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Academic Integrity

The University understands that if the academic and professional achievements of its staff and the qualifications of its students are to carry weight in the world they must have been honestly and fairly gained and be seen to have been so gained. As a corollary of its commitment to maintaining the academic standards of its awards and qualifications, the University is committed to promoting academic integrity and ethical behaviour in the work of all its students and staff.

This statement reflects the University's recognition that its qualifications are used by employers and third parties (including other universities) as proxies not only for the achievements of its graduates but for their personal integrity and reliability. For that reason, academic misconduct by an individual not only casts doubt on the genuineness of their own achievement but has the potential to taint the achievements of others and the University unless it is identified and dealt with.

What constitutes academic integrity?

1. The University is committed in all it does to support academic integrity which it considers is based on honesty, trust, fairness, respect, and responsibility. [Supporting Academic Integrity. Approaches and resources for higher education, HEA/JISC Academic Integrity Service, 2010, p. 3]
   
   • honesty – in making and keeping commitments, in straightforward dealing with fellow students and staff, in not misrepresenting the work of others as one's own
   
   • fairness – in the consistent way students and staff are treated, their work rated and reported, academic matters are handled, and dishonesty and misconduct are dealt with
   
   • trust – earned by honesty and fairness, that enables ideas, scholarship, research and work to be shared, without fear that it will be misrepresented or misappropriated
   
   • respect – for the work and contributions of others by acknowledging when they are referred to, and for the contributions of staff and students, shown by preparing in advance for learning sessions, attending on time, being attentive to the tutor or instructor and to what others have to say, being courteous, respectful, helpful, and meeting deadlines
   
   • responsibility – recognising that all the members of the University share responsibility for safeguarding its values and reputation, upholding the University's regulations, in accepting responsibility for one's actions, in not ignoring the dishonesty of others.

In the light of the above the University has based its approach to dealing with academic misconduct on promoting academic integrity, through explaining why it is essential, before describing what behaviours and practices constitute academic misconduct and how it deals with them.

Avoiding academic misconduct

The University seeks to ensure that students studying for its awards and qualifications can be confident that academic misconduct is treated consistently. This is one reason why the area of academic misconduct has been brought into the University's Academic Regulations, which are required to be applied uniformly institution-wide, subject to the overriding need for individuals to be treated fairly.

Academic misconduct and poor academic practice

Students who are new to the University may need to adjust to Surrey's requirements for academic integrity and its approach to academic misconduct. The University recognises it has a duty to ensure that students understand its approaches to these matters so that they can understand how to avoid being accused of academic misconduct without good cause.

The University requires that all those who teach its newly arrived students and those who act as personal tutors should be able to explain to students what is meant by the term 'academic integrity' and how, through adopting good academic practice, students can avoid being accused of academic misconduct.

For plagiarism, which is the form of academic misconduct most often encountered, the University expects all those who teach newly arrived students to encourage them to complete the plagiarism modules on the University's virtual learning environment that are appropriate to the subjects they are studying. Tutors should also advise students of the availability of advice and support from the University's Student Personal Learning and Study Hub (SPLASH). Students in Associated and Accredited Institutions should be directed to the equivalent resources provided by their own Institution.

Academic misconduct

2 Practices and actions that undermine academic integrity have the capacity to diminish the value of the University’s awards to their holders and damage the University's reputation. They constitute academic misconduct.

3 The University's definition of academic misconduct is

   Acts or omissions by a student that have the potential to give an unfair advantage in assessments.

4 The University's regulations and procedures for addressing academic misconduct by undergraduate students (including students studying for CertHE, DipHE, and FD awards) and taught postgraduate students studying for higher awards, are consistent with the relevant provisions of its regulations and procedures for addressing academic misconduct by students studying for higher awards by research.¹

Plagiarism

Academic misconduct: plagiarism and academic judgement

Reviewing assessed work submitted by a student, and assessing whether it includes the products of academic misconduct (such as plagiarised material or material that is the product of collusion) requires the careful application of academic judgement and subject expertise by academic staff.

¹ For academic integrity and academic misconduct with respect to postgraduate students undertaking research see Annex 1, page 17.
Academic Integrity Officers are key figures in the University's Academic Integrity procedures. Tutors who suspect that a piece of assessed work contains plagiarised material will seek the guidance of the relevant Academic Integrity Officer, who will advise how the results of the diagnostic tests the tutor has made should be interpreted, how they should be explained to the student and how, on the basis of the particular way what appears to be plagiarism has occurred, the student should be dealt with and how they should be advised to proceed in order to avoid a recurrence.

Tutors will not accept failure to understand what constitutes plagiarism, pressure of time, or conflicting deadlines for assessed work, as sufficient explanations for the submission of plagiarised material. Tutors will remind students that where they know that there are good reasons why they will be unable to submit assessed work by the required deadline, they are to make this known to the person designated in their programme handbook to deal with assessment deadlines, and request an extension. Individual tutors and module coordinators are not authorised to grant extensions to assessment deadlines, other than where they are the person explicitly designated to do so in the programme handbook.

Plagiarism is the academic misconduct most frequently encountered by the University, which defines it as

- inserting words, concepts, or images from the work of someone else into work submitted for assessment without acknowledging the originator's contribution and
- representing the work of another as one's own, whether purchased or not, or taken with or without permission.

Forms in which plagiarism can be encountered include

- collusion, in which work that has been set to be undertaken by an individual is undertaken by more than one person but is submitted as the work of an individual
- personation, in which one person represents themselves as another person in order to undertake an assessment (including an examination) for the person for whom they have substituted
- acquiring work to pass off as your own from services and individuals that provide essays, papers, reports, graphics, compositions, program-code, and programs
- providing work for another to pass off as their own (whether that person is a student of the University or another institution)
- passing off work as original that has already been assessed (whether by the University or another institution).

The definition of 'collusion' set out above distinguishes between work that has been set to be completed by an individual and work that has been set by the tutor to be undertaken by a group. Where, in accordance with these Regulations, group assignments provide for work to be submitted that has been undertaken collectively, with marks recorded for collective and individual achievement, students take care to identify those parts undertaken collectively and their individual contributions.

Declaration of originality

In order to be sure that its students understand the importance it attaches to academic integrity the University requires that work they submit for assessment is accompanied by a signed and dated 'Declaration of Originality'. The wording of this Declaration is as follows:
'I confirm that the submitted work is my own work and that I have clearly identified and fully acknowledged all material that is entitled to be attributed to others (whether published or unpublished) using the referencing system set out in the programme handbook. I agree that the University may submit my work to means of checking this, such as the plagiarism detection service Turnitin® UK. I confirm that I understand that assessed work that has been shown to have been plagiarised will be penalised.'

'In completing this work I have been assisted with its presentation by [state name and contact details of assistant] and, if requested, I agree to submit the draft material that was completed solely by me prior to its presentational improvement.' [This paragraph is to be deleted where it is not relevant.]

**Assistance by third parties and academic misconduct**

The University reminds its students that being assisted by individuals or services to prepare work that is to be submitted for assessment by proof-reading and/or correcting English may bring into question whether they have engaged in academic misconduct. The University therefore requires that assistance by paid or unpaid proof-readers is declared when completing the Declaration of Originality that must be made for each piece of assessed work (see paragraph 7).

In cases where markers consider that the student's work for assessment might have been completed with the assistance of another person, the University may require that the finished work is submitted together with the draft material that was given to the person to proof-read and/or correct. This is to enable those marking the work to establish (where necessary) that the intellectual and conceptual content of the work is wholly the responsibility of the student submitting it.

8 Where the presentation (including language, syntax, spelling and layout) of a student's work for assessment has been assisted by another person, the University may, at its discretion, require that the finished work is submitted together with the draft material that was given to the person to proof-read and/or correct.

It is acknowledged good practice for authors to retain successive drafts of their work as a precaution against its loss and to enable them to trace its development and improvement for their own benefit. Students are strongly advised to keep successive copies of drafts of work that is to be submitted for assessment for their own benefit, and to enable them, if challenged, to counter any suspicion that they have been unfairly assisted to produce work to be submitted for assessment.

9 Where the presentation of assessed work has been assisted by a third party, failure to declare such assistance, or to provide the draft material submitted for proof-reading where requested, may be dealt with under the University's Academic Misconduct Procedures.

**Assistance from third-parties in the presentation of assessed work where the learning outcomes for a module include demonstrating facility with written English**

10 Meeting the learning outcomes for a module may include an explicit requirement that the student demonstrates their facility with written English. Where this is the case, recourse by the student to assistance in the completion of assessed work from third parties, through proof-reading and correcting English (not including the use by the student of dictionaries, thesauruses and spell-checkers) constitutes academic misconduct and may be dealt with under the University's Academic Misconduct Procedures.
Personation and impersonation

11 The University defines personation in the context of academic misconduct as
   • assuming the identity of another in order to mislead or deceive
   • allowing another to assume your identity in order to mislead or deceive.

[Impersonation is where the appearance of a first person is assumed by a second person. Personation may or may not involve impersonation.]

Personation (with or without impersonation) is a form of academic misconduct. An instance of personation might be associated, for example, with an individual passing themselves off as another for the purpose of submitting an assessment, attending to sit for an assessment, attending an award ceremony, collecting an award qualification, or engaging in any other act or failure to act that enables someone to gain an unfair academic advantage, a financial or other advantage (such as a bursary) or gain an award or qualification to which they are not entitled.

12 Where there is evidence that what appears to be personation or impersonation has taken place the tutor, invigilator, or other person who has identified the possible academic misconduct reports the matter to the relevant Academic Integrity Officer. The Officer reviews the evidence and, advised by the relevant Associate Dean and Academic Registry, determines whether the matter is to be dealt with through the University's Academic Misconduct Procedures or otherwise, such as through the University's Disciplinary Procedures.

Collusion

13 The University defines collusion in assessments as two or more students working together, in an unauthorised fashion, to share materials and/or findings for submission to the University as an assessment produced separately by each.

14 Where a tutor identifies material that appears to show evidence of collusion in work submitted for assessment by two or more students, the tutor consults the relevant Academic Integrity Officer and they review the material together. Where material that appears to show evidence of collusion is identified in the assessments of two or more students, and the Academic Integrity Officer is able to confirm that the instructions provided with the assignment required that the work was to be undertaken and submitted for assessment individually, the matter is dealt with under the University's Academic Misconduct Procedures.

15 Where students whose work has been investigated for possible collusion are able to demonstrate that the terms in which the relevant assignment were set were insufficiently clear to enable them to determine whether the work was to be undertaken singly or collectively, and the Academic Integrity Officer concurs with this view, the students will not be considered to have colluded.

The phrase 'unauthorised fashion' in paragraph 13 marks the University's recognition that work may be expressly set to be undertaken by a group of students working together.

Other forms of academic misconduct

Making false claims

16 Academic misconduct can also take the form of misrepresentation, such as
   • falsely claiming
     • qualifications that are not validly held or experience (including practice-based or performance experience) that has not been acquired
to have undertaken work, including empirical investigations, research, and interviews

17 Where a student appears to have falsely claimed to have qualifications that they do not hold, experience they have not acquired, or to have undertaken work when they have not done so, the relevant Academic Integrity Officer will consult with the Associate Dean and the Deputy Registrar in order to determine whether to refer the matter to the University's Disciplinary Procedures, its Fitness to Practise Procedures, or its Academic Misconduct Procedures.

Fabricating results and misrepresenting data

18 Where a tutor identifies results from laboratory or other work, including research work that has been submitted for assessment that appear to have been fabricated, or data that appears to have been misrepresented, they consult the relevant Academic Integrity Officer and they review the materials together. Where they agree that the results appear to have been fabricated, or the data has been misrepresented, the matter is dealt with under the University's Academic Misconduct Procedures.

Introducing unauthorised materials and/or devices into an examination

19 Introducing unauthorised textual materials or bringing an unauthorised mechanical or electronic device into an examination room or ancillary area, such as a cloakroom or toilets, constitutes academic misconduct.

20 Where there is evidence that a student has brought unauthorised material or devices into an examination room or associated area the tutor, invigilator, or other person who has identified the possible academic misconduct reports the matter to the relevant Academic Integrity Officer. The Officer reviews the evidence and, advised by the relevant Associate Dean and Academic Registry, determines whether the matter is to be dealt with through the University's Academic Misconduct Procedures or otherwise, such as through the University's Disciplinary procedures.

Possible academic misconduct in work submitted by students entering a programme with advanced standing

21 Students who are admitted to the University with advanced standing part-way through a programme may need to adjust to the University's requirements for academic integrity and its procedures for dealing with academic misconduct. For such students, the submission of work for assessment that is found to be the product of academic misconduct in the first six months of their studies with the University may be dealt with under the procedures described in paragraphs 30-37 with the agreement of the Programme Director, the Associate Dean and the Office for Student Complaints, Appeals and Regulation (OSCAR).

Possible academic misconduct by a student registered with another University or higher education institution

22 A student studying with the University may be registered for the award of another University or higher education institution. Where the studies undertaken by the student are subject to a formal agreement between the University and the student's 'home' institution the University follows the procedures set out in the formal agreement in any case of possible academic misconduct by the student.

Where a student who is studying with the University is registered for the award of another institution their studies may not always be conducted under a formal agreement between the two institutions. The following paragraph addresses such a case
23 Possible academic misconduct by a student studying with the University, whose studies are not covered by a formal agreement between the two institutions, is reported by the relevant Academic Integrity Officer to OSCAR. In such a case (and with the advice and approval of the Vice-President and Deputy Vice-Chancellor (Academic Affairs)) OSCAR will liaise with the student's 'home' institution. Subject to the approval of the Vice-President and Deputy Vice-Chancellor (Academic Affairs), evidence and reports collected by the University of Surrey tutor who marked the work, and the Academic Integrity Officer, may be provided to the student's 'home' institution and the student through OSCAR.

**Academic misconduct committed by a former student**

24 In cases where a former student of the University is found to have achieved their award through academic misconduct Senate may resolve to rescind the award by the powers conferred on it by University of Surrey Statute 18. In such a case, and following the relevant meeting of Senate, the University inserts a notice in The London Gazette stating that the student's award has been rescinded.

**Academic Misconduct Procedures**

**Responsibilities**

25 Academic misconduct is of concern to all staff and student members of the University and its avoidance requires their constant attention. Senate, on behalf of the University has delegated the responsibility for managing academic integrity and academic misconduct procedures to the Deans of the Faculties advised by, among others, the University's Academic Integrity Officers and its Associate Deans (Learning and Teaching).

26 Faculties deal with cases of possible academic misconduct through the work of the Academic Integrity Officers and cases of possible academic misconduct are heard by Academic Misconduct Panels. These Panels are convened at Faculty level under the authority of the Dean of the Faculty to address possible instances of academic misconduct and make recommendations. Further information on the work of Academic Misconduct panels can be found in paragraphs 44-73.

**Academic misconduct and cross-faculty studies**

27 Where a student follows a programme of studies with the University in more than one Faculty any matters to do with possible academic misconduct are initially dealt with by the Academic Integrity Officer for the relevant subject area, even when this is not in the student's home Faculty. If the matter is subsequently referred to a hearing by an Academic Misconduct Panel, however, the Panel is organised and managed by the student's home Faculty advised by the relevant Academic Integrity Officer(s) for the student's area of studies.

**Confidentiality**

28 The University deals with academic misconduct matters in confidence, to the extent that this is compatible with making enquiries and holding meetings to consider the matter. Papers, emails, and telephone conversations that are connected to an instance (or possible instance) of academic misconduct are kept securely and are not disclosed where it is not strictly necessary as part of the Academic Misconduct Procedure. All those involved observe the requirements of confidentiality in all matters to do with academic misconduct and information to which the University, the University of Surrey Students' Union or their staff are party.
In no case will assessed work that appears to be the product of academic misconduct be submitted to the University's Academic Misconduct Procedures unless it has been checked by more than one member of academic staff, including at least one Academic Integrity Officer.

**Note: fitness to practise considerations**

In all cases where there is a fitness to practise aspect to the potential academic misconduct the matter is handled under the University's Regulations for Fitness to Practise and may involve reference to the University's Standing Fitness to Practise Panel.

**How the University deals with instances of possible academic misconduct in work submitted by a newly admitted Foundation Level student or FHEQ Level 4 student and in the first unit of assessment submitted by a taught postgraduate student studying for a higher degree**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>The University's procedures for addressing instances of possible academic misconduct recognise the need to discriminate between work submitted for assessment by a student who is new to the University, and may be the product of poor scholarly technique (or a misunderstanding of what constitutes academic misconduct), and work that is, more likely than not, the product of academic misconduct. For students new to the University Its Academic Misconduct Procedures therefore emphasise the importance of assisting students to identify what constitutes academic integrity and academic misconduct and how to avoid the latter, while retaining sanctions where academic misconduct has been identified. When they are dealing with work that may be the product of academic misconduct, tutors, Academic Integrity Officers, and other professional advisers are not required to enquire into a student’s state of mind, or motivation, but to identify material that indicates academic misconduct and, where possible, the extent and source of such material. In all cases where a student is notified by the University that work they have submitted for assessment appears to contain evidence of academic misconduct they will find it helpful to inform their personal tutor without delay and seek their advice, and to consult a Students' Union official and seek their advice.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Where a tutor identifies work what appears to be evidence of academic misconduct in work submitted for assessment by a Foundation Level or FHEQ Level 4 student (see paragraphs 5, 6, 11, 13, 16, 18 or 19), or in the first unit of assessment submitted by a taught postgraduate student, the tutor consults the relevant Academic Integrity Officer. If the tutor is also the Academic Integrity Officer they will consult another tutor or Academic Integrity Officer (see paragraph 29). Through joint discussions the tutor and the Academic Integrity Officer reach an initial view on whether the work appears to be the product of academic misconduct. In coming to this view they consider the advice of any specialist consulted by the Academic Integrity Officer and (where relevant) any testing service authorised by the University – such as Turnitin®. The Academic Integrity Officer will also check whether the student is a newly arrived Foundation Level or FHEQ Level 4 student or, for a taught postgraduate student, whether the work forms part or all of their first submitted unit of assessment whether the individual's Student Progression Information record in SITS shows that they have previously submitted work that has been found to be the product of academic misconduct.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Where the Student Progression Information record shows that the student is not a newly arrived Foundation Level or FHEQ Level 4 student the potential academic misconduct is referred to an Academic Misconduct Panel for hearing. Likewise, where the individual's Student Progression Information record in SITS shows that they have previously submitted work that has been found to be the product of academic misconduct the potential academic misconduct is referred to an Academic Misconduct Panel for hearing.

**Formal discussion with the Academic Integrity Officer**

Where work submitted for assessment by a Foundation Level or FHEQ Level 4 student, or by a taught postgraduate student as part or all of their first unit of assessment, appears to be the product of academic misconduct, and assessed work produced by that student has not formerly been penalised for academic misconduct, the Academic Integrity Officer writes to the student to require that they attend for a formal discussion of their work. The letter to the student explains that

- they have submitted work for assessment that appears to be the product of academic misconduct
- the discussion they are required to attend forms part of the University's approved procedures for academic misconduct; and that
- when they attend the interview they may be accompanied by a friend (who may be an official of the University of Surrey Students' Union (or its equivalent for Associated and Accredited Institutions).

The Academic Integrity Officer will also notify the student's personal tutor of the matter, in confidence.

The meeting between the Academic Integrity Officer and the student is a formal discussion. It is also attended by the tutor who marked the work and the student may be accompanied by a friend. The meeting provides an opportunity for the Academic Integrity Officer and the tutor ask the student how they approached the assessment task, to show the student (and their friend) how what appears to be the product of academic misconduct was identified in the assessed work, and to hear any explanation or claim for extenuating circumstances the student may wish to advance.

**Extenuating circumstances**

Where the student claims that there were valid extenuating circumstances these are subjected to the University's standard procedures for their evaluation and verification (see Regulations for Extenuating Circumstances). Where the Academic Integrity Officer is able to confirm that extenuating circumstances apply in a particular case they advise the Chair of the relevant assessment or examination board accordingly.

**Poor academic practice**

Where the Academic Integrity Officer finds that the student's assessed work was the product of poor academic practice, rather than academic misconduct, they recommend to the relevant assessment or examination board that poor academic practice has been noted, and update the individual's Student Progression Information record in SITS to that effect so that follow-up action may be monitored. The Academic Integrity Officer will also

- direct the student to the University's SPLASH service
- direct the student to the University's Plagiarism Modules provided through its virtual learning environment
- advise the student to review their understanding of academic integrity and scholarly technique with their personal tutor
• notify the student's personal tutor so that they may support the student and follow up their work with SPLASH and the University's Plagiarism Modules.

37 Where the Academic Integrity Officer has heard the student and, advised by the tutor, comes to the view that it is likely that the assessed work was the product of academic misconduct they refer the matter to be heard by an Academic Misconduct Panel.

38 Where a student fails to attend a formal discussion with an Academic Integrity Officer in connection with a possible instance of academic misconduct the Officer refers the matter to an Academic Misconduct Panel.

**Instances of possible academic misconduct in work submitted by students who are not new to the University**

39 Where a student who is not new to the University submits work for assessment that appears to contain the products of academic misconduct the procedures set out in paragraphs 30-38 do not apply but the tutor and the Academic Integrity Officer perform the checks described in paragraph 31. Where they find possible evidence of academic misconduct they convene formal discussions with the student, who may be accompanied by a friend (who may be an official of the University of Surrey Students’ Union).

40 The purpose of formal discussions between the Academic Integrity Officer, the tutor and the student is to give the student an opportunity to alert the tutor and the Academic Integrity Officer to any previously undisclosed extenuating circumstances and to hear the student's account of how the work was produced. Any claim by the student that there are valid extenuating circumstances is tested against the University's criteria (see Regulations for Extenuating Circumstances) and may be submitted to an Extenuating Circumstances Panel.

41 Where, following these discussions, the Academic Integrity Officer and the tutor come to an initial view that the work is more likely than not the product of poor academic practice, rather than academic misconduct, they require the student to undertake the learning activities described in paragraph 36 and may refer them for follow-up sessions with their personal tutor and/or the University's learning support services.

42 Where the Student Progression Information record shows that the individual has previously been advised of poor academic practice the Academic Integrity Officer consults the relevant Associate Dean (Learning and Teaching) in order to determine with their advice the most suitable means of helping the student to improve their academic practice. The Academic Integrity Officer also updates the individual's Student Progression Information record in SITS, accordingly.

43 Where the Academic Integrity Officer and the tutor, after completing the checks described in paragraph 31, and holding formal discussions with the student, come to the view that it is likely that the work in question is the product of academic misconduct they refer the matter to be heard by an Academic Misconduct Panel.

**Academic Misconduct Panels**

Where a student is informed that they have submitted work that appears to be the product of- or appears to contain material that is the product of- academic misconduct the University recognises the need to have the matter dealt with fairly, reasonably, and in a timely manner.

44 Academic Misconduct Panels are convened at Faculty level under the authority of the Dean of the Faculty to address possible instances of academic misconduct. They are normally convened by the Faculty Office acting on behalf of the Dean. Academic Misconduct panels conduct themselves in accordance with the relevant sections of the University’s Regulations for Hearings by Panels.
Communications with the student

45 Not less than five working days before a proposed Academic Misconduct Panel hearing the relevant Faculty Office writes to the student to

- confirm in writing the date, time and place for the meeting
- provide a copy of the material that will be considered by the Academic Misconduct Panel and of the procedures to be followed by the Panel
- confirm whether the tutor (or tutors) who marked the relevant work and the Academic Integrity Officer are likely to attend the meeting to advise the Panel and answer its questions
- remind the student that they may be accompanied by a friend
- remind the student of the penalties that an Academic Misconduct Panel may recommend

46 The letter and/or email from the Faculty Office containing this information is sent to the student's email address and their current postal address as held by the University. The letter requests the student to acknowledge its receipt immediately.

Failure to respond to a request to attend an Academic Misconduct Panel

47 Where a student does not acknowledge receipt of the letter and/or email that requests them to attend a hearing by an Academic Misconduct Panel within three working days the Faculty Office attempts to contact them by telephone and text message. If the student fails to respond to communications from the Faculty Office it asks the Academic Registry and OSCAR to advise it whether a hearing by an Academic Misconduct Panel should proceed in the student's absence.

Timing of Academic Misconduct Panel hearings

48 Where a student is registered to study with the University full-time, and the date and time proposed for the Panel hearing does not clash with the student's timetabled commitments, they will be expected to be able to attend the hearing where they have been given reasonable notice.

49 In cases where it is proposed to convene a hearing by an Academic Misconduct Panel outside the University's published semester dates, and the student states in writing that they are unable to attend the Panel hearing, the University will offer to defer the hearing until the next available opportunity within its published semester dates.

50 Where a student states in writing that they wish an Academic Misconduct Panel hearing to proceed in their absence and they are willing

- to appoint a friend to attend the panel on their behalf
- to make a written submission to the Panel in lieu of attendance

the hearing may proceed.

51 Where a student has stated in writing that they wish an Academic Misconduct Panel to proceed in their absence with representation by a friend or by making a written submission to the Panel the student may not later cite their absence from the Panel hearing as cause to reject its findings, recommendations, or outcomes.

Part-time and distance learning students

52 If a student is registered to study with the University on a part-time basis, or via distance-learning, the University makes all reasonable efforts to ensure that the student can participate in the hearing by Academic Misconduct Panel and may use video- or audio-conference arrangements where this is available and appropriate.
Membership of Academic Misconduct Panels

53 Each Academic Misconduct Panel consists of three members of staff. One of the members of staff is an Academic Integrity Officer from a Faculty that is not the student's 'home' Faculty, who acts as the Chair of the Panel. Staff invited to serve as members of an Academic Misconduct Panel are drawn from the pool of staff from across the University who have been briefed by it on its academic misconduct procedures and Regulations for Hearings by Panels. Panel members are required to confirm before hearing an academic misconduct matter that they have no current academic or personal connection with the student (or students) to come before the Panel. Where they are unable to do so an alternate from the pool of trained staff, who has had no academic or personal connection with the student (or students), substitutes for them.

54 When a Faculty Office establishes the provisional membership of an Academic Misconduct Panel it informs the relevant student in writing, requesting them to notify it immediately if any member of the Panel might not be impartial towards them and to state the grounds for any possible partiality. If the student states, in writing, that a member of the Panel may not be impartial in the matter and provides grounds to support this position, the Faculty Office may replace that Panel member with another member of the pool.

Representation of students in academic misconduct hearings, including legal representation

55 A student may be represented at an academic misconduct panel by a friend, who may be another University of Surrey student, or an official of the University of Surrey Students' Union. Where this is the case, the student is required to inform the University of the contact details of their friend at least three working days before the Panel meeting, so that the University can confirm the date, time and place of the panel and provide the friend with the evidence that will be referred to (if required).

56 In any Academic Misconduct Panel meeting a student's friend accompanies them in a supportive role. They may speak to the student during the panel and may speak for the student (with their permission) to the Panel. The friend may also ask questions of the Panel and those providing advice or evidence with the permission of the Chair.

57 The University's Academic Misconduct Procedure is not a legal process but an academic procedure. Where a student insists on legal representation in a hearing by an Academic Misconduct Panel the University will also require legal representation.

Standard of proof

58 The standard of proof required of an Academic Misconduct Panel in reaching its findings is that of the balance of probability: in a case of academic misconduct, that it is more likely than not that the work submitted for assessment is the product of academic misconduct. In general, the more serious the consequences for the student of a finding that work is the product of academic misconduct the more cogent the evidence the Panel will need to see to support any finding.

Burden of proof in academic misconduct

The term "burden of proof" is used in a hearing to designate who has to prove what: whether the University has to prove that the work the student submitted for assessment is more likely than not the product of academic misconduct or contains material that is the product of academic misconduct, or the student has to prove the contrary.

59 In academic misconduct matters it is for the University to show that it is more likely than not that the work the student submitted for assessment is the product of academic misconduct or contains material that is the product of academic misconduct.
Evidence

60 Prior to the meeting of an Academic Misconduct Panel the Faculty Office provides for the Panel, the student (and any accompanying friend) copies of

- the work in question that was submitted by the student for assessment, together with any earlier drafts of the work that were requested and have been provided, and the results of any analyses that the tutor who marked the work and the Academic Integrity Officer have undertaken, and copies of sources (or extracts from sources) that might have been plagiarised
- a report compiled by the Academic Integrity Officer of the outcomes of any meeting between the student (and their friend) and the tutor or tutors who originally marked the work (see paragraph 30).

61 Academic Misconduct Panels follow the procedures laid down in the University Regulations for Hearings by Panels.

62 Academic Misconduct Panels will normally expect the tutor who marked the work that has been identified as possibly the product of academic misconduct, and/or the relevant Academic Integrity Officer, to attend the hearing to explain to the Panel and to the student what has given rise to doubts about the authenticity of the work. The Panel may also ask the tutor or the relevant Academic Integrity Officer (as appropriate) to ask the student, in its presence, how the work was completed, including the resources used and the approach taken.

The discussions described in paragraph 61 are not a viva voce examination but provide an opportunity for the student to assist the Panel by placing the work in the context of their overall learning.

Students who commit more than one form of academic misconduct

63 Where a student appears to have committed academic misconduct in more than one of the different ways described in paragraphs 5, 6, 11, 13, 16, 18 or 19, within a short space of time (normally less than one calendar month) it is open to the Faculty Office, advised by the Academic Registry and OSCAR, to submit all the instances to a single Academic Misconduct Panel. In such a case it will be open to the Panel to deal with them as a single instance of academic misconduct, or as a series of instances, and to recommend any penalties accordingly.

An Academic Misconduct Panel might deal with two or more instances of academic misconduct as a single instance where a student has submitted several pieces of work for assessment at the same time, and each piece of work appears to have been the product of the same form of academic misconduct.

64 Where an Academic Misconduct Panel chooses to deal with several instances of academic misconduct as one instance, and the student's records show that they have previously been penalised for academic misconduct, the penalties available to the Panel include recommending to the Dean of Faculty that the student's registration be terminated.

Findings and recommendations that an Academic Misconduct Panel may make

65 Panels may come to one of two findings

- that the work does not include material that is the product of academic misconduct
- that the work includes material that is the product of academic misconduct.
At the end of the Academic Misconduct Panel meeting the Chair announces the outcome to the student. Where the finding is that the work includes material that is the product of academic misconduct, the Chair explains the penalty that the Panel will recommend to the relevant assessment or examination board, and the student’s right to appeal. The Faculty subsequently confirms the panel’s findings to the student in writing, together with their right to appeal. Following the relevant board, the Faculty Office updates the individual’s Student Progression Information record on SITS if necessary.

Table 1. Penalties that may be recommended to Assessment and Examination Boards by Academic Misconduct Panels

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Instances of academic misconduct (Penalties are cumulative)</th>
<th>Recommended scale of penalties where academic misconduct is found to have taken place during initial (first) assessment attempt</th>
<th>Recommended scale of penalties where academic misconduct is found to have taken place during a reassessment attempt</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>First instance</td>
<td>Mark of zero for the unit of assessment AND If the module is passed overall – The module mark is capped at the pass mark; If the module is failed – reassessment is allowed. Reassessment penalty is applied to the re-assessed unit(s) of assessment. In cases, where following the reassessment attempt, the module is passed, the Module mark is capped at the pass mark.</td>
<td>Mark of zero for the unit of assessment AND If the module is passed overall – The module mark is capped at the pass mark; If the module is failed – no further reassessment is allowed. General regulations apply.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Second instance</td>
<td>Mark of zero for the unit of assessment AND If the module is passed overall – the module mark is capped at zero and module credits are awarded; If the module is failed – reassessment is allowed. Reassessment penalty is applied to the re-assessed unit(s) of assessment. In cases, where following the reassessment attempt, the module is passed, the module mark is capped at zero and module credits are awarded.</td>
<td>Mark of zero for the unit of assessment AND If the module is passed overall – the module mark is capped at zero and module credits are awarded; If the module is failed – no further reassessment is allowed. The module mark is capped at zero. No module credits are awarded. General regulations apply.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Third instance</td>
<td>Termination of Registration</td>
<td>Termination of Registration. General regulations apply.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

See also Annex for penalties applying to research students.
The penalties that an Academic Misconduct Panel may recommend to assessment or examination boards normally escalate in severity from a first instance of academic misconduct to a third instance.

Where an Academic Misconduct Panel finds that a first or second instance of academic misconduct is so serious that it would be inappropriate and unfair to other students to penalise it other than by recommending the termination of the student's registration it may recommend this. Subversion of the academic integrity of other students and the University through, for example, an individual producing work for submission by other students for assessment as their own work or through cheating in an examination would be so viewed.

An Academic Misconduct Panel that finds evidence that a student has subverted academic integrity by producing and distributing work for submission by other students for assessment as their own work, might recommend termination of the student's registration where the instance dealt with by the Panel is a first or second instance of academic misconduct.

For those cases where an Academic Misconduct Panel is convened to address a third instance of academic misconduct, or a matter that is to be treated as a third instance of academic misconduct, the University recognises that a finding that academic misconduct took place is likely to lead to the termination of the student's registration. For that reason the membership of such Panels is likely to include at least one senior member of staff with wide experience of hearing academic misconduct cases and the evidence required to come to a finding will need to be particularly cogent.

Where an Academic Misconduct Panel finds that work has been submitted that contains- or consists of- the products of academic misconduct, and this is a particularly serious matter, or is the third occasion that the student has been penalised for academic misconduct, the Panel recommends to the relevant Dean of Faculty or their nominee that the student's registration is terminated.

Should the student submit an academic appeal against the termination of their registration, the termination remains in place until the outcome of their academic appeal is known.

Where a student's registration is terminated following a third instance of academic misconduct the individual's Student Progression Information record in SITS states this. Where the credits the student has accrued are sufficient to entitle them to an intermediate award they may take the award but may not receive it at a University award ceremony.

Communicating the outcomes of an Academic Misconduct panel Hearing

At the close of a hearing by an Academic Misconduct Panel its secretary drafts letters to the student and other relevant parties setting out the Panel's findings and recommendations. In addition, the letter to the student sets out the consequences of the Panel's findings; for example, should any further finding of academic misconduct be made. The draft letters are provided for the Chair of the Panel who, when satisfied, signs them on behalf of the Panel and sends them to the relevant Faculty Office for registration and copying and transmission to their recipients.

Appeal against a finding of academic misconduct

Where a student has grounds for considering that in their case an Academic Misconduct Panel

• has not followed the University's approved regulations and procedures, or not followed them with due care

• that the Panel did not act fairly towards them in that it showed (or appeared to have shown) bias in the way it made its decision
The student may appeal against the Panel's findings through the University's Academic Appeals Procedure.

Records of Academic Misconduct Panel Hearings

The outcomes of Academic Misconduct Panel hearings, including the relevant correspondence, information and notes of findings and recommendations are held securely by the Faculty in accordance with the University’s standard records retention policy and arrangements.
Annex 1

Academic Integrity – postgraduate students undertaking research

75 This Annex contains supplementary academic integrity regulations that apply to
• research activities and their management undertaken by postgraduate research
  students and
• research components and research management that forms part of the assessed
  work of other postgraduate students studying for higher awards.

Who these regulations apply to

76 This section of the Academic Regulations applies to postgraduate students registered
for a higher award of the University by research. These awards include Master of
Philosophy (MPhil), Doctor of Philosophy (PhD), and Doctor of Medicine (MD) by
research and thesis.

77 This section of the Academic Regulations also applies to the thesis, dissertation,
portfolio or other research components of programmes undertaken by postgraduate
students registered for a higher award of the University. Such awards include the
research components of taught modular programmes that lead to the University's
higher awards and practitioner doctorate awards.

Academic Integrity and Good Research Practice

78 Students registered for the University's higher awards by research and those
undertaking the research component of taught modular programmes that lead to
higher awards or practitioner doctorate awards are required to comply with the
University's Code on Good Research Practice and the Code of Practice on Misconduct
and Fraud in Research. These documents set out the University's requirements for the
management by students of the research process and define academic misconduct
Paragraphs 4 and 5 below provide examples of academic misconduct.

Research management

79 For students registered for the University's higher awards who engage in research and
research management the University identifies the following acts, omissions and
behaviours as academic misconduct related to research management:

i Mismanagement or inadequate preservation of data and/or primary materials,
  including failure to
  • keep clear and accurate records of the research procedures followed and
    the results obtained, including interim results
  • hold records securely in paper or electronic form
  • make relevant primary data and research evidence accessible to others for
    reasonable periods after the completion of the research: data should
    normally be preserved and accessible for ten years, but for projects of
    clinical or major social, environmental or heritage importance, for 20 years
    or longer;
  • manage data according to the research funder's data policy, and all
    relevant legislation
  • wherever possible, deposit data permanently within a national collection

The University recognises that the proper management and preservation of data and primary
materials is shared between the researcher and the research organisation.
ii Breach of duty of care, which involves deliberately, recklessly, or by gross negligence
- disclosing improperly the identity of individuals or groups involved in research without their consent, or other breach of confidentiality
- placing any of those involved in research in danger, whether as subjects, participants or associated individuals, without their prior consent, and without appropriate safeguards even with consent; this includes reputational danger where that can be anticipated
- not taking all reasonable care to ensure that the risks and dangers, the broad objectives, and the sponsors of the research, are known to participants or their legal representatives, to ensure appropriate informed consent is obtained properly, explicitly and transparently
- not observing legal and reasonable ethical requirements or obligations of care for animal subjects, human organs or tissue used in research; or for the protection of the environment

iii Misrepresentation of qualifications and/or experience, including claiming or implying qualifications or experience which are not held;

iv Cheating or otherwise disclosing information with the intent of gaining for oneself or for another an unfair advantage;

v Intentional damage to, or removal of, the research-related property of another;

vi Intentional non-compliance with the terms and conditions governing the award of external funding for research or with the University's policies and procedures relating to research, including accounting requirements, ethics, and health and safety regulations.

Misconduct in respect of theses, portfolios, other assessment or confirmation review report submitted for Doctoral Awards

80 Academic misconduct identified in the thesis, portfolio, other assessment or confirmation review report includes
- Plagiarism: misrepresentation of the work or expressed thoughts of others as one’s own without permission or acknowledgement
- Deliberate exploitation of ideas and concepts of others without acknowledgement
- Fabrication and/or misappropriation of: participant consents; results of work which the student falsely claims to have undertaken (for example, experiments, interviews, observations or other forms of research and investigation); results which the student has not obtained or has obtained but in a context very different from that claimed, including work performed by other University staff and/or students; results by omission from analysis and publication of selected components of a data set; research attribution and credentials (for example: false claims of publication of work or denial of authorship, where an author has made a significant contribution).
- Falsification, including the inappropriate manipulation and/or selection of data, imagery and/or participant consents
- Misrepresentation of data or knowingly, recklessly or by gross negligence, presenting flawed interpretation of data
- Undisclosed duplication of publication to gain another award.
Academic Misconduct Panels to hear possible cases of academic misconduct by students registered for higher awards by research and in research components of taught modular programmes that lead to the University's higher awards and practitioner doctorate awards

81 The University's procedures for investigating possible academic misconduct with respect to research or research management by a postgraduate student at any stage before or after the award of degree are set out below, in the Regulations for Hearings by Panels.

82 Where a supervisor or tutor finds evidence of possible academic misconduct

- in the work, conduct, or research management of a student registered for a higher award by research or
- in the research components produced by a student following a taught modular programme or a practitioner doctorate that leads to a higher award of the University, or in the student's conduct or their research management

the supervisor or other member of staff consults the relevant Academic Integrity Officer and the relevant Faculty's Postgraduate Research Director (or a nominee of the Dean of Faculty where the Postgraduate Research Director is the student's supervisor). Together they review the evidence in order to come to a judgment whether the evidence points to poor academic practice or to academic misconduct. In all cases where the tutor who has identified possible academic misconduct is not the student's principal supervisor the latter is informed and consulted.

83 In cases where the supervisor or other member of staff, the Academic Integrity Officer and the Faculty's Director of Postgraduate Studies (or their equivalent) having reviewed the student's work or conduct comes to the view that it represents poor academic practice or research management they require the student to attend for a formal discussion of the work or conduct in question at which the student may be accompanied by a friend, who may be another student or an official of the University of Surrey Students' Union.

84 The formal discussion provides an opportunity for the Academic Integrity Officer and one or more of the tutor, supervisor and Director of Postgraduate Studies (or their equivalent) to show the student (and their friend) how what appears to be the product of academic misconduct was identified in the student's work or conduct, and to hear any explanation or claim for extenuating circumstances the student may wish to advance.

Extenuating circumstances

85 Where the student claims that there were valid extenuating circumstances for their poor academic practice or apparent academic misconduct these are subjected to the University's standard procedures for their evaluation and verification. Where the Academic Integrity Officer is able to confirm that extenuating circumstances apply in a particular case they advise the Postgraduate Research Director (or their equivalent) and the Examinations Office accordingly.

Poor academic practice

86 Where the Academic Integrity Officer finds that the student's work or conduct was the product of poor academic practice, poor conduct, or poor research management, rather than academic misconduct, they recommend to the Postgraduate Research Director (or their equivalent) that this has been noted. The student's record is updated accordingly to enable follow-up action to be monitored.
The Academic Integrity Officer together with the student's principal supervisor and OSCAR assist the student to compile a remedial programme of activities to address the poor practice, conduct, or research management that is at issue. The supervisor monitors the student's completion of these activities and the Academic Integrity notifies the Examination Office when they are completed so that the student's record can be updated.

Possible academic misconduct

87 Where, having heard the student, the Academic Integrity Officer, the Director of Postgraduate Studies (or their equivalent) and the supervisor come to the view that the matter may be one or more of academic misconduct, a breach of the University's requirements for academic integrity, or its requirements for good research practice, they refer the matter(s) to be heard by an Academic Misconduct Panel.

Failure to attend a formal meeting with an Academic Integrity officer

88 Where a student fails to attend a formal discussion with the Academic Integrity Officer and one or more of the relevant tutor, the supervisor, and the Director of Postgraduate Studies, in connection with a possible instance of academic misconduct, the Officer refers the matter to an Academic Misconduct Panel.

Possible academic misconduct identified in a doctoral thesis submitted for examination

89 Where a doctoral thesis has been submitted for examination and one or more of the examiners consider that it may contain material that is the product of academic misconduct they consult the relevant Academic Integrity Officer. Together they seek to identify and agree the areas of potential academic misconduct in the thesis and to establish whether, in their academic judgement, the nature of the academic misconduct is such that it should be categorised as ‘minor’ or ‘major’.

In order to maintain consistency across the University in the way academic misconduct is handled, when deciding whether possible academic misconduct in a doctoral thesis submitted for examination should be viewed as ‘minor’ or ‘major’ the Academic Integrity Officer will seek the advice of the Academic Registry, Examinations Office, and OSCAR.

Possible minor academic misconduct in a doctoral thesis submitted for examination

90 The University views possible failings in the literature review or in the methods sections of the thesis or isolated instances of plagiarism as ‘minor’ academic misconduct when the material in question does not compromise the examiners’ ability to assess the integrity of the work as a whole, and the potential academic misconduct can be addressed in the normal viva voce process.

91 In any case where a student has submitted a thesis in which there is evidence of possible academic misconduct and this is to be discussed in the viva voce examination the student needs to know before their viva voce examination that possible ‘minor’ academic misconduct has been identified in their thesis so that they can prepare themselves for the matter to be raised for discussion.

92 Where the examiners for a thesis consider it possible that there is evidence of minor academic misconduct in a thesis submitted for examination the internal examiner(s) consult(s) the student's academic records. If these show that the student has previously been penalised for academic misconduct the thesis may not be put forward for viva voce examination but is put to an Academic Misconduct Panel by the relevant Faculty.

93 Where the student's records show that they have not previously been penalised for academic misconduct the examiners note the context and particulars of the possible academic misconduct in their reports, the Academic Integrity Officer informs the student and the examiners conducting the viva voce examination through the
Examinations Office, so that the examiners are aware that the matter is to be discussed with the student as part of the viva voce examination, and the viva voce examination may proceed.

94 In the course of a viva voce examination where the possibility of minor academic misconduct by a research student has been raised by the internal examiners the examiners conducting the viva voce examination will raise the matter with the student and invite them to respond. Where the examiners are satisfied that the possible academic misconduct has not affected the integrity of the whole of the student's thesis, dissertation, project or portfolio, and the student's records show that this is their first instance of academic misconduct, the maximum positive recommendation available to the examiner shall be limited to 'not to award, but permit resubmission of a revised thesis, with or without further viva' The examiners are required to note these matters the student's account of themself, and any recommended remedial work to the thesis in their report(s).

95 In cases where the examining panel for a thesis has been informed that the internal examiners consider that 'minor' academic misconduct may have occurred those examiners conducting the viva voce will review the thesis and discuss the possible academic misconduct with the student. Where, having taken these steps the examiners come to the view that the possible academic misconduct is more serious than the examiners had previously considered they suspend the viva voce and refer the possible academic misconduct back to the relevant Faculty, to be heard by an Academic Misconduct Panel.

Possible major academic misconduct identified in a doctoral thesis submitted for examination

96 Where the examiners for a doctoral thesis, together with the relevant Academic Integrity Officer, consider that it is possible that the thesis submitted for examination includes the fabrication or plagiarism of research outputs or interpretation, or that there is extensive plagiarism in parts of the thesis, they recommend to the Research Degrees Committee that the thesis examination process be suspended and that the matter be referred to an Academic Misconduct Panel.

Hearings by Academic Misconduct Panels of matters to do with academic misconduct by postgraduate research students and students submitting dissertations, theses, portfolios, projects and other research products for higher awards

97 Academic Misconduct Panels that are convened to hear and make recommendations on possible instances of academic misconduct by postgraduate research students or postgraduate students who are submitting dissertations, theses, and other products of research for a higher award, conduct their business as required by the University's Regulations for Hearings by Panels.

98 The membership of an Academic Misconduct Panel convened to hear and make recommendations on possible instances of academic misconduct by a postgraduate research student, or a postgraduate student who has submitted a dissertation, thesis, or other products of research for a higher award, will include an Academic Integrity Officer not linked to the student or their supervisory team; a member of academic staff from the student's Faculty who has acted as a principal supervisor to postgraduate research students and a Postgraduate Research Director from another Faculty who Chairs the Panel. The Faculty Registrar or a member of their staff acts as the secretary to the Panel. If the student has been found guilty of a previous offence of academic misconduct, the panel must comprise of members not involved with the first hearing.
Decisions open to an Academic Misconduct Panel dealing with academic misconduct by postgraduate research students and students submitting dissertations, theses, portfolios, projects and other research products for higher awards

99 Having reviewed the evidence, and heard the student, an Academic Misconduct Panel may make the following findings
- that academic misconduct took place
- that academic misconduct did not take place

100 Where the Academic Misconduct Panel finds that academic misconduct did not take place the examination process is resumed and no modifications may be made to the thesis. A letter is sent to the student (copied to the examiners) informing them of the outcome.

101 Where the Academic Misconduct Panel finds that academic misconduct did take place it recommends one of the prescribed penalties to the Research Degrees Committee.

Penalties for Academic Misconduct

Penalties for a first instance of academic misconduct with respect to the management of research

102 Where an Academic Misconduct Panel finds that a research student studying for a higher award has committed academic misconduct as defined in paragraph 82, and it is the first such instance recorded for that student, the Panel recommends to the Research Degrees Committee that the Committee issues a formal warning to the student and that if this recommendation is accepted that the student's record be updated accordingly by the Examinations Office.

Second instance of academic misconduct by a student registered for a higher award with respect to the management of research

103 Where a postgraduate student registered for a higher award is found by an Academic Misconduct Panel to have committed academic misconduct as defined in paragraph 82, and the student's record shows that they have already received a formal warning, the Academic Misconduct Panel may recommend to the Research Degrees Committee that the student's registration be terminated and that they should not be allowed to resubmit their dissertation, thesis or other research product for examination.

104 Where a postgraduate research student registered for a higher award is found by an Academic Misconduct Panel to have committed academic misconduct as defined in paragraph 82 and the student's record shows that they have already received a formal warning, the Academic Misconduct Panel may recommend to the Research Degrees Committee that the student's dissertation, thesis or other research product be failed but that they should have the opportunity to resubmit it for examination.

Penalties for academic misconduct identified in a thesis, dissertation, portfolio, other work submitted for assessment or confirmation review report

105 An Academic Misconduct Panel which finds that a postgraduate research student or a student submitting a dissertation, thesis, portfolio, project or other assessment for a Doctoral award has committed, or has attempted to commit academic misconduct (listed in paragraph 83) the Panel may recommend the following penalties to the Research Degrees Committee
- the assessment is failed (if a first offence) with an opportunity to resubmit
- for cases where there are extenuating circumstances supported by independent evidence, or where the academic misconduct is the first instance where the
student has been penalised, the Panel may recommend that the student be allowed to revise their thesis, portfolio, project or other research product in order to remove the offending material and to resubmit it within a stated period.

106 Where an Academic Misconduct Panel finds that academic misconduct has occurred, that it was identified at the point of the examination of the thesis, and that the misconduct had the potential to taint the academic integrity of the University (such as the fabrication or misrepresentation of results, plagiarism, failure to observe academic integrity and research good practice) the Panel will recommend the failure of the student's thesis, the termination of their registration and that the student shall not be permitted to resubmit a thesis for a higher award of the University.

107 For serious cases of academic misconduct, such as those identified in paragraph 109, where the academic misconduct has come to light after the student has taken their higher award the University may rescind the award as provided under University of Surrey Statute 18.

**Reporting of academic misconduct to Research Councils**

108 Where a postgraduate student is funded by or engaged with one of the RCUK member Research Councils the University is required by its engagements with the Councils to report to them on the outcomes of any hearing by an Academic Misconduct Panel and subsequent decisions by the Research Degrees Committee. This obligation extends to reporting the outcomes of cases where allegations do not relate to a grant from one or more of the Research Councils.

109 The University also acknowledges its obligation under its engagements with the Research Councils to comply with any action requested by a Council with respect to duties performed by the research student for it, or on its behalf.