate sanction in the event a decision that a student has committed academic misconduct.

The **Order of Proceedings** for a School hearing shall normally be as follows:

- i) Introduction of those present and confirmation of the Procedure;
- ii) Student invited to declare any factors which may affect their performance in the hearing;
- iii) Allegation of academic misconduct set out by the AMO;
- iv) The student, or the student representative, responds to the allegations;
- v) The Chair has the opportunity to question both AMO and the student;

- vi) Either party may call witnesses who attend only to present their evidence and to answer any questions from the Chair or the other party. Once their evidence has been heard and there are no more questions witnesses are required to withdraw (see guidance)
- vii) AMO nominee sums up the allegations. New evidence is not admissible at this time;
- viii) The student invited to make a final statement. New evidence is not admissible at this time;
- ix) The AMO and the student and their representative withdraw whilst the Chair reaches their decision;
- x) The Chair makes a decision on the academic misconduct or otherwise based on the evidence provided;
- xi) Should a finding of academic misconduct be made, records of any previous cases of proven academic misconduct are provided by the secretary;
- xii) The Chair makes a decision on the sanction to be applied;
- xiii) Where a hearing is held in person (non-virtually), AMO and the student are invited back into the hearing to be given oral feedback on the decision of the Chair. Where a hearing is held virtually (for example via MS Teams), and where the outcome is not available the student will normally be sent informal notification of the outcome to their University email account on the same day. The formal notification will still be sent within five working days.

In cases of alleged collusion offences, each student case should be heard separately, but in series at the same hearing. No conclusion should be reached until all cases have been heard. That is for each individual case stages i) to x) will be completed, the Chair will then consider their findings, and for each individual case separately.

The Chair shall find the student has committed academic misconduct if, on the evidence available to the hearing, they are satisfied, on the balance of probabilities, that the student had committed academic misconduct.

It may be appropriate in certain circumstances of alleged collusion to treat each case as one of plagiarism of an individual piece of work (third party) or one from another (or others). In cases of collusion where an individual student believes that another/others have misappropriated their work, or that another student inappropriately accessed their work it is the student's responsibility to provide evidence to the hearing regarding this. Whilst the cases must be heard together, sanctions imposed on two or more students found to have colluded may vary depending on mitigating and aggravating factors. The Chair (and the Record of Consideration) must be clear as to factors influencing all decisions.

The decision of the Chair shall also be confirmed in writing to all relevant parties within 5 working days. Where there is a decision of academic misconduct, details of the process to Request a Review (appeal) must be included in written notification of the outcome (see template letters).

The Chair shall reach a decision on every case presented to them, except where the Chair considers it would be contrary to the interests of natural justice to reach a decision, in which case the Chair shall adjourn the case to a future meeting. In such cases, a written record of this decision, with details of why it was made, must be made and forwarded to the student and QMO.

The decision of the hearing shall nevertheless be communicated in writing to all parties, normally within 5 working days.

If the student is found not to have committed academic misconduct, but the assessment is characterised by poor academic practice, then the student will be directed to discuss their practice with an appropriate member of staff (normally the Academic Progression Tutor), and to Skills in the Library, advice will be given and a record kept on the student's record.

Appendix C – Indicative Guidance for the Application of Sanctions

The following is indicative guidance for the application of sanctions for academic misconduct on taught programmes but, in the final event, application is entirely at the discretion of the Chair/Panel.

Generally, when looking at academic sanctions it is suggested that the below act as starting points, against which sanctions can be mitigated/aggregated against.

a) *0 for the component:*

Starting point for undergraduate students.

b) *0 for the component and the module mark capped:*

Starting point for postgraduate students.

In addition, a hearing may then take account factors which may result in higher or lower levels of sanctions from the indicative levels suggested above, including:

- the total volume of credit affected, the extent of academic misconduct and the proportion of assessment affected. The weighting of the particular component of assessment in relation to the assessment of the module as a whole and the programme as a whole (for example, academic misconduct in a 45 credit dissertation weighted at 100% of a module may be considered a more serious offence than an assignment weighted at 25% of a 20 credit module);
- whether this is a first offence or whether the student has previously been found to have committed academic misconduct;
- whether the academic misconduct has been admitted by the student and if so whether the admission was made readily at an early stage or was made reluctantly, and not until the hearing;
- the form of academic misconduct;
- whether there are previous records of related poor academic practice (against mitigation of a sanction as evidence the student had been given additional support and guidance).

Mitigation may not be applied for the lowest sanction option.

The Procedure does not permit consideration of Exceptional Circumstances (ECs). Should a student raise EC matters then they should, at the earliest opportunity, and ideally before a hearing, be referred to the EC and/or Academic Appeals procedures.

Students are expected to be independent learners and have responsibility for ensuring that they familiarise themselves with matters of academic good practice and academic misconduct. However, schools must provide information that students have been directed, in a timely manner, to suitable information, guidance and support. Where a School has not provided information to demonstrate this has occurred a case may be dismissed. In such instances, QMO will write to the Dean of School asking for confirmation of how processes have been reviewed to ensure all students get appropriate support.

The Dean of School's nominee (normally the AMO) shall be expected to be familiar with the specific support provided for students on the given programmes and to offer a view on the extent and appropriateness of support offered.

Research Awards

Academic misconduct at Level 8 and on programmes subject to the Research Award Regulations shall be referred automatically to the Student Misconduct Panel and normally the most serious sanction would be applied in upheld cases (Expulsion from the University).

The procedure allows in specific and limited circumstances for an alternative sanction to be applied (see section 16 above).

Document Control Information			
Revision History incl. Authorisation: (most recent first)			
Author	Summary of changes	Version	Authorised & Date
Richard Clemens	<p>Removal of Academic “Sanction C”</p> <p>Guidance on application of academic sanctions re-written to reflect above.</p> <p>Some rephrasing to update in relation to other procedures and to simplify language.</p>	V4.4	Quality and Standards Committee Approved
Helen Sharman/ Richard Clemens	<p>Paragraph 6.0 (Page 13) text added Reports from Examinations including Apprenticeship End-Point Assessments (EPAs) In the case of suspected academic misconduct in an examination including Apprenticeship End-Point Assessments, the Senior Invigilator (or for EPAs, the Independent Assessor)</p> <p>Paragraph 9.1.5 (Page 15) text added ‘it would normally be likely that Level 4 and Level 5 Apprentices taking an End-Point Assessment (EPA) should be meeting the expected levels of academic practice’</p> <p>Information added following July 2024 external review of the University’s readiness for an OfS external review of its integrated End-Point Assessments (EPAs).</p> <p>Removal of reference to compensation this follows changes to the ARTP. Removal of “and reported in the annual overview of this procedure” from 16.1.2 to align with practice. Addition of “where a student has already graduate from the programme of study” to section 14 and Appendix A Update of title of Postgraduate Research Director. Minor corrections to text.</p>	V4.3	Chair’s Action on behalf of the 19/09/24
Richard Clemens	<p>Addition of option for students at earlier levels of study to accept AM has occurred and bypass hearing. Addition of Artificial Intelligence as an example of AM. Restructuring of examples of AM. Removal of sections relating to supports, representatives and witnesses common to multiple procedures to separate guidance.</p>	V4.2	ULTC May 2023

Document Control Information			
	Requirement for schools to offer support for students referred. Some minor rewording.		
Richard Clemens	Change 'Appeal' to 'Request for Review'. Use of 'Chair' rather than 'Dean' to refer to Dean of School nominee hearing school level hearings. Update of organisational and role details.	V4.1	
Richard Clemens	New title. Restructuring, separation of policy from procedure. Additional example of academic misconduct. Some editorial changes to increase clarity, for example in relation to Supporters/representation/witnesses and school hearings requiring students to take steps to seek further support.	V4	SELTEC 19 May 2021
Richard Clemens	<i>Update of links, addition of 'Failure to correctly obtain necessary approval' to the examples of possible misconduct, minor amendments to wording</i>	V3.2	31 July 2020
Richard Clemens	<i>Removal of reference to referral under Fitness to Practise. Change so now normally tutors do not to mark work where there is suspected academic misconduct until case is concluded (3.1.2). Update to Data protection with regard to GDPR 2018. Expansion on how cases may change between procedures. Some minor re-wording to clarify meaning in relation to assessment of former students, students studying with partner institutions and marking of 'poor practice'.</i>	V3.1	SELTEC 22 May 2019
Richard Clemens	<i>Amendment to sanctions, and review of structure and format. Changes to how allegations are considered by Schools, replacement of Academic Misconduct Panels with consideration by Associate Deans Academic. Clarification on when cases should be referred to University level.</i>	V3	ASQAC 4 September 2017 (by Chair's Action following consultation with Committee members)
Policy Management and Responsibilities:			
Owner:		This Policy is issued by the Head of Academic Quality Management, who has the authority to issue and communicate policy on Academic Misconduct and has delegated day to day management and communication of the policy to the Assistant Quality Standards Manager.	

Document Control Information	
Others with responsibilities (please specify):	All staff and students
Author to complete formal assessment with the following advisory teams:	
Equality Analysis (E&D, HR)	1. <i>submitted to I&D May 2019</i>
Legal implications (LPG)	2. <i>consulted on updates</i>
Information Governance (LPG)	3. <i>consulted on updates</i>
Student facing procedures (QMO)	4. <i>Throughout development</i>
UKVI Compliance (Student Admin)	5. <i>N/A</i>
Consultation:	
Staff Trades Unions via HR Students via USSU Relevant external bodies (specify)	1. USSU 2. Academic Misconduct Officers. 3. Academic Misconduct Forum, Assessment Forum.
Review:	
Review due:	2026/27
The owner and author are responsible for publicising this policy document.	