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Flowchart of the Academic Integrity Process at School Level

1. Recognition of a possible academic integrity offence
2. Module leader/teacher/invigilator brings the issue to the attention of the course leader and collects evidence in support of the allegation
3. Module leader/teacher/invigilator to send ‘allegation letter’ to student
4. Notice of Academic Offence completed and passed to AIO/DAIO along with evidence - Statement of Offence, Evidence of whether others are involved, Assignment/Course Work/Exam paper, Module documents and invigilator report where appropriate
5. AIO/DAIO to check paperwork and documentation
6. Interview individual raising the allegation
7. AIO/DAIO to send ‘interview request letter’ to student including file of evidence against the student and the relevant parts of the Students’ Handbook of Regulations - a minimum of 5 working days notice must be given
8. Interview student
9. Does the student accept the allegation?
   - Yes
     - Is it a Tariff 1, 2 or 3 offence?
       - Yes
         - AIO/DAIO to complete report
         - Apply tariff penalty - consult with Registry if applying mitigation before advising student of outcome
       - No
         - Case to be referred to AIC
         - AIO/DAIO to complete report
         - Send letter to student
   - No
     - Complete academic offences reporting form and submit University’s Registry along with 7 copies of supporting documentation

Complete academic offences reporting form and submit University's Registry along with 7 copies of supporting documentation
Flowchart of the Academic Integrity Process – Collaborative Provision

Recognition of a possible academic integrity offence

Module leader/marker/invigilator brings the issue to the attention of the course leader and collects evidence in support of the allegation

Module leader/marker/invigilator to send ‘allegation letter’ to student

Notice of Academic Offence’ completed and passed to Partner Institution’s AIO/DAO along with evidence – Statement of Offence, Evidence of whether others are involved?, Assignment/Course Work/Exam paper, Module documents and invigilator report where appropriate

PI AIO/DAO interview individual raising the allegation

Partner Institution’s AIO/DAO to check paperwork and documentation and to contact DALO at the University of Huddersfield

Partner Institution’s AIO/DAO to send ‘interview request letter’ to student including file of evidence against the student and the relevant parts of the Students’ Handbook of Regulations – a minimum of 5 working days notice must be given

Interview student

Does the student accept the allegation?

Yes

Is it a Tier 1, 2 or 3 offence?

Yes

Partner Institution’s AIO/DAO to complete report

Continue with AIO at University of Huddersfield (via DALO) who will apply the penalty and write to student

Student must be informed that if they wish to appeal against the decision they must do so within 28 working days to the Head of Registry at the University of Huddersfield.

Complete academic offences reporting form and submit to the University of Huddersfield’s Registry via the DALO

No

Case to be referred to AIC via DALO

PI sends letter to student

UoH AIO/DAO completes overview report

Complete academic offences reporting form and submit University’s Registry along with 7 copies of supporting documentation. University convenes AIC and the outcome is sent to the Student, DALO and School.

DALO informs PI
Flowchart of the Academic Integrity Committee

Academic Integrity Committee (AIC)

Convened by Registry:
3x AIOs or DAI0s
Students' Union President or Students' Union Representative
Registry note taker/advisor

Convened to hear:
Students refuting academic misconduct allegation
Cases where the penalty is Tariff 3 or above
Appeals for reduction in penalty applied by AIO/DAIO

Receives 7 copies of each of the following:
Notice of academic offence – with supporting evidence
the standard allegation notice which puts the allegation in context
A copy the work submitted by the student
A copy of the original source text with relevant sections highlighted
and cross-referenced
Report of AIO/DAIO meeting with student/s including student signature

Meets:
Student, plus supporter
AIO/DAIO
Witnesses - if applicable

AIC makes decision and letter/notes of the meeting are sent by Registry to:
Student
An electronic copy is sent to the nominated School Administrative contact

Schools record on ASIS
Registry records on Access Database
Registry provides annual report to UTLC/Schools (November)
Flowchart of the Appeals Process

Students can request leave to appeal the decision(s) of:
- The AIO/DAIO
- The Academic Integrity Committee

If...

1. The student can demonstrate a material irregularity has occurred in the procedure
2. Extenuating circumstances that for very good reason were not presented at an earlier hearing

Leave to appeal will only be granted if 1 or both of the above conditions are met.

Student submits appeal to Registry

Leaves to appeal granted
Academic Integrity Committee convened
Meets:
- Student, plus supporter
- AIOs/DAIO's
- Witnesses— if applicable

AIK makes decision and letter/notes of the meeting are sent by Registry to:
- Student
- An electronic copy is sent to the nominated School Administrative contact

Schools record on ASIS
- Registry records on Access Database
- Registry provides annual report to UTLC/Schools (November)

Leaves to appeal not granted
Registry advises the student in writing giving clear explanation as to why its not granted and issues a 'Completion of Procedures' letter for the OIA.
Students' Handbook of Regulations - Assessment Regulation 3: Academic Integrity

Students are advised to seek impartial help, advice, guidance and support from sabbatical officers in the Students' Union and Students' Union Advice Centre.

3 POLICY

3.1 The University regards any action by a student which may result in an unfair advantage, such as cheating, collusion, falsification, ghosting, personation and plagiarism, as a serious academic offence. Where such conduct is proven this may lead to the application of a disciplinary penalty. In the event of an allegation(s) being proved after a student has been awarded credit or graduated, any credit, degree or other award of the University that is held by the student may be revoked by the Academic Integrity Committee (AIC).

3.2 All students are expected to maintain academic integrity throughout their period of study at the University. This means that they must respect other members of the academic community, both within and outside the University, and uphold the ethical values of that community when producing work. This extends beyond ensuring that work presented is one's own and may include the reporting of any instances of malpractice of which they become aware.

3.3 It is the responsibility of each student to ensure that any work presented for assessment is their own, and that any work (e.g. a collaboration) or opinions of others are appropriately acknowledged. To reinforce this responsibility students are required to include a declaration of integrity with every piece of work they present for summative assessment. Students are also encouraged to report any instances of malpractice of which they become aware.

3.4 Suspected instances and allegations of breaches of academic integrity will be investigated in accordance with the procedures set out in Section 4, Assessment Regulation 4 and having regard at all times to the principles of equity and fairness.

3.5 Students are advised that if an allegation of a breach of academic integrity is proven the penalty can range from repeating the module in full the following year capped at 40% to exclusion from the University. The University’s Tariff of Penalties is contained within the Appendices of the Students’ Handbook of Regulations.

3.6 The University provides a software package for completion by all students to support them in understanding accurate referencing and the dangers of plagiarism. Students are expected to complete this test in the early stages of their studies at the University. Failure to have completed this test satisfactorily will be taken into account when an allegation of a breach of academic integrity relating to plagiarism is being considered.
DEFINITION OF AN ACADEMIC INTEGRITY OFFENCE

3.7 The University defines an academic integrity offence as a failure to act in accordance with generally recognised standards of academic behaviour and honesty.

Some examples of academic integrity offences are set out below but they do not constitute an exhaustive list:

3.8 Cheating
1. Copying from another candidate’s notes during an examination;
2. The placing of unauthorised items on the examination desk, this includes pencil cases, mobile phones, electronic calculators;
3. Communication in any way during an examination with any person other than an authorised member of staff;
4. Accessing or copying from any source of information during an examination (including written or printed materials and electronically stored information), except as authorised by the examination regulations;
5. Gaining access to unauthorised material prior to an assessment (e.g. an examination paper).

3.9 Collusion
1. Submission of work presented as the student's own which has been done in unauthorised collaboration with another person, whether or not that other person is a student of the University;
2. Unauthorised collaboration with another student in completion of work which that other student then submits as entirely his/her own work;
3. Failing to safeguard one’s own work or making it available to another student who then submits it as his/her own (including access to work in subsequent academic sessions);
4. Making instructions, briefs or similar instructional documents relating to assessments available to others (including posting to the internet or making available by similar means) that results in an academic advantage.

3.10 Falsification
1. Claiming to have carried out experiments, observations, interviews or any form of research which the student has not carried out;
2. Falsification of results or other data.

3.11 Ghosting
1. Submission of work presented as the student's own which has been purchased, commissioned or otherwise acquired from another person (including internet sellers) whether or not specifically produced for that student or "off the shelf".
2. Making available to students of the University or elsewhere work or material to be incorporated in work which the recipient uses to commit an academic integrity offence regardless of whether there is financial gain.

3.12 Personation
1. Assuming the identity of another student (of this or any other institution) with the intention of gaining an unfair advantage for that student;
2. A student allows another person to impersonate him/her in order to gain an unfair advantage.

3.13 Plagiarism
1. Reproduction of published or unpublished (e.g. work of another student or your own work) material without acknowledgement of the author or source;
2. Presenting information from electronic sources such as the internet without acknowledgement of the source;
3. Paraphrasing by, for instance, substituting a few words or phrases or altering the order of presentation of another person's work, or linking unacknowledged sentences or phrases with words of one's own.
Students' Handbook of Regulations - Assessment Regulation 4: Action following a report of an Academic Integrity offence to the Academic Integrity Officer or Deputy

Students are advised to seek impartial help, advice, guidance and support from sabbatical officers in the Students' Union and Students' Union Advice Centre.

4 PROCEDURE

4.1 Framework

4.1.1 Each School shall designate one member of its senior academic staff to fulfil the role of Academic Integrity Officer (AIO) and a deputy (DAIO) or deputies shall be designated to act in the absence of the Academic Conduct Officer. The Academic Integrity Officer and/or Deputy will:

- advise academic staff in conducting interviews with students,
- advise on the collection of information and evidence,
- convene the School based investigation and decide on the subsequent penalty if appropriate,
- attend the Academic Integrity Committee (AIC).

4.1.2 Where an allegation of a breach of academic integrity regulations is brought against a student by a tutor from a School owning the module, which is different to the School in which the student is registered; the allegation will be investigated and put forward by the School owning the module.

4.1.3 The Academic Integrity Committee will be convened as and when the volume of work dictates but no less than once every two months and will be comprised of:

- any combination AIO or deputy from each School,
- a member of the SU Executive (normally the SU President)

and will be convened by the Head of Registry or nominee.

4.1.4 The Academic Integrity Officers will confirm the penalty to be applied where a student admits an academic offence and the penalty is between Penalty 1 and Penalty 3 on the Tariff of Penalties. If a penalty is likely to have the effect of resulting in the loss of credit or excluding the student from the course or University the allegation should be referred to the Academic Integrity Committee for consideration. If a student submits evidence of extenuating circumstances that is accepted by the (D)AIO a lesser penalty may be applied without reference to the Academic Integrity Committee provided:

- The penalty does not result in the loss of credit or excludes the student from the University and
- Agreement from the Head of Registry (or nominee) had been received by the (D)AIO.

4.1.5 The Academic Integrity Committee will consider all cases referred to it and apply a penalty as appropriate in accordance with the University Tariff of Penalties. If a student submits evidence of extenuating circumstances that is accepted by the AIC a lesser penalty may be applied.

4.2 Allegation of a Breach of Academic Integrity

4.2.1 Where an examiner, whether internal or external suspects academic misconduct in an assessment he/she will report it to the (D)AIO and provide evidence in support of any allegation. The (D)AIO will advise the examiner on whether there is a case to answer.

4.2.2 Where it is suspected that the assessment is not the work of the student, the student may be invited to an interview with the module tutor and module moderator to demonstrate his/her understanding of the work in question. Following the interview a report will be made and agreed jointly by the module tutor and moderator and submitted to the (D)AIO as part of the evidence.
4.3 School Based Investigation by the (Deputy) Academic Integrity Officer (D)AIO

4.3.1 The (D)AIO will meet with the member of staff making the allegation and hear all evidence and will arrange for a member of staff to act as note taker.

4.3.2 The (D)AIO will invite the student/s to an interview to discuss the allegation. The letter and hearing documentation should be sent by first class. A copy of the letter should also be sent to the student’s University email address. In the letter, the student/s will:

1. be advised of the date of the meeting, (at least 5 working days notice to be given) and asked to confirm attendance by no later than two working days in advance of the hearing;
2. be provided with details of the allegation/s including the report from the member of staff bringing the allegation/s;
3. be provided with a copy of the Turnitin report, examination paper or other evidence as appropriate, (the student will retain the evidence after the meeting);
4. be provided with a copy of the assessment submitted by the student and a copy of the original source text with relevant sections highlighted;
5. be provided with the module assessment criteria where appropriate;
6. be asked to bring all notes used in producing the work;
7. be provided with a copy of this procedure to be followed in the event that the student accepts/refutes the allegation;
8. be advised he/she is entitled to have a supporter from the University community to attend the interview with them, normally a representative from the University’s Students’ Union Advice Centre, another student, a member of academic staff or a member of staff from Student Services;
9. be advised that a supporter will not normally act as an advocate;
10. be provided with express confirmation of who will conduct the interview;
11. be advised that failure to respond will result in the meeting going ahead in absentia and a decision being made on the basis of the information contained within the hearing documentation.

4.3.3 If a student/s does not respond to the letter by the deadline, the School should make appropriate checks that correspondence is going to the correct address and send an email to the student’s University email account advising them of the hearing and reminding them that failure to respond will result in the meeting going ahead in absentia and that a decision will be made on the basis of the information contained within the hearing documentation.

4.3.4 The (D)AIO will arrange for a member of staff to act as note taker.

4.3.5 In the interview the (D)AIO should:

1. commence by inviting all those present to introduce themselves and explain their role or function at the hearing;
2. confirm that the supporter (if present) cannot act as an advocate;
3. confirm that the purpose of the interview is to establish whether the allegation of a breach of academic integrity regulations has taken place;
4. ask the student if they accept or refute the allegation;
5. ask the student if the allegation is being refuted to present his/her case explaining how this has happened and/or provide any supporting evidence including, where applicable, any witness statements.

4.3.6 Following the interview:

1. If the meeting finds that there is no offence to answer the student will be advised in writing within 5 working days of the School hearing and no record will be retained.
2. The (D)AIO will check that the allegation is a first offence or otherwise and whether or not the student has successfully completed the on-line academic misconduct training tool.
3. If the student accepts the allegation and the applicable penalty is between Penalty 1 and Penalty 3 on the Tariff of Penalties, the (D)AIO will advise the student of the
penalty that will be applied. In reaching this decision the (D)AIO will take into account the successful completion or otherwise by the student of the on-line academic integrity training tool.

4 The (D)AIO will advise the Chair of the CAB of the offence and subsequent penalty and record on ASIS the offence and penalty applied against the student's record.

5 If the student accepts the allegation and the applicable penalty is either Penalty 4 or Penalty 5 on the Tariff of Penalties, the (D)AIO will refer the case to the Academic Integrity Committee who will consider the academic offence and apply an appropriate penalty using the University tariff.

6 In all cases where the student refutes the allegation the (D)AIO should send 7 copies of the written report and supporting evidence within 5 working days of the School hearing to the Head of Registry for consideration by the Academic Integrity Committee. Supporting evidence includes:

- report from (D)AIO
- report from member of staff bringing the allegation
- signed statement from the student confirming the notes of the School based meeting
- copy of Turnitin report or examination paper or other evidence as appropriate
- copy of the assessment submitted by the student and a copy of the original source text with relevant sections highlighted;
- any mitigating evidence provided by the student
- module assessment criteria where appropriate.

4.4 Student absence from a school based Academic Integrity meeting

4.4.1 If a student has indicated that they do not wish to attend, the (D)AIO will make a decision and advise the student accordingly.

4.4.2 If a student has indicated that they are attending but is prevented from doing so for good reason which can be evidenced, and the student advises the School Office before the meeting, the meeting will be deferred to a later date.

4.4.3 If the student has indicated that they are attending but fails to attend and does not inform the School Office prior to the meeting, the meeting will go ahead and a decision will be reached based on the information available to the (D)AIO.

4.4.4 If a student fails to confirm attendance and all attempts to contact the student have failed, the meeting will go ahead and a decision will be reached based on the information available to the (D)AIO. Attempts to contact the student will be recorded on the student file including, copy letters and emails.

4.4.5 A student who does not attend the Academic Integrity Meeting waives the right of appeal except where an unavoidable inability to engage with the process can be demonstrated.

4.5 The Academic Integrity Committee

4.5.1 Where a case is reported to the Head of Registry for consideration by the Academic Integrity Committee the (D)AIO will advise the Chair of the Course Assessment Board who will defer consideration of the work in question until a decision has been made by the Academic Integrity Committee. The results for modules unaffected by the allegation should be considered as normal. Where the student has refer or defer work to be completed the student should be required to complete this work.

4.5.2 The Head of Registry will convene the hearing of the Academic Integrity Committee. The date of the hearing will be governed by a predetermined schedule.
4.6 Notifying the Student/s

4.6.1 Students should be given at least 5 working days notice of the hearing. The student will be advised in writing of the allegation together with accompanying documents, a copy of the regulations concerning academic integrity, the timing of the hearing and who the panel members will be. Correspondence should be sent to students by first class post using the relevant address as recorded on ASIS or an address provided by the student to Registry.

4.6.2 The student should be advised that he/she is entitled to have a person of their choosing from the University community to attend the hearing with them, normally a member from the Students’ Union Advice Centre, a member of academic staff, a student or a member of staff from Student Services. The student should be asked to confirm attendance at the hearing and the name and status of the person accompanying them to the hearing. A supporter will not normally act as an advocate.

4.6.3 If the student has previously provided witness statements he/she should be advised to notify the witnesses of the date of the hearing to ensure that they can attend.

4.7 Composition of the Academic Integrity Committee

4.7.1 The Academic Integrity Committee will comprise of a minimum of four members including:

1. any combination of 3 (D)AIOs not drawn from the Schools where the allegations originated

2. a member of the Students’ Union Executive normally the SU President.

The Head of Registry or nominated deputy will act as secretary but will not be a member.

4.7.2 The Academic Integrity Committee reserves the right to call any witness not already identified by the student or the School.

4.7.3 Any member of the Committee who knows of any possible conflict of interest or who has been personally involved in the individual’s current or prior case will not be eligible to be a member of the Committee for that case and should inform the Head of Registry prior to the meeting.

4.7.4 Documents for the hearings will be distributed to committee members and are private and confidential. They should only be discussed with other committee members or for clarification purposes with Registry.

4.8 Student absence from a University Academic Integrity Hearing

4.8.1 If a student has indicated that they do not wish to attend, the Chair will ensure that the Committee is familiar with all facts related to the case and present any supporting evidence forwarded by the student. The Committee will make a decision and advise the student accordingly.

4.8.2 If a student has indicated that they are attending but is prevented from doing so for good reason which can be evidenced, and the student advises the secretary before the meeting, the meeting will be deferred to a later date.

4.8.3 If the student has indicated that they are attending but fails to attend and does not inform the secretary prior to the meeting, the meeting will go ahead and a decision will be reached based on the information available to the committee.

4.8.4 If a student fails to confirm attendance and all attempts to contact the student have failed, the meeting will go ahead and a decision will be reached based on the information available to the committee. Attempts to contact the student will be recorded on the student file, copy letters held on file and receipts for recorded delivery letters will be requested.
4.8.5 A student who does not attend the Academic Integrity Committee waives the right of appeal except where an unavoidable inability to engage with the process can be demonstrated.

4.9 The Academic Integrity Hearing

4.9.1 The following should be adhered to in all circumstances and only varied where there is concern for the welfare of a student, witness or a member of staff:

1. The secretary will meet the student, supporter and School staff outside of the meeting and escort them into the meeting. Witnesses will remain in a designated waiting area until called.

2. The Chair will commence introductions of members present and invite others present to introduce themselves and their function.

3. If a supporter is present, the Chair should confirm that the supporter cannot act as an advocate.

4. The Chair will advise the student of the alleged offence and the specific details of the allegation.

5. The student will be asked whether they understand the allegation.

6. The student will be asked whether they accept or refute the alleged offence.

7. If the student accepts the allegation the Chair will ask the student if they wish to plead mitigating circumstances.

8. The Chair will thank the student, supporter and School staff for attending and advise the student that a decision will normally be made in writing within five working days. The attendees will be escorted from the room.

9. The Committee will discuss the case and consider whether the allegation has been proved and reach its decision.

10. If the student has been previously found guilty of an academic offence the secretary will advise the Committee once a decision has been reached.

11. If the student is found guilty the Academic Integrity Committee will consider what penalty, if any, is to be imposed using the penalties as approved by UTLC. In reaching this decision the Committee will take into account the successful completion or otherwise by the student of the on-line academic misconduct training tool.

12. If the student is found guilty the decision of the penalty imposed will be reported electronically to the Dean, (D)AIO, module tutor, administrative contact and recorded on the student's file on ASIS. The student will be advised in writing.

13. Notes of the hearing will be made available electronically to the Dean, (D)AIO, module leader and administrative contact and retained in Registry. The student will be sent a written copy of the notes.

14. If the student refutes the allegation the Chair of the Committee will explain that the purpose of the Academic Integrity Committee is to hear evidence in support of the student and the School and make a decision based on the information provided.

15. The Chair will invite the School staff to present the case against the student.

16. The Chair will ask the student if he/she wishes to make a statement to the Committee.

17. If appropriate, witnesses will be called at this stage. The Chair will give members of the Committee an opportunity to ask questions of the witnesses. The witnesses will be escorted from the room.
The Chair will give both the student and staff members the opportunity to ask questions of each other, and the members of the Committee to ask questions of the staff and student.

The Chair will ensure that all members of the Committee have completed their questioning.

The Chair will ask the student and each member of staff if they wish to make any closing statement.

The Chair will ask the student, supporter and School staff for attending and advise the student that a decision will normally be made in writing within five working days. The attendees will be escorted from the room.

The Committee will discuss the case and consider whether the allegation has been proved and reach its decision. Any evidenced mitigating circumstances will be taken into account. Absolute proof of the allegation is not required to determine that an allegation has been substantiated.

If the student has been previously found guilty of an academic offence the secretary will advise the Committee once a decision has been reached.

If the student is found guilty the Academic Integrity Committee will consider what penalty, if any, is to be imposed using the penalties approved by UTLC and taking into account any previous offences.

If the student is found guilty the decision of the penalty imposed will be reported electronically to the Dean, the (D)AIO, module tutor and administrative contact and recorded on the student’s file on ASIS. The student will be advised in writing.

Notes of the hearing will be made available electronically to the Dean, (D)AIO, module tutor and administrative contact and retained in Registry. The student will be sent a written copy of the notes within 5 working days of the Committee having reached a conclusion.
Students’ Handbook of Regulations - Assessment Regulation 5: Appeal Against a Decision Related to an Academic Integrity Offence

Students are advised to seek impartial help, advice, guidance and support from sabbatical officers in the Students’ Union and Students’ Union Advice Centre.

5.1 Appeal against a decision of a School Based Investigation

5.1.1 A student may apply for leave to appeal to the Academic Misconduct Committee regarding a penalty imposed by the Academic Integrity Officer or Deputy [(D)AIO] following the School hearing. Such appeals must be made in writing to the Head of Registry not later than 10 working days after the decision has been issued to the student.

5.1.2 A student who does not attend the School Based Academic Integrity Meeting waives the right of appeal except where an unavoidable inability to engage with the process can be demonstrated.

5.1.3 Leave to appeal will only be granted if:

- the student can demonstrate a material irregularity has occurred
- the student presents extenuating circumstances which for very good reason could not be presented at the original interview.

5.1.4 On receipt of an application for leave to appeal the Head of Registry or nominated deputy will review the documentation submitted to identify if a material irregularity has occurred and/or is demonstrated within the documentation or ascertain why the extenuating circumstances could not have been presented to an earlier meeting. If leave to appeal is not granted, the Head of Registry or nominated deputy will write to the student with a full explanation.

5.1.5 If leave to appeal is granted the appeal will be heard at the next available Academic Integrity Committee normally within 15 working days of the appeal being lodged. There will be no further opportunity to submit additional evidence. Its meetings shall be private and its proceedings confidential. The student and School representative may be required to attend the hearing and the Committee’s decision will be final.

5.1.6 The Appeals Committee will comprise of three members of the Academic Integrity Committee, one of whom will be a student number. No member will have been directly involved in the decision under dispute.

5.1.7 Students should be aware that the Appeals Committee may impose a greater or lesser penalty. The Committee may:

1. confirm the findings and the penalty in all respects
2. change, revise or vary the penalty in accordance with the decision of the appeal
3. uphold the appeal, remove the penalties and any record of the offence on the student file.

5.2 Appeal against a decision of the Academic Integrity Committee

5.2.1 The student may appeal to the Pro Vice-Chancellor (Teaching and Learning) regarding the decision and/or penalty imposed by the Academic Integrity Committee. Application for leave to appeal must be made in writing to the Head of Registry not later than 10 working days after the decision has been issued to the student, and must demonstrate that a material irregularity has occurred to be successful.

5.2.2 A student who does not attend the Academic Integrity Committee Hearing waives the right of appeal except where an unavoidable inability to engage with the process can be demonstrated.

5.2.3 Leave to appeal will only be granted if:
• the student can demonstrate a material irregularity has occurred
• the student presents extenuating circumstances which for very good reason could not be presented at the original interview.

5.2.4 On receipt of an application for leave to appeal the Head of Registry or nominated deputy will review the documentation submitted to identify if a material irregularity has occurred and/or is demonstrated within the documentation or ascertain the extenuating circumstances could not have been presented to an earlier meeting. If leave to appeal is not granted, the Head of Registry or nominated deputy will write to the student with a full explanation.

5.2.5 If leave to appeal is granted the appeal will be heard at the next available Academic Integrity Committee normally within 15 working days of the appeal being lodged. There will be no further opportunity to submit additional evidence. Its meetings shall be private and its proceedings confidential. The student may be required to attend the hearing and the Committee’s decision will be final. No member of the new committee will have been involved in the previous committee but may be called to give evidence.

5.2.6 The Appeals Committee will comprise of three members of the Academic Integrity Committee, one of whom will be a student member. No member will have been directly involved in the decision under dispute.

5.2.7 The Committee may:

1. confirm the findings and the penalty in all respects
2. change, revise or vary the penalty in accordance with the decision of the appeal
3. uphold the appeal, remove the penalties and any record of the offence on the student file.
MANAGING ACADEMIC INTEGRITY ISSUES - POLICY AND PROCESSES WITHIN COLLABORATIVE PROVISION

The University of Huddersfield’s Policy and Tariff of Penalties are applicable to all courses operated with Partner Institutions (PI), irrespective of the nature of the collaboration, and to all students registered on these courses.

It is assumed that:

1) All collaborative partnership agreements, franchise, designed & delivered and ODUPPLUS, will have procedures for dealing with Academic Integrity Offences which reflect the University’s procedures for internal courses. These procedures will be agreed at (re)validation and reviewed by the DALO/ILO as part of the AEM.

2) For franchised and designed & delivered provision the PI will appoint an Academic Integrity Officer (AIO) who will operate as AIOs within Schools but will, additionally, inform the DALO of Academic Integrity investigations and outcomes.

3) For ODUPPLUS provision the PI and the School will agree upon the appointment of the AIO as part of the (re)validation process. Depending upon the nature of the PI this may be a member of the PI, a member of UoH staff who visits the PI regularly or the DALO.

4) Decisions made under 2) and 3) will be required to be confirmed by the relevant School’s AIO.

Where a student refutes the allegation of Academic Integrity or admits the offence but it is not an offence which lies on penalty Tariff Points 1 – Tariff Point 3 then the University’s procedures require the case be referred to Academic Integrity Committee (AIC). The student is expected to attend and present their case.

For students on collaborative provision it may be unrealistic for students (and staff) to attend the AIC at the University. It is agreed that:

5) Video or telephone conference alternatives to physical attendance at the AIC is explored

6) The PI to establish jointly with the School an AIC to mirror the work of the University’s AIC. The establishment and membership of the PI AIC will need to be agreed as part of the (re)validation and reviewed as part of AEM. Decisions made by the PI AIC will be confirmed by the University’s Head of Registry.
STAGE ONE

DECIDING IF THERE IS A CASE TO ANSWER
Academic Integrity process - Deciding if there is a case to answer

Other than exam cheating, allegations should always refer to ‘a breach of the academic integrity regulations’ and not to a specific offence within those regs – so please don’t refer to collusion or to plagiarism, instead refer to ‘unexplained or unacceptable levels of similarity between student X and student Y’ - or ‘unexplained levels of similarity with published texts as demonstrated by the highlighted passages’.

1. The tutor has a suspicion of a breach of regulations.
   
   **Please Note:** An allegation can be made at any point – usually it’s at the marking stage, but even if unconfirmed marks have been released (or even after a CAB has confirmed credit) an allegation can still be brought.

2. If the tutor feels on balance that it’s a matter of poor referencing only, then no further action is taken and no penalty can be applied – other than whatever provision has been made in the marking scheme for general academic skills.

3. If the tutor feels there has been a breach of the regs, then the tutor investigates, collates evidence and passes it to the (D)AIO with the standard ‘notice of allegation of breach of academic integrity regulations’ (Appendix 1).

4. In addition to the module specification and assessment brief, the tutor may want to include any specification directions issued or support offered in connection with academic integrity - but, depending on the nature of the offence, the evidence should include as a minimum:
   - collusion:
     - the TurnItIn report
     - the two (or more) pieces of work which are similar with relevant sections highlighted and cross-referenced with a commentary that adds information as necessary on shared or common occurrences with an unusually high or improbable frequency such as structure, typographical or spelling errors, obscure conclusions or phraseology
     - the standard allegation notice which puts the allegation in context. This notice and the commentary mentioned above may be the same document
   - plagiarism:
     - the TurnItIn report
     - the piece of work submitted by the student and a copy of the original source text with relevant sections highlighted and cross-referenced. In cases where a number of sources have been identified, tutors may decide to bring the formal allegation on the basis of a selected number of offending sections instead of the full list – the selected number could be as few as one (where this is a significant element of the work) or as many as necessary if it’s a question of a number of shorter extracts
     - the standard allegation notice which puts the allegation in context
   - ghosting (the tutor invites the student to attend a meeting to review their recent submission):
     - a report of the meeting held with the student to review the student’s submission which concludes with the specific areas of concern/discrepancy which lead the tutor to believe that the work is not that of the student ( e.g. inability to explain how this topic had been chosen, a lack of understanding of the research methodology used, inability to answer questions about the content, inability to explain the choice of sources used and how they had been identified, concerns over the student’s ability to express her/himself in English either in terms of subject-specific language or in English generally)
     - the piece of work submitted by the student cross-referenced as necessary with the report to show examples in the work which formed part of the discussions with the student
     - the standard allegation notice which puts the allegation in context
   - exam cheating:
     - the invigilator’s report
     - any evidence retained during the exam (this may include photographs)
     - the standard allegation notice which puts the allegation in context
5. The tutor sends a standard letter to the student to confirm that there is a concern over the authenticity of their work and the mark will be delayed (Appendix 2). The letter also advises the student they will be hearing from the (D)AIO shortly.

6. The (D)AIO determines if there’s a case to answer. The (D)AIO may decide that a meeting with the tutor is necessary – if this is the case, that meeting has to be minuted and the minutes then form part of the evidence bundle that is sent to the student. A suggested format for this is in Appendix 3. If any further evidence is required, it is the responsibility of the (D)AIO to ask the tutor to collate and supply that.

7. No mention should be made in the documentation of any previous allegations – the (D)AIO should be in a position where s/he can consider this allegation in isolation without any suggestion that the student has had an earlier allegation upheld.

8. If there’s no case to answer, the tutor and the student are informed and the mark is released to the student. A standard letter is sent to the student (Appendix 4). No record is kept on the student’s file.

9. If there is a case to answer, the student is invited to a hearing with the School (D)AIO.
Points to consider when conducting investigations:

Poor referencing or a breach of the regulations?

The point at which poor referencing becomes a breach of the regulations is a matter of academic judgement. It is unlikely that a series of small coincidences (half sentences or an occasional phrase) would result in a formal allegation – but single sentences being regularly copied with no attempt at quotation (whether from a single source or a range of sources) may be grounds for a tutor to pursue a case. If at any point the (D)AIO feels that there is insufficient evidence for a case to proceed, s/he will inform the tutor – at which point further discussion could take place (all minuted and made available to the student if the allegation is pursued), but, once these discussions have been concluded, the (D)AIO's decision is final.

The TurnItIn report *

The report will give you a similarity match – please don't rely on this as hard evidence of an offence. The match includes correctly referenced passages as well as book/journal titles and the information contained in the bibliography. The key to effective use of the TurnItIn report is to select the paragraphs which most clearly suggest that some form of copying has taken place and to provide the original source text with the relevant sections highlighted and numbered to match the student's submission – or (in the case of collusion) to provide both submissions and to highlight and cross-match the offending paragraphs. It is the tutor's responsibility to collate and mark up this paperwork.

Collusion and safeguarding work

The regulations require students to take responsibility for the security of their own work. Students can get caught up in allegation of collusion without ever having realised that someone else has accessed their work. Whether or not they are then found guilty of an offence will depend on the extent to which they can satisfy the (D)AIO that they took reasonable steps to safeguard their own work. A student whose explanation is that they mislaid a USB and reported it as missing has a stronger explanation than a student who explains that s/he left work available on a screen on a public computer while going to get a coffee.

We expect students not to supply a copy of their work to a friend (even if they include a request that it shouldn't be copied).

In recognition of the differing levels of fault in collusion/safeguarding cases, there is a separate policy and additional set of penalties which may be appropriate in these cases (Appendix 13).

Cases that involve revoking credit

If a case arises that involves credit (or even an award) that has been confirmed by a CAB, it is still pursued. With respect to the student whose work has been reproduced, an initial informal approach may be best to gauge if they are aware of how their work may have been accessed –some (particularly health) students are required to place their completed assessments in a resource room at the place of work and have no control over how they are then used by others: obviously in such cases, it would be unfair to penalise the student. But if the initial approach does not lead to a satisfactory explanation then the standard process should be employed and a School hearing arranged.
STAGE TWO

THE SCHOOL HEARING
Academic Integrity process – The School hearing

1. If there is a case to answer, the student is sent a standard letter (Appendix 5) inviting them to attend a hearing. Bear in mind:
   a) hearings should only be scheduled in term time unless the student has separately and willingly agreed for it to be held in vacation time. If the allegation is made at a time when the hearing would naturally fall during the summer vacation and a CAB decision on progression cannot be reached until the outcome of the allegation is known, this should be made clear to the student – if they still want to delay until the Autumn term, that’s fine - but it means that they will not be able to progress to the next year of their course
   b) the student has to have five working days’ notice of the hearing – so the letter and the full evidence bundle should be sent in plenty of time to reach the student so that s/he has time to review it all before the hearing
   c) the letter should be emailed to the student’s university email account as advanced notice – the email should advise that the evidence bundle has been posted and that if it doesn’t arrive promptly it is the student’s responsibility to call into the School Office to get a second copy of the bundle. We always recommend that a delivery and a read receipt is put on the email so it can be shown later that it was sent
   d) the invite letter requests the student to confirm their attendance a couple of days in advance of the hearing. If no reply is received, reasonable efforts should be made by the School Office to get hold of the student to see if they are coming or not. A reasonable effort would be a couple of phone calls and an email – all logged on the student’s file so that it can be reported should the need arise
   e) if the student has a good reason for requesting a rescheduling of the hearing and contacts the school office in advance, then the hearing should be re-arranged on one occasion only
   f) the invite letter requests the student to submit any additional paperwork (including a case and evidence for mitigation) in advance of the hearing (normally 2 working days before the hearing)
   g) the letter advises the student that they can bring a friend or supporter with them
   h) a copy of the regulations should be included with the letter and the evidence
   i) the name of the (D)AIO conducting the hearing should be included in the letter.

2. If the student contacts the Office after receiving the invite letter and reports that they cannot attend the scheduled date, a judgement needs to be made as to whether the reason for non-attendance is sufficiently compelling to warrant a rescheduling. Bear in mind that as long as the hearing is scheduled during term-time (particularly for full-time students) there should be no reason why a student can’t attend – so you’re probably looking for reasons around ill-health. But if there’s no compelling reason for non-attendance or the student doesn’t turn up after saying they will, the hearing goes ahead and a decision is made based on the evidence.

3. Exceptionally (usually if the student is based off-campus or an allegation arises in the summer vacation and it’s unreasonable to expect the student to return to Huddersfield), if all sides are in agreement, a telephone or Skype interview could be arranged (Skype is preferred). If it’s a telephone interview, a few basic questions to confirm the student’s identity should be asked.

4. The hearing goes ahead and a record is kept. An example of how to record the meeting is in Appendix 6.

5. The record needs to show that the student:
   a) understands the allegation
   b) received all the paperwork
   c) accepts or denies the allegation – there needs to be an explicit question asked of the students and a clear reply recorded. If the student accepts that there are similarities, you still need an outright admission of the allegation. Many students admit there are similarities but deny that they have ‘cheated’
   d) was offered the chance at the hearing to raise any mitigation
6. If the student has brought a supporter along, the (D)AIO should explain that only either the student or the supporter can speak. They are able to confer between themselves but only one can answer throughout the proceedings.

7. If the student accepts that there is some similarity but declares it was an accident and/or unintentional, every effort should be made by the (D)AIO to explain that this is still a breach of the regs and would not be a valid defence if the case was to be heard by an Academic Integrity Committee.

8. The documentation will not have made any reference to earlier allegations, but if the student raises the fact that this has happened before, the (D)AIO needs to clarify that this information would not have been available to him/her had the student not mentioned it – and it will be disregarded from any conclusion reached by the (D)AIO.

9. If the student doesn’t turn up (provided that the reasonable efforts in 1d above have been made to contact the student), then the hearing goes ahead and a conclusion is reached based on the evidence bundle.

10. If the student raises any issues that need further investigation don’t be worried if you have to follow something up after the hearing – just make sure that the student understands that there may be a short delay before you can confirm your conclusions. And if the delay takes you beyond the date by which the student is entitled to have been told of the outcome, just keep the student informed of progress and apologise for the delays.

11. At the conclusion of the hearing (after the student has left), the (D)AIO needs to reach a conclusion on the allegation and any associated penalty. There are seven possible outcomes:
   i. the (D)AIO is persuaded by the student’s account of an alternative and innocent explanation for the similarities - the conclusion is that the allegation is not upheld
   ii. the student admits the offence and has offered no mitigation. The standard penalty for that level of offence is applied – and it’s at this point that the (D)AIO should find out if the student has any previously upheld allegations and if the student has completed the on-line Academic Integrity Resource.
   iii. the student admits the offence and offers mitigation which does not persuade the (D)AIO that a lesser penalty is warranted. The reasons for not being persuaded are recorded in the report and the standard penalty is applied – and it’s at this point that the (D)AIO should find out if the student has any previously upheld allegations and if the student has completed the on-line Academic Integrity Resource.
   iv. the student admits the offence and offers mitigation which does persuade the (D)AIO that a lesser penalty is warranted. The (D)AIO makes a case to Registry for the lesser penalty to be applied – and it’s at this point that the (D)AIO should find out if the student has any previously upheld allegations and if the student has completed the on-line Academic Integrity Resource.
   v. the student admits the offence and the penalty to be applied (after any mitigation is taken into account) means that the student will not be able to remain on his/her course after the next CAB. The case has to be referred to Registry for submission to the Academic Integrity Committee. Only the Committee can apply a penalty which will effectively end a student’s study. As far as the (D)AIO is concerned the allegation is upheld but the penalty is to be applied by the committee.
   vi. the student admits the offence but it involves the removal of credit (i.e. by the time the allegation has been brought against the student, the CAB has already met and confirmed the credit for that module). The case has to be referred to Registry for submission to the Academic Integrity Committee. Only the Committee can apply a penalty which will effectively remove credit. As far as the (D)AIO is concerned the allegation is upheld but the penalty is to be applied by the committee.
vii. the student continues to deny the allegation – in which case the matter is referred to Registry for consideration by an Academic Integrity Committee

12. In determining the penalty the (D)AIO needs to be very clear in the report exactly which penalty is being applied and on what grounds that penalty has been identified. In cases where a tutor reassessment has been identified as the outcome (penalty #2), the (D)AIO should check:
   i. that TR is provided for in the module in question
   ii. that there is still sufficient time for the TR to be completed prior to the CAB
If either i or ii is not possible, then the penalty remains at #2 but is reported to the CAB as a formal referral.

13. The outcome of the school hearing should be notified to the student within 5 working days of the hearing. It’s a standard letter (Appendix 7). The letter and report should also be made available to the module tutor so that any arrangements for TR or other completion of marking can take place.

14. If the case has been concluded at School level and will not involve a referral to the Academic Integrity Committee, a report is also made to Registry with the outcome of the case (Appendix 8).
STAGE THREE

PENALTIES, CASES FOR MITIGATION AND REFERAL TO AIC
**Academic Integrity process – Deciding on penalties and cases for mitigation**

1. The University has a set tariff of penalties which are now available to students in the Students’ Handbook of Regulations.

2. A student will have been told in the invite letter to submit any case (and evidence) for mitigation in advance of the hearing. In reality, mitigation is generally accepted at the hearing itself.

3. Mitigation doesn’t make an allegation go away. If there is evidence that an offence was committed then the allegation stands – the mitigation just allows consideration of a lower penalty.

4. The mitigation must apply to the time when the offence occurred.

5. In terms of judgement as to the acceptability of the grounds offered, the (D)AIO needs to be persuaded that the evidence does show that the actions of the student in committing the offence were affected by the circumstances described. If these circumstances mean that it would be unreasonable to have expected the student to have been able to request an extension, then there would be an argument for mitigation. But if the mitigation suggests that the student could still have had the presence of mind to have sought support or seek an extension, the (D)AIO is likely to conclude that the grounds described do not warrant a lower penalty.

6. The standard of evidence required for mitigation should be similar to that required for ECs – so a formal medical note to confirm the impact of any circumstances.

7. If the (D)AIO feels that a lower penalty should be applied, s/he needs to get agreement from Registry first. This ensures consistency for all students in the types of mitigation being accepted. As part of the case being made, the (D)AIO needs to be clear what penalty is being proposed in light of the mitigation. Although the usual practice is to drop to the next penalty down, any penalty (standard or otherwise) can be suggested.

8. If a student has had a previous case upheld where mitigation was applied, if s/he then goes onto to commit another offence then that offence is one up from the previous offence (not from the previous penalty). So if a student has already been found guilty of an offence at I level because they plagiarised in an essay which contributes 50% to the overall module assessment, then the usual penalty would be #3. If mitigation had been applied then that penalty may have been reduced to #2. But a subsequent upheld offence should initially be considered for the #4 penalty.
### ACADEMIC INTEGRITY: TARIFF OF PENALTIES

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Penalty #1: (not available for allegations relating to examinations)</th>
<th>Available at pre-foundation and foundation level for a first upheld offence</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>• The student is issued with an official warning</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• The submission is marked as presented ignoring offending paragraphs</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Subsequent option for Tutor Reassessment remains available if a pass mark for the assessment is not achieved</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• The offence is recorded on ASIS but does not appear on the student's transcript</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• The student is referred to the AST</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Penalty #2: (not available for allegations relating to examinations)</th>
<th>Available at pre-foundation and foundation level for second upheld offence when the earlier offence would normally have attracted the standard Penalty #1</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Available at intermediate or honours level for first upheld offence provided that the assessment is worth 10% or less of the overall module</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• A mark of 0% Fail is recorded for that assessment</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• The assessment is repeated as a Tutor Reassessment. If no provision is made in the module specification for TR or if time does not permit a TR to be completed before the Board the assessment is repeated as a formal referral in the resit period</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• The offence is recorded on ASIS but does not appear on the student’s transcript</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• The student is referred to the AST</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Penalty #3:</th>
<th>This is the lowest available penalty for an upheld offence relating to an examination</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>This is the lowest available standard penalty for a first upheld offence at M level</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>This is the lowest available standard penalty for a first upheld offence where the assessment is worth 10.01% or more of a module at I or H level</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>This is the lowest available standard penalty for a second upheld offence at I or H level when the earlier offence would normally have attracted the standard Penalty #2</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• A mark of 0% Fail is recorded for the overall module</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• The full set of module assessment tasks are repeated in full in the next academic session</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• The offence is recorded on ASIS and appears on the student’s transcript</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• The student is referred to the AST</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Penalty #4:</th>
<th>This is the lowest available standard penalty when the earlier offence would normally have attracted the standard Penalty #3</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>• A mark of 0% Fail is recorded for the overall module</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• The student cannot repeat this module or substitute it (this will normally require the student to leave the course)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• The offence is recorded on ASIS and appears on the student’s transcript</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• The student is referred to the AST</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Penalty #5:</th>
<th>This is the lowest available standard penalty when the earlier offence would normally have attracted the standard Penalty #4</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>• A mark of 0% Fail is recorded for the overall module</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• The student is excluded from the University but can keep any accrued credit</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• The offence is recorded on ASIS and appears on the student's transcript</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Academic Integrity process – Sending cases to the Academic Integrity Committee

1. Cases will be sent to the AIC for the following reasons:
   a. the student denies the allegation
   b. the student admits the allegation but it involves revocation of credit and/or award
   c. the penalty to be applied will have the result of requiring the student to leave his/her course (i.e. being unable to repeat a module)
   d. the student has had a case upheld against them and has now demonstrated grounds for an appeal to be heard

2. The documentation for consideration by the AIC should include:
   2.1 Cases to be heard in full:
      a. the full set of documentation supplied for the hearing (see earlier section for details on this)
      b. any evidence or statement of mitigation offered by the student to date
      c. a copy of the record of the School hearing and associated correspondence (the letter which invited the student to that hearing and the one which accompanied the report of the hearing)
      d. an overview from the (D)AIO of the process followed so far (an example of this can be found at Appendix 9)
   2.2 Cases for the application of a penalty or revocation of credit:
      a. any evidence or statement of mitigation offered by the student to date
      b. a copy of the record of the School hearing
      c. an overview from the (D)AIO of the process followed so far (an example of this can be found at Appendix 9)
   2.3 Cases of appeal:
      a. Registry will prepare the documentation and supply it to the Committee – Schools will have provided their contribution as part of the early consideration by Registry of the appeal.

3. The Committee operates largely on set dates throughout the year. (D)AIOs will have been asked their availability at the start of the session and will have been allocated a small number of meetings to attend. If you’ve accepted a diary request to be on a specific committee please do ensure that you keep that time free for that purpose. If it looks like there will be no business, Registry will contact you and let you know in advance.

4. The School will be required to submit seven copies of the papers to Registry for circulation to the Committee and the student. Registry doesn’t necessarily read through the documentation before circulating so it’s important that you’re happy that the full set has been provided. Anything you provide to Registry will be sent to the student. There’s a standard letter used by Registry to invite students to the hearing (Appendix 10)

5. Someone from the School will need to attend the AIC to present the School’s case. This should really be the (D)AIO who conducted the case at School level – but if that person is unavailable another (D)AIO could attend on their behalf. Whoever attends should be confident that they are fully familiar with the case. If specialist input is required, it would be the School’s responsibility to indicate when sending the papers to Registry the names of any witnesses who need to be scheduled into the hearing – and then to arrange for the witness to attend the meeting.
Academic Integrity process – Sitting on an Academic Integrity Committee

1. A (D)AIO can't hear a case involving a student from their own School.

2. Registry aims to allocate Committee duty fairly among all (D)AIOs. Three (D)AIOs have to be on each Committee (along with a member of the SU Executive team). The chair is decided on the day by those on the Committee.

3. Although efforts are made to avoid overloading Committees, it may be necessary to list up to 6 cases per Committee. Occasionally a Committee will be conducted via Skype – all arrangements are made by Registry.

4. Papers are usually sent out to the Committee a week in advance of the meeting – (D)AIOs should check to make that there is no conflict of interest (such as having sat on a previous Committee which considered an earlier allegation for that student). If a (D)AIO identifies some additional papers that s/he may want to see at the Committee, a request should be made to Registry as soon as possible so that they can be sourced and passed to all those who will be attending for that case - including the student.

5. The student will have been prompted again in the invite letter to submit any grounds and evidence for mitigation. The deadline for this is two or three days in advance of the hearing – and if anything arrives in Registry it is emailed out to the committee members and the School rep. In extreme cases (usually involving health) mitigation may still be accepted by the Committee at the hearing – but this may cause a delay if the School rep needs to take advice on it.

6. Registry has a standard running order and prompt sheet to help chairs get through the business (Appendix 11).

7. Registry always has a representative at Committees – this person is not a member of the Committee but can advise on regulations and will keep the record. If it looks like the Committee is acting out of line with regulations or established processes, the Registry rep is responsible for pointing that out to the Committee. But any decision on upholding an allegation or applying a penalty falls to the members of the Committee.

8. The considerations for deciding if an allegation is to be upheld and what (if any) penalty is to be applied are the same as after a School hearing – with the exception that if the student continues to deny the allegation, the Committee decides on the basis of the evidence and discussions held. Once a conclusion on guilt or innocence is decided, the Registry rep will inform the Committee what number of offence this is for that student so that the standard penalty can be identified.

9. Registry writes up the report and sends the report and accompanying letter to the student, the School Office and the (D)AIO who attended the meeting.
APPEALS AGAINST CONCLUSIONS AND/OR PENALTIES
Academic Integrity process – Appeals against conclusions and/or penalties

1. A student who does not attend either the School’s hearing or a meeting of the Academic Integrity Committee waives the right of appeal except where an unavoidable inability to engage with the process can be demonstrated.

2. Students are advised that penalties may change on appeal – but they can be increased as well as decreased.

3. Appeals are always lodged with Registry who will (as necessary) contact the School for more information. Registry will make the decision whether leave to appeal shall be granted, and will advise the student accordingly.

4. If leave to appeal is granted, the case will be referred back to the Academic Integrity Committee with a clear explanation of what is being reconsidered. The student will be invited to attend and the School will be asked if it wishes to send a representative to speak on its behalf. The student’s case and any other relevant evidence will be collated and circulated to the Committee, the student and the School.
APPENDICES
Appendix 1A

TEMPLATE NOTICE OF SUSPECTED BREACH OF ACADEMIC INTEGRITY REGULATIONS - COURSEWORK

NOTICE OF SUSPECTED BREACH OF ACADEMIC INTEGRITY REGULATIONS

I (name), (state position within the University), give this statement in connection with an allegation that:

(name/s of student/s) registered on the (course and year of study)

breached the Academic Integrity Regulations of the University by …….

(insert a short description of whatever the allegation is – for example:

- submitting work with significant similarities to the work submitted by student X
- submitting work with significant similarities to the following websites/text books/published works).

Title of module: _______________________

Date coursework due to be submitted (if applicable):________________________

Date coursework submitted (if applicable):________________________________

The events relating to this allegation are:

Below is a sample explanation that may help you form the basic report for this case:

The assessment brief was issued to the cohort on 15 October – the brief is attached for information. Students were advised as part of that brief that they should ensure that the work they submitted was exclusively their own work and that all sources had to be fully cited with quotations correctly referenced.

The Turnitin report for this student’s piece of work indicated a 63% similarity index.

On further investigation it was clear that some of the similarity could be disregarded as the text was correctly referenced. However, significant sections of text matched internet sources on a word for word basis – these sections have been highlighted and numbered 1, 2, 3, and 4.

The relevant internet sources have been printed off and are enclosed with this document with appropriate cross-referencing to the highlighted passages in the student’s work.
NOTICE OF SUSPECTED BREACH OF ACADEMIC INTEGRITY REGULATIONS

I (name), (state position within the University), give this statement in connection with an allegation that:

(name of student) registered on the (course and year of study)

breached the Academic Integrity Regulations of the University in connection with the conduct of an examination

(insert a short description of whatever the allegation is – for example:
  • the student was found to have access to unauthorised material in the examination).

Title of module: __________________________________________________
Date of examination:________________________
Room:________________________________

The events relating to this allegation are:

Below is a sample explanation that may help you form the basic report for this case:

The events related to this allegation are:

1. I am module leader for X module and I was the invigilator at the unseen closed-book examination for this module. The examination was held on Monday 10 May at 2pm in the Sports Hall. The only items required for the exam were the question booklet, the answer booklet and a pen.

   The standard invigilator rubric was read out in full at the start of the exam - this included reminders to students that the only items permitted on the desk during the examination are writing implements, water in a clear plastic bottle and books/materials specified in the exam paper. It was confirmed that access to other materials is not permitted. Students were told that if they wished to place anything in their bags they must do so at that point (i.e. before the examination started). (Some invigilators pause at this point and ask if anyone has anything they need to remove from the desk - if this happened, this should be mentioned here) At the end of the invigilator announcement, students were informed that they were then under examination conditions.

   If there were reminders given out during the course of the year about how exams are conducted and the fact that no additional material could be taken into an exam - then this should be mentioned here

2. The exam commenced at TIME. NAME was seated in seat number XXX and at TIME I noticed her flicking backwards and forwards between early and later parts of the answer booklet - there seemed to be no justifiable reason as to why this should happen so I watched her carefully for X minutes from three rows behind her (near to seat XXX). I remained suspicious and asked her to show me her answer booklet. She seemed reluctant to allow me to do so but after I insisted she passed it to me which was when I discovered a small piece of paper tucked into the front cover of the answer booklet. The paper contained XXX information.
3. I removed the answer booklet and question paper, noted the time on them both (TIME) and provided a fresh answer booklet and question paper immediately. NAME continued with the examination and left the room at XXX. I noted the events on the invigilator report sheet and informed the Course Leader after the examination.

4. I have looked at the contents of the piece of paper and they relate to XXXX. These did form part of the curriculum for this module and a candidate may have expected them to appear on the examination paper.

5. Included with this statement are
   - Copy of paper discovered in answer booklet
   - Copy of exam question paper
   - Copy of answer booklet complete prior to this incident
   - Copy of answer booklet completed after this incident
   - Copy of module curriculum showing where this item arose in the syllabus
Date:

Dear (name)

Allegation of breach of Academic Integrity regulations (Students' Handbook of Regulations Section 4, Assessment Regulations 3, 4 and 5)

I am writing to advise you that an allegation has been made against you that you have breached the University's academic integrity regulations. This concerns your assessment for (title and code of module). Your results for this module cannot be given to you until this issue is resolved.

You will be written to and invited to attend an interview shortly with the Academic Integrity Officer/Deputy Academic Integrity Officer (AIO/DAIO) for the School to discuss the above allegation.

That invitation will include the full details of the allegation and will explain the process to be followed, including opportunities and deadlines for you to provide any further documentation in connection with the allegation or information on mitigating circumstances. It will also explain your entitlement to bring a supporter with you to the interview (normally a representative from the Students' Union Advice Centre).

Yours sincerely

Module leader/Marker
Appendix 2B

Template - Letter to student informing of allegation (to be sent out by module/course leader) - Examination

FIRST CLASS AND EMAILED with a delivery and read receipt

Date:

Dear (name)

Allegation of breach of Academic Integrity regulations (Students' Handbook of Regulations Section 4, Assessment Regulations 3, 4 and 5)

I am writing to advise you that an allegation has been made against you that you have breached the University’s academic integrity regulations. This concerns your attendance at the examination for (title and code of module) on (date of the exam). Your results for this module cannot be progressed until this issue is resolved.

You will be written to and invited to attend an interview shortly with the Academic Integrity Officer/Deputy Academic Integrity Officer (AIO/DAIO) for the School to discuss the above allegation.

That invitation will include the full details of the allegation and will explain the process to be followed, including opportunities and deadlines for you to provide any further documentation in connection with the allegation or information on mitigating circumstances. It will also explain your entitlement to bring a supporter with you to the interview (normally a representative from the Students’ Union Advice Centre).

Yours sincerely

Module leader/Marker
Investigation into an alleged breach of the Academic Integrity Regulations

Present: D/AIO name, Tutor name

In attendance: Secretary name

Allegation regarding Student Name, Module X, Title of assessment

An allegation had been brought by Tutor Name, that Student Name had breached the Academic Integrity regulation in assessment X for Module X.

Tutor Name had collated the evidence in support of the allegation which included:

- List of evidence

The purpose of this meeting was to clarify the allegation and review the evidence which had been offered in support of that allegation.

Tutor Name confirmed that the allegation focussed on the highlighted 4 sections. He explained that the TurnItIn originality report had highlighted additional sections but that these had been disregarded due to:

- correct use of quotation marks
- presentation of information in the bibliography
- other reason?

Having reviewed the TurnItIn report in detail, Tutor Name had retrieved the original source material and cross-referenced it to the student’s submission. Tutor Name felt that this represented a clear breach of the regulations and had submitted the allegation for further action.

Signed: ........................................ Date: ........................................
Appendix 4

Template- Letter for advising no case to answer

FIRST CLASS AND EMAIL with delivery and read receipt

Date:

Dear (student)

Allegation of breach of Academic Integrity regulations (Students’ Handbook of Regulations Section 4, Assessment Regulations 3, 4 and 5)

Further to the letter to you dated (date) regarding the investigation into an allegation of a breach of the Academic Integrity Regulations in module (title of module).

I have investigated the matter and have concluded that there is no case to answer.

I am aware of the distress that this allegation may have caused you but I hope you can appreciate the need for the University to investigate all allegations in order to protect the integrity of its awards – not only for the University but also for the standing of its students and graduates.

Thank you for your engagement with this process and I wish you well for your future.

Yours sincerely

(Deputy) Academic Integrity Officer
Copy: Module Tutor
FIRST CLASS AND VIA EMAIL with delivery and read receipt

Date: (must be sent so that it arrives at least 5 working days before the meeting)

(Name)
(Address)

Dear (name)

Allegation of breach of Academic Integrity regulations (Students' Handbook of Regulations Section 4, Assessment Regulations 3, 4 and 5)

[Module and Assessment]

I am writing to advise you that an allegation of a breach of the academic integrity regulations has been made against you. This concerns your assessment for module (Title of Module). I attach a copy of the relevant section of the Students' Handbook of Regulations along with the report and evidence supplied by your module tutor/course leader.

You are required to attend an interview with (Name of (D)AIO conducting meeting) to discuss the above allegation. The meeting will take place on (date) at (time) in (venue). Please telephone my office by no later than (date – 2 working days before the hearing) on 01484 47xxxx to confirm that you will be attending. Failure to respond to this letter will result in the meeting going ahead in your absence and a decision will be made on the basis of the information contained within the hearing documentation. If the allegation is upheld, the appropriate penalty will be applied or the case may be referred to the Academic Integrity Committee.

If you intend to provide any documents or evidence to support your case please would you submit them to (name of admin contact and location) by (date – 2 working days before the hearing). If you wish to submit mitigating circumstances as to why this may have happened, you must mention them at the meeting and supply appropriate supporting evidence.

You are entitled to bring a supporter with you to the interview, normally a representative from the Students’ Union Advice Centre, another student, a member of academic staff or a member of staff from Student Services. A supporter will not normally act as an advocate.

Yours sincerely

(Deputy) Academic Integrity Officer

Encs.
Notes of an Academic Integrity Meeting established under Assessment Regulation 4 (Academic Integrity) of the Students' Handbook of Regulations, September 2015

1. The Academic Integrity Interview was convened on [DATE] to consider an allegation of breaching the regulations on academic integrity against [STUDENT NAME] with respect to module [Module Code] [(module name)].

2. The interview was conducted by [(D)AIO].

3. [XXX] Attended as note taker.

4. [Student] attended accompanied by XXXX [(their friend/husband/wife/from the SU Advice Centre)] for support.

Or

[Student] attended unaccompanied.

5. The following papers had been made available to the student: [LIST EVIDENCE]
   1. A copy of the notice of a suspected breach of academic integrity written by XXX;
   2. A copy of [Student's] original assignment;
   3. A Turnitin report for [Student's] submission;
   4. A copy of [the source material]
   5. Other evidence as appropriate

6. [(D)AIO] welcomed [Student] and explained that (s)he was an independent member of the School Academic Integrity Team and would be conducting the interview into the allegation. XXX would be taking notes of the meeting which would be sent to the student to check and sign.

7. [Student] confirmed that (s)he had received the relevant paperwork and that (s)he understood the purpose of today's meeting.

8. [If no Supporter]

   (D)AIO noted [Student] attended unaccompanied and confirmed that [student] was aware that (s)he could have had a supporter present.

   [If Supporter present] – (D)AIO will have to confirm whether the Student or the Supporter will be speaking. Only one may address the hearing; however they may confer with each other.

9. [(D)AIO] to outline the allegation against [Student]. [Include detailed summary of investigation and note any evidence referred to].

10. [(D)AIO] asked whether [Student] accepted or refuted the allegation. [Student] confirmed that they [accepted/refuted] the allegation.

   Either If the Student accepts the allegation:

11. Invite the student to present any mitigation [Record nature of mitigation and whether any evidence was presented].

12. Advise the student that they will be notified of the outcome of the meeting in writing within 5 working days.

   Or If Refuted:

11. Invite the student to present their case and/or present any evidence. [Record summary of student's case and record a summary of any questions and responses between (D)AIO and Student.]

12. Once all questions have been asked, confirm whether the student has anything else to add [Record details of information as necessary or that the student had nothing further to add]. Once the Student has confirmed that they have nothing further to add., (D)AIO advises the Student that as the allegation was refuted the matter would be referred to the University Academic Integrity Hearing for consideration.

13. Confirm that the Student will be advised of this in writing by the (D)AIO within 5 working days.

Signed: [(D)AIO]................................................................. Date...........................................
Signed: [Student]............................................................................... Date...........................................
FIRST CLASS AND EMAIL with a delivery and read receipt

Date: (Not more than 5 working days after the hearing)

Dear (student)

Allegation of breach of Academic Integrity regulations (Students’ Handbook of Regulations Section 4, Assessment Regulations 3, 4 and 5)

Thank you for attending the academic integrity interview (today/on date) related to an allegation of a breach of the Academic Integrity Regulations in module (title of module).

I enclose two copies of the record of our meeting. Please read and check carefully. If you are satisfied that the record is an accurate account of our meeting, please sign one of the copies and return to me within 5 working days. If I do not receive a signed copy I shall assume that you have accepted the report as a true record of the meeting.

I must advise you that having taken into account your statement (and mitigating evidence if appropriate) the allegation against you is upheld. In accordance with University regulations I am advising you that this letter:

1. Constitutes a formal warning that this offence will be placed on your personal student record and any repeat offence will incur a more severe penalty than that detailed below;
2. Confirms that the penalty to be applied is that the submission will be marked as originally presented; however, the offending paragraphs will not be marked;
3. Confirms that the offence will not appear on your student transcript;
4. That you seek support from the Academic Skills Tutor in relation to future assessments.

If you wish to appeal this decision this must be made in writing to the Head of Registry no more than 10 working days from the date of this letter (insert deadline date). Leave to appeal will only be granted if you can demonstrate:

1. A material irregularity has occurred or is demonstrated within the documentation.
2. Extenuating circumstances that for a very good reason were not made available at the original hearing.

If leave to appeal is granted please note that the Committee may:

- Confirm the findings and the penalty in all respects.
- Change, revise or vary the penalty in accordance with the decision of the Appeal.
- Uphold the appeal, remove the penalties and any record of the offence on the student’s file on ASIS.

Yours sincerely

(Deputy) Academic Integrity Officer
Copy: Module Tutor
Encs.
Appendix 7B
Template - Letter for Tariff 2 offence

Available for:
- Second upheld offence at pre-foundation or foundation level where previous offence would have normally attracted the standard Penalty 1
- I or H level modules where assessment is worth 10% or less of the overall module grade

FIRST CLASS AND EMAIL with a delivery and read receipt

Date: (Not more than 5 working days after the hearing)

Dear (student)

Allegation of breach of Academic Integrity regulations (Students’ Handbook of Regulations Section 4, Assessment Regulations 3, 4 and 5)

Thank you for attending the academic integrity interview (today/ on date) related to an allegation of a breach of the Academic Integrity Regulations in module (title of module).

I enclose two copies of the record of our meeting. Please read and check carefully. If you are satisfied that the record is an accurate account of our meeting, please sign one of the copies and return to me within 5 working days. If I do not receive a signed copy I shall assume that you have accepted the report as a true record of the meeting.

I must advise you that having taken into account your statement (and mitigating evidence if appropriate) the allegation against you is upheld. In accordance with University regulations I am advising you that this letter:

1. Constitutes a formal warning that this offence will be placed on your personal student record and any repeat offence will incur a more severe penalty than that detailed below;
2. Confirms that the penalty to be applied is that a mark of 0% Fail will be recorded for the assessment;
3. Confirms that the assessment will be repeated as a Tutor Reassessment OR (If no provision is made in MSD for a TR or a TR cannot be completed before the CAB) the assessment will be repeated as a formal referral in the resit period.;
4. Confirms that the offence will not appear on your student transcript;
5. That you seek support from the Academic Skills Tutor in relation to future assessments.

If you wish to appeal this decision this must be made in writing to the Head of Registry no more than 10 working days from the date of this letter (insert deadline date). Leave to appeal will only be granted if you can demonstrate:

1. A material irregularity has occurred or is demonstrated within the documentation.
2. Extenuating circumstances that for a very good reason were not made available at the original hearing.

If leave to appeal is granted please note that the Committee may:

- Confirm the findings and the penalty in all respects.
- Change, revise or vary the penalty in accordance with the decision of the Appeal.
- Uphold the appeal, remove the penalties and any record of the offence on the student’s file on ASIS.

Yours sincerely

(Deputy) Academic Integrity Officer
Copy: Module Tutor
Encs
Appendix 7C
Template - Letter for Tariff 3 offence

Available for:
- Lowest penalty relating to an examination,
- A first upheld offence at M level;
- I or H level modules where assessment is worth 10.01% or more of the overall module grade;
- the lowest offence available standard penalty for a second offence at I or H level where the earlier offence would normally have attracted the standard Penalty 2

FIRST CLASS AND EMAIL with a delivery and read receipt

Date: (Not more than 5 working days after the hearing)

Dear (student)

Allegation of breach of Academic Integrity regulations (Students' Handbook of Regulations Section 4, Assessment Regulations 3, 4 and 5)

Thank you for attending the academic integrity interview (today/ on date) related to an allegation of a breach of the Academic Integrity Regulations in module (title of module).

I enclose two copies of the record of our meeting. Please read and check carefully. If you are satisfied that the record is an accurate account of our meeting, please sign one of the copies and return to me within 10 working days. If I do not receive a signed copy I shall assume that you have accepted the report as a true record of the meeting.

I must advise you that having taken into account your statement (and mitigating evidence if appropriate) the allegation against you is upheld. In accordance with University regulations I am advising you that this letter:

1. Constitutes a formal warning that this offence will be placed on your personal student record and any repeat offence will incur a more severe penalty than that detailed below;
2. Confirms that the penalty to be applied is that a mark of 0% Fail will be recorded for the entire module;
3. Confirms that the full set of module assessment tasks are to be repeated in full in the next academic session;
4. Confirms that the offence will be recorded on your student transcript;
5. That you seek support from the Academic Skills Tutor in relation to future assessments.

If you wish to appeal this decision this must be made in writing to the Head of Registry no more than 5 working days from the date of this letter (insert deadline date). Leave to appeal will only be granted if you can demonstrate:

1. A material irregularity has occurred or is demonstrated within the documentation.
2. Extenuating circumstances that for a very good reason were not made available at the original hearing.

If leave to appeal is granted please note that the Committee may:

- Confirm the findings and the penalty in all respects.
- Change, revise or vary the penalty in accordance with the decision of the Appeal.
- Uphold the appeal, remove the penalties and any record of the offence on the student’s file on ASIS.

Yours sincerely

(Deputy) Academic Integrity Officer
Copy: Module Tutor
Encs
Appendix 7D

Template - Letter to student who refutes the allegation and referral is required to the Academic Integrity Committee

FIRST CLASS AND EMAILED with delivery and read receipt

Date: (Not more than 5 working days after the hearing)

Dear (name)

Allegation of breach of Academic Integrity regulations (Students’ Handbook of Regulations Section 4, Assessment Regulations 3, 4 and 5)

Thank you for attending the academic integrity interview (today/on date) related to an allegation of a breach of the Academic Integrity Regulations in module (title of module).

You did not accept the allegation made against you and therefore I am advising you that this will be referred to Registry who will convene an Academic Integrity Committee Hearing. Registry will be writing to you separately to invite you to the hearing.

I enclose the notes of the meeting and would be grateful if you could sign these to confirm they are a correct record of the meeting and return to (address) by (date – 5 working days from date of letter). Failure to return a copy of the signed or amended notes will be taken as your acceptance that they are a true record.

Yours sincerely

(Deputy) Academic Integrity Officer

Enc
Appendix 7E

Template - Letter to student where allegation requires referral to Academic Integrity Committee (where the penalty would be at Tariff Level 4 or 5)

FIRST CLASS AND EMAIL with a delivery and read receipt

Date: (Not more than 5 working days after the hearing)

Dear (name)

Allegation of breach of Academic Integrity regulations (Students’ Handbook of Regulations Section 4, Assessment Regulations 3, 4 and 5)

Thank you for attending the academic integrity interview (today/on date) where you accepted that allegation that you breached the Academic Integrity Regulations in relation to module (title of module).

As this is not your first offence and the level of penalty exceeds what can be imposed at the School level, I am advising you that your case will be referred to Registry who will convene an Academic Integrity Committee to consider the level of penalty to apply. Registry will be writing to you separately to invite you to the hearing.

I enclose the notes of the meeting and would be grateful if you could sign these to confirm they are a correct record of the meeting and return to (address) by (date – within 5 working days). Failure to return a copy of the signed or amended notes will be taken as your acceptance that they are a true record.

Yours sincerely

(Deputy) Academic Integrity Officer

Enc
Appendix 7F
Template- Letter for Tariff 1 preliminary offence (pre-foundation and foundation degree level only) where student did not attend hearing

FIRST CLASS AND EMAIL with a delivery and read receipt

Date: *(Not more than 5 working days after the hearing)*

Dear *(student)*

Allegation of breach of Academic Integrity regulations (Students’ Handbook of Regulations Section 4, Assessment Regulations 3, 4 and 5)

I write to advise you of the outcome of the academic integrity interview held *(today/ on date)* related to an allegation of a breach of the Academic Integrity Regulations in module *(title of module)*.

I enclose two copies of the record of the meeting, please sign one of the copies and return to me within 5 working days. If I do not receive a signed copy I shall assume that you have accepted the report.

As you did not attend the hearing or advise that you were unable to attend, the hearing was held in your absence and a decision was made on the basis of the evidence available at the time of the hearing.

I must advise you that having taken into account the evidence available at the time of the hearing the allegation against you is upheld. In accordance with University regulations I am advising you that this letter:

1. Constitutes a formal warning that this offence will be placed on your personal student record and any repeat offence will incur a more severe penalty than that detailed below;
2. Confirms that the penalty to be applied is that the submission will be marked as originally presented; however, the offending paragraphs will not be marked;
3. Confirms that the offence will not appear on your student transcript;
4. That you seek support from the Academic Skills Tutor in relation to future assessments.

Please be advised that as you did not attend the hearing or provide notification of a valid, evidenced, reason as to why you would not be able to attend the hearing, you have waived your right of appeal. This is in accordance with the Students’ Handbook of Regulations.

Yours sincerely

*(Deputy)* Academic Integrity Officer
Copy: Module Tutor
Encs
Appendix 7G
Template - Letter for Tariff 2 offence where student did not attend hearing

Available for:
- Second upheld offence at pre-foundation or foundation level where previous offence would have normally attracted the standard Penalty 1
- I or H level modules where assessment is worth 10% or less of the overall module grade

FIRST CLASS AND EMAIL with a delivery and read receipt

Date: (Not more than 5 working days after the hearing)

Dear (student)

Allegation of breach of Academic Integrity regulations (Students' Handbook of Regulations Section 4, Assessment Regulations 3, 4 and 5)

I write to advise you of the outcome of the academic integrity interview held (today/on date) related to an allegation of a breach of the Academic Integrity Regulations in module (title of module).

I enclose two copies of the record of the meeting, please sign one of the copies and return to me within 5 working days. If I do not receive a signed copy I shall assume that you have accepted the report.

As you did not attend the hearing or advise that you were unable to attend, the hearing was held in your absence and a decision was made on the basis of the evidence available at the time of the hearing.

I must advise you that having taken into account the evidence available at the time of the hearing the allegation against you is upheld. In accordance with University regulations I am advising you that this letter:

1. Constitutes a formal warning that this offence will be placed on your personal student record and any repeat offence will incur a more severe penalty than that detailed below;
2. Confirms that the penalty to be applied is that a mark of 0% Fail will be recorded for the assessment;
3. Confirms that the assessment will be repeated as a Tutor Reassessment OR (If no provision is made in MSD for a TR or a TR cannot be completed before the CAB) the assessment will be repeated as a formal referral in the resit period;
4. Confirms that the offence will not appear on your student transcript;
5. That you seek support from the Academic Skills Tutor in relation to future assessments.

Please be advised that as you did not attend the hearing or provide notification of a valid, evidenced, reason as to why you would not be able to attend the hearing, you have waived your right of appeal. This is in accordance with the Students' Handbook of Regulations.

Yours sincerely

(Deputy) Academic Integrity Officer
Copy: Module Tutor

Encs
Available for:
- Lowest penalty relating to an examination,
- A first upheld offence at M level;
- I or H level modules where assessment is worth 10.01% or more of the overall module grade;
- the lowest offence available standard penalty for a second offence at I or H level where the earlier offence would normally have attracted the standard Penalty 2)

FIRST CLASS AND EMAIL with a delivery and read receipt

Date: (Not more than 5 working days after the hearing)

Dear (student)

Allegation of breach of Academic Integrity regulations (Students’ Handbook of Regulations Section 4, Assessment Regulations 3, 4 and 5)

I write to advise you of the outcome of the academic integrity interview held (today/on date) related to an allegation of a breach of the Academic Integrity Regulations in module (title of module).

I enclose two copies of the record of the meeting, please sign one of the copies and return to me within 5 working days. If I do not receive a signed copy I shall assume that you have accepted the report.

As you did not attend the hearing or advise that you were unable to attend, the hearing was held in your absence and a decision was made on the basis of the evidence available at the time of the hearing.

I must advise you that having taken into account the evidence available at the time of the hearing the allegation against you is upheld In accordance with University regulations I am advising you that this letter:

1. Constitutes a formal warning that this offence will be placed on your personal student record and any repeat offence will incur a more severe penalty than that detailed below;

2. Confirms that the penalty to be applied is that a mark of 0% Fail will be recorded for the entire module;

3. Confirms that the full set of module assessment tasks are to be repeated in full in the next academic session;

4. Confirms that the offence will be recorded on your student transcript;

5. That you seek support from the Academic Skills Tutor in relation to future assessments.

Please be advised that as you did not attend the hearing or provide notification of a valid, evidenced, reason as to why you would not be able to attend the hearing, you have waived your right of appeal. This is in accordance with the Students’ Handbook of Regulations.

Yours sincerely

(Deputy) Academic Integrity Officer
Copy: Module Tutor
Encs
Appendix 7I

Template - Letter to student where allegation requires referral to Academic Integrity Committee (where the penalty would be at Tariff Level 4 or 5) where student did not attend hearing

FIRST CLASS AND EMAIL with a delivery and read receipt

Date: (Not more than 5 working days after the hearing)

Dear (name)

Allegation of breach of Academic Integrity regulations (Students’ Handbook of Regulations Section 4, Assessment Regulations 3, 4 and 5)

I write to advise you of the outcome of the academic integrity interview held (today/ on date) related to an allegation of a breach of the Academic Integrity Regulations in module (title of module).

As you did not attend the hearing or advise that you were unable to attend, the hearing was held in your absence and a decision was made on the basis of the evidence available at the time of the hearing. The conclusion was that the allegation should be upheld.

Please be advised that as you did not attend the hearing or provide notification of a valid, evidenced, reason as to why you would not be able to attend the hearing, you have waived your right of appeal. This is in accordance with the Students' Handbook of Regulations.

As this is not your first offence and the level of penalty exceeds what can be imposed at the School level, I am advising you that your case will be referred to Registry who will convene an Academic Integrity Committee to consider the level of penalty to apply (this Committee will not consider whether the allegation should be upheld or not). Registry will be writing to you separately to invite you to the hearing.

I enclose the notes of the meeting and would be grateful if you could sign these and return a copy to (address) by (date – within 5 working days). Failure to return a copy of the signed notes will be taken as your acceptance of the content of the notes.

Yours sincerely

(Deputy) Academic Integrity Officer

Enc
Academic Offences Reporting Form
On completion please forward one copy to Registry and one copy to your School Office

School
(D)AICO name
School admin contact
Student Name
Student Number
Course
Module Title
Module Code
Assessment being investigated

Please list any previous upheld allegations:

Date when the case was concluded  Module code  Penalty applied

Has the student accepted this allegation  Yes  No

If yes, has a penalty been applied (if a reduced penalty due to acceptance of mitigation has been agreed please attach the email from Registry agreeing to the reduction)

If no, please forward the required documents to Registry for consideration by the Academic Integrity Committee
Appendix 9

Example - Report by (D)AIO of the Investigation into alleged breaches of Academic Integrity regulations

Report by (D)AIO of the Investigation into alleged breaches of Academic Integrity regulations

Investigation into an alleged breach of the Academic Integrity Regulations by XXXXXXXXXXXX

This report presents the findings of an investigation into an alleged breach of the University’s Academic Integrity regulations by XXXXXXX on module XXXXXXX. The investigation was carried out under Section 4 of the University Regulations (September 2015). XXXXXXX is a student on the first year of BSc (Hons) XXXXXXX. He transferred to this course after completing the first year of BSc (Hons) XXXXXXX.

The investigation was carried out in accordance with the University’s procedure for dealing with academic integrity offences as presented in the Students’ Handbook of Regulations (September 2015). The allegation was that XXXXXXX copied a significant proportion of one of his assignments on module XXXXXXX from a website without acknowledgement of the source. The evidence of the alleged offence was collected through an interview with and evidence provided by the module leader, XXXXXXX. The evidence comprises a Turnitin report, a written statement from (the module tutor) (and the notes of an interview with XXXXXXX). The Turnitin report clearly indicates that a significant proportion of the assignment is taken directly from a website without acknowledgement of the source.

XXXXXXX was provided with the evidence of the alleged plagiarism and invited to an interview. XXXXXXX was interviewed by myself on XXXXXXX and was accompanied by XXXXXXX from the Students’ Union. Notes of the interview can be found in Appendix 2. XXXXXXX agreed that the work he submitted constituted academic misconduct in the form of plagiarism as defined in the Students’ Handbook of Regulations (September 2015). He presented mitigating evidence in the form of a claim that he had not fully understood the nature of the assignment. This was based on a claim that he had lost his module handbook and had acquired the assignment questions from a friend on the course. However, XXXXXXX also acknowledged that he was aware that he could have accessed a copy of the module handbook from the Unilearn website.

XXXXXXX ASIS record indicated that he had been found guilty of plagiarism in the previous academic year (13/14). This was while he was a student on the BSc (Hons) XXXXXXX course. Subsequent to the interview with XXXXXXX it was confirmed that this should be taken into account when considering the current allegations of plagiarism.

XXXXXXX was sent a copy of the notes of his interview and confirmed that they represented an accurate record (Appendix 2).

Following the interview XXXXXXX submitted a written statement in support of his mitigating circumstances (Appendix 3).

Based on the evidence and XXXXXXX admission that his work constitutes plagiarism it is my decision that this constitutes his second instance of plagiarism.

List of Documents referred to:

Turnitin Report for XXX
The students Submission for XXX
Copies of Source Text from Website
Module Tutor’s witness statement
Appendix 2 - Notes of Interview with student held on XXXX
Appendix 3 - Written Statement in support of Mitigating Circumstances

Signed: ………………………………………………………………………..  Date: …………………………………..
Role: ……………………………………………………………………………..
Appendix 10

Template Academic Integrity Hearing Letter

Our Ref:  

Date:  

(Name)  

Dear (Name)  

Section 4 – Assessment Regulations 3, 4 and 5  

Allegation of a Breach of Academic Integrity Regulations  

I have received a report of suspected breach of the regulations on Academic Integrity.  

Could you please attend an Academic Integrity Committee on (Date) to be held in (room) in the (building). You should make yourself available from (Time am/pm).  

If you intend to refer to any additional documents or if you wish to present extenuating circumstances, you must supply the paperwork to my office, Central Services Building Level 9 by noon on (date 2 working days in advance of hearing). You should note that a claim for mitigation can only be considered on the production of independent evidence which corroborates the claim.  

Members of the Committee will be:  

[List Names]  

You may bring a friend with you as support or to speak on your behalf. Most students bring someone from the Students’ Union Advice Centre, and they can be contacted on 01484 473446. Please be advised that a supporter cannot act as an advocate.  

Please confirm your attendance no later than noon on (date 2 working days in advance of hearing) (telephone no 01484 472256). I enclose a copy of the Students’ Regulations detailing the University’s regulations on suspected breaches of academic integrity; Section 4, Assessment Regulation 3 and 4 apply in particular.  

Yours sincerely  

Patricia J Mulcahy  
Office Support, Registry  

Cc School Office
Appendix 11A
Order of procedures for AIC – full case to be heard

Order of procedures for AIC – full case to be heard

Private meeting: no conflicts of interest, understood docs and no previous discussion

Open meeting

1. Welcome and introductions (including School rep and anyone accompanying the student) – and quick explanation of the process to be followed
   • to hear evidence from the School
   • to hear evidence from the student
   • to make a decision based on that evidence.

2. Chair to confirm that the student understands the allegation and has received the paperwork

3. Chair to note whether the panel membership has changed since invitation sent to student.

EITHER (If a supporter is present):

4. Chair to ask if supporter or student will be speaking
   Student to Speak – Chair to confirm that a supporter cannot act as an advocate (supporter and student may confer with each other)
   Supporter to Speak – Chair to Confirm that the student cannot address the panel (supporter and student may confer with each other)

OR (If a supporter is not present):

4. Chair to confirm that student was had been informed that they could have brought a friend/supporter. (If student claims that were unaware confirm that it was in the letter inviting them to the hearing.)

5. Chair outlines alleged offence

6. Chair asks student if s/he accepts or refutes the allegation

   **Accepts:** does s/he wish to present any mitigation?
   (Committee concludes at this point)

   **Refutes:**

7. Chair invites School to present the case

8. Chair offers the student the opportunity to make a statement

9. Witnesses (if any) are called at this point - they give their evidence and leave the room

10. School and student are given an opportunity to ask any questions

11. The Chair and the Panel are given the opportunity to ask questions.

12. The School and the student are asked to leave the hearing for the Panel to confer with respect to any final questions

13. The Panel ask any final questions and the Chair then confirms with the panel that they have no further questions

14. School is given an opportunity to make any further statements

15. Student is given an opportunity to make any further statements
(14 or 15 can be heard in private)

16. Chair confirms with everyone that a decision will normally be made within 5 working days. School and student leave.
Order of procedures for AIC – application of penalty

Private meeting: no conflicts of interest, understood docs and no previous discussion

Open meeting

1. Welcome and introductions (including School rep and anyone accompanying the student)
2. Chair to confirm that the student has received the paperwork
3. Chair to note whether the panel membership has changed since invitation sent to student.

EITHER (If a supporter is present):

4. Chair to ask if supporter or student will be speaking
   Student to Speak – Chair to confirm that a supporter cannot act as an advocate (supporter and student may confer with each other)
   Supporter to Speak – Chair to Confirm that the student cannot address the panel (supporter and student may confer with each other)

OR (If a supporter is not present):

4. Chair to confirm that student had been made aware that they could have brought a friend/supporter. (If student claims that were unaware confirm that it was in the letter inviting them to the hearing.)
5. Chair:
   - Confirms the nature of the offence
   - reconfirms that it has been accepted
   - explains that purpose of the meeting is to apply a penalty
   - this is an opportunity for the student to offer mitigation
6. Chair invites School to summarise the case
7. Chair offers the student the opportunity to make a statement of mitigation
8. School and student are given an opportunity to ask any questions
9. The Chair and the Panel are given the opportunity to ask questions.
10. The School and the student are asked to leave the hearing for the Panel to confer with respect to any final questions
11. The Panel ask any final questions and the Chair then confirms with the panel that they have no further questions
12. Chair confirms with the panel if they have any further questions
13. School is given an opportunity to make any further statements
14. Student is given an opportunity to make any further statements
   (13 or 14 can be heard in private)
15. Chair confirms with everyone that a decision will normally be made within 5 working days. School and student leave.
Notes on managing allegations of ghosting

Ghosting includes the following:
Submission of work presented as the student's own which has been purchased, commissioned or otherwise acquired from another person (including internet sellers) whether or not specifically produced for that student or "off the shelf".

Tutors have found it very difficult to manage these allegations and identify the best way to approach students where ghosting is suspected.

The following scenario is based on a case brought against a postgraduate student during the 2009/10 session (expanded to include further suggestions on what actions could be taken).

The student had submitted a research proposal which was completely at odds with other interactions between the student and tutors leading to doubts over its authenticity as a piece of work created entirely by the student. Particular discrepancies included:
- Highly fluent expression in English compared to contributions during seminars in very limited and broken English
- Clear articulation of complex academic concepts which had not been demonstrated in other areas of the student's work

Before deciding whether or not to submit a formal allegation the tutor and moderator held a meeting with the student to discuss the work to try to get a feel for its authenticity. The student was invited to bring a friend along with her if she wanted and was asked to bring any notes or background work with her. The meeting was held along the lines of an informal tutorial but the student was told in advance that the purpose of the meeting was to determine her understanding of the work in question in light of concerns that the work may not be entirely the student’s own work.

At the meeting, the tutors attempted to clarify with the student:
- What had led her to choose this particular topic
- Her understanding of the research methodology that had been used in this assignment
- Questions about the actual content of the work
- What types of sources she had used and how she had identified them
- The extent to which she had discussed or shared her work with another party

It was also noted that the student had not taken up any offers for tutorials or formative feedback when completing the assignment which was different to previous assignments when drafts had been submitted for feedback.

The questions were first asked in a style that would be deemed appropriate for a postgraduate student who had recently conducted a piece of research. When it became apparent that the student did not understand the questions, the same issues were covered in more basic language – again the student could not respond.

The tutors reached the conclusion that an allegation of ghosting should be brought based on:
- Lack of understanding regarding the texts which had been used
- Lack of knowledge regarding the assignment content
- Concerns over the student’s ability to express herself in English a) in this subject area and b) at the same level evidenced in the assignment.

A report was submitted by the tutors to the (D)AIO. The student was advised of the allegation in the normal manner and was invited to a meeting with the (D)AIO where the same ground was covered that had previously been discussed with the tutor but this time it was in the context of a formal academic integrity hearing.

At this meeting, the (D)AIO compared the assignment in question with a range of other assignments submitted by the student and explored with the student issues around her style of writing and the significant improvement in the language, the structure and the analysis in the assignment. The student did not recognise any differences and had no satisfactory explanation why her previous submissions achieved a narrow pass mark and were written in a completely different style.
The student refuted the allegation. However, the (D)AIO concluded that ghosting had taken place and the case was referred to the Academic Integrity Committee. The Academic Integrity Committee received all of the evidence (including copies of other assignments by the student).

The Committee’s questions focussed on:
- The student’s own assessment of her spoken and written English and any IELTS scores
- Concerns raised by the staff at earlier points in the session regarding the student’s English ability
- Clarification of how the student went about writing assignments in general and this one in particular
- Her use of translation software and whether the assessment had been written in English or in her native language and subsequently translated through software
- Involvement of a third party as a proof-reader and the extent to or areas in which changes had been suggested by this person (the student was asked to provide any documentation that supported her claims in this respect)
- The lack of any earlier versions and how the student had approached the assignment without now being able to provide evidence of research undertaken
- The student’s view on having been unable to explain the work or the methodologies adopted when questioned at School level

The Committee upheld the allegation and cited the following grounds for doing so:
- The very articulate and professional style and tone of the written submissions compared to the student’s extreme difficulty in following and contributing to the Committee’s discussions which required repeated clarification and rephrasing
- The lack of available evidence in terms of draft versions or examples of marked up proof read texts
- The lack of evidence in terms of any statement provided by the proof reader in support of the case or any evidence regarding the type of amendments arising from a proof-reading exercise
- The student’s inability to explain her work and the methodologies adopted when completing the assignment

A summary of points to consider in cases of ghosting – some points are specific to cases where the student’s first language is not English:
- English ability demonstrated elsewhere on the course/in assignments
- Student’s own style of writing and structuring an essay – if anything prompted a particular change with respect to this assignment
- Student’s approach to this particular assignment
- Student’s general academic ability as demonstrated in previous assessments
- Extent to which a third party may have been involved in the assignment in terms of proof reading:
  - Statements from the proof reader
  - Indication of typical changes/amendments made
  - Draft versions of the assessment annotated by the proof reader
  - The possible use of translation software
- Student’s understanding during discussions with tutor/(D)AIO
  - Key concepts in the assessment
  - Range of sources quoted in the assessment
  - Research methodology employed
- Formative feedback:
  - Did the student approach tutors for feedback on drafts
  - Similarity of the final piece compared to earlier versions seen by tutors
  - Comparison of the extent to which the student usually seeks formative feedback compared specifically to the feedback sought for this assignment
- Availability of draft versions of the assignment to show progress and development of the ideas – or other research notes that relate directly to the final submission
Members are asked to consider the amended Academic Integrity Penalties for collusion

1 The April 2015 meeting of QSAG considered and approved interim measures for the application of penalties in collusion cases pending the development of a new academic integrity policy or code of conduct for September 2016.

2 Subsequent implementation of these interim measures have shown that there is potential for misinterpretation and therefore inconsistency of approach, which needs directly addressing in the document. Attached below is a copy of the original document, as approved by QSAG, with tracked changes showing the proposed amendments. The amendments address the following concerns:

   a. That the document should clearly outline a set of penalties to be applied when an allegation of collusion is upheld which, depending on the circumstances, will differ from the standard tariff of penalties set out in the Student Handbook of Regulations; for example issuing a written warning rather than standard penalty 3.

   b. The current drafting may be interpreted and applied with the effect that the severity of the penalty for a first time failure to safeguard offence is greater than the penalty applied for a student who actively supplies their work for another student to copy.

3 QSAG is asked to consider and approve the amendments.

4. If the proposed amendments are not approved, QSAG is asked to confirm that it is their intention that failure by a student to safeguard their own work should carry a more severe penalty on a first offence, than a case of a student actively supplying their own work for another student to copy.

Registry
February 2016
University of Huddersfield

QSAG

02 April 2015

Academic Integrity Penalties for collusion

Members are invited to consider the proposals for the application of penalties in cases of collusion between two students.

Background
At its meeting in September 2014, QSAG requested Registry and the Students’ Union to undertake further work with respect to sector practice for collusion regulations and the typical penalties applied.

Registry and the SU met and formulated proposals for consideration by QSAG in December. That meeting identified a concern over the penalties to be applied in cases where:

- it was unclear if the student had safeguarded their own work
- it was determined that the students had failed to safeguard their own work.

The Group asked for the paper to be revised to include proposals on these issues and for a revised paper to be submitted to the February meeting.

An unchanged paper was inadvertently submitted for consideration in February. Following that meeting the intended proposals have been further discussed and the final proposals are detailed below.

General
The initial concern was raised by the SU who felt that students who have provided their own work for another student to copy should not face a penalty which may directly lead to the failure of their course and exclusion from the University. The SU strongly felt that the student providing the work may be doing so inadvertently or under pressure from the other student.

Separate surveys of sector practice were undertaken by Registry and the SU. The combined results showed that, out of a total of 18 HEIs who replied, 3 would bring a case along the lines pursued at Huddersfield; there were more frequent references to ‘conscious collaboration’ or ‘knowingly permitting another student to copy their work’ without specific reference to ‘safeguarding’.

Proposal
It is proposed that, in the longer term (for introduction in September 2016 at the latest), a wider-ranging University policy or code of conduct on academic integrity is developed in consultation with the Students’ Union. This document should:

- indicate that the responsibility for safeguarding work rests exclusively with the student whose work it is and that any sharing or provision of work is not permitted except with the explicit permission of tutors. From the point of introduction of the policy, any student who is found to have facilitated access to their work by another student will face the standard penalty in accordance with the list of penalties in force at the time
- be provided to students on arrival and be explicitly covered as part of induction
- be incorporated into the Academic Integrity Resource which is completed by all students before or shortly after registration
- be the subject a publicity/promotion campaign during the first term of each academic session.

There should be a more formalised system of training for colleagues appointed as (D)AIOs and that no one should be allowed to take up this role until that formal training has been completed.

In the shorter term while the University establishes a more detailed academic integrity policy, the following is proposed:

1. The regulation regarding a student’s responsibility to safeguard their own work should be maintained in the Regulations
2. However, (D)AIOs and Academic Integrity Committees be advised that, as an interim measure only pending the introduction of a new Academic Integrity Policy or Code of Conduct, in cases of collusion between two students which revolve around a piece of work having been passed from one student to another, the following process should apply for applying a penalty:

   **Supplying the work**
   a. An Academic Integrity Committee (AIC)/(D)AIO has accepted that a student has taken reasonable steps to safeguard their work but it has been copied as a result of theft or being available as an open resource
      The allegation is not upheld against the student who wrote the original assessment - no penalty is applied (it is expected that this will be established early in the process by the investigating (D)AIO to allow a prompt withdrawal of any allegation).

   b. A panel/(D)AIO has concluded that Student A has supplied Student B with their work – this may be as a result of:
      i. an admission from Student A that they supplied the work
         (this can be concluded at School level by the (D)AIO)
      ii. there is no admission from Student A and the case has been referred to the AIC and the AIC’s own conclusion is that, on the balance of probabilities, Student A did supply the work
      iii. an admission from Student A that they failed to safeguard their own work
         (this can be concluded at School level by the (D)AIO)
      iv. there is no admission from the student and the case has been referred to the AIC and the AIC’s own conclusion is that, on the balance of probabilities, the student failed to safeguard their work.

**Penalty to be applied**

**First allegation** In cases where the AIC/(D)AIO upholds an allegation that a student has supplied their work to another or has failed to safeguard their own work and it is the student’s first academic integrity offence, the student will receive standard penalty #1 and formally warned in writing that:
- their behaviour is unacceptable
- if they breach the academic integrity regulations in the future, this case will be treated for the purposes of the academic integrity regulations as having been a first offence under the regulations and the standard tariff of penalties set out in Appendix 3 of the Student Handbook of Regulations will apply to any second or subsequent breach of the academic integrity regulations.

The warning will be held on ASIS but will not appear on the transcript.

**Second or subsequent allegation**
In cases where the AIC/(D)AIO upholds an allegation that a student has supplied their work to another or has failed to safeguard their own work, and this is the student’s second or subsequent upheld academic integrity offence, the standard tariff of penalties set out in Appendix 3 of the Student Handbook of Regulations will apply.

**Copying the work**

- A student has admitted copying another student’s work with or without their knowledge. An AIC/(D)AIO concludes that a student has copied another student’s work with or without their knowledge.

The allegation is upheld and the standard tariff of penalties set out in Appendix 3 of the Student Handbook of Regulations will apply.

**Unclear which of the two parties may have written the piece and which may have copied it**

- It is clear from the two pieces that there has been collusion but both parties maintain that the work is their own and the AIC cannot distinguish the author from the copier (such a case would always be referred to the AIC for resolution).

If the AIC upholds the allegation the standard tariff of penalties set out in Appendix 3 of the Student Handbook of Regulations will apply in respect of each student.

QSAG is asked to approve these proposals for immediate implementation.

Students’ Union and Registry
March 2015