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Scope
1. These Regulations apply to students on undergraduate and taught postgraduate programmes delivered at the University and by the University's Associated and Accredited Institutions that lead to University of Surrey awards and to students studying individual modules for academic credit. Postgraduate research students are subject to the provisions of the Code of practice for handling allegations of research misconduct.

Academic integrity
2. 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.


Academic misconduct
3. 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.

4. 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.

Declaration of originality
5. In order to be sure that students understand the importance it attaches to academic integrity, the University requires that work students 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.]

**Plagiarism**

6. 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.

7. 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 one's 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).

**Collusion**

8. 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.

9. 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.

10. 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.
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.

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 (Learning and Teaching) and the Student Administration (Assessment and Awards) team, determines whether the matter is to be dealt with through these Regulations or otherwise, such as through the University's Student disciplinary regulations.

Assistance by third parties and academic misconduct

13. 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.

14. 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

15. 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.

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 (Learning and Teaching) and the Director of Student Services and Administration in order to determine whether to refer the matter to the University's Student disciplinary regulations, its Regulations for fitness to practise, or these Regulations.
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 grounds for 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 (Learning and Teaching) and Student Administration (Assessment and Awards), determines whether the matter is to be dealt with through the University's academic misconduct procedures or otherwise, such as through the University's Student disciplinary regulations.

Research management

21. For students registered for taught postgraduate 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

(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.

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

22. 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 Regulations 32-40 below with the agreement of the Programme Leader and the Associate Dean (Learning and Teaching).

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

23. 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.

24. 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 the Office of Student Complaints, Appeals and Regulation (OSCAR). In such a case (and with the advice and approval of the Vice-Provost (Education and Students) OSCAR will liaise with the student’s home institution. Subject to the approval of the Vice-Provost (Education and Students), 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

25. 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 Ordinance 6.3.1.1(d). 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.
Responsibilities

26. 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 Executive Deans of the Faculties advised by, among others, the University's Academic Integrity Officers and it's Associate Deans (Learning and Teaching).

27. 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 Executive 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 Regulations 46-74 below.

Academic misconduct and cross-Faculty studies

28. 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 conducted under the auspices of the student's home Faculty advised by the relevant Academic Integrity Officer(s) for the student's area of studies.

Confidentiality

29. 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.

30. 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.

Fitness to practise considerations

31. 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.

Instances of possible academic misconduct in work submitted by a newly admitted student

32. Where a tutor identifies what appears to be evidence of academic misconduct, as described Regulations 6, 7, 8, 11, 16, 18 or 19 above, in work submitted for assessment by a FHEQ level 4 student, 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 Regulation 30 above).
33. 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 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

34. 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**

35. Where work submitted for assessment by a 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.

36. 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.

37. 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 Board of Examiners accordingly.

38. 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 Board of Examiners 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 Student Personal Learning and Study Hub (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.

39. 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.

40. 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**

41. 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 Regulations 32-40 above do not apply but the tutor and the Academic Integrity Officer perform the checks described in Regulation 33 above. 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).

42. 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.

43. 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 Regulation 38 above and may refer them for follow-up sessions with their personal tutor and/or the University's learning support services.

44. 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.

45. Where the Academic Integrity Officer and the tutor, after completing the checks described in Regulation 33 above, 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

46. Academic Misconduct Panels are convened at Faculty level under the authority of the Executive Dean of the Faculty to address possible instances of academic misconduct. They are normally convened by the Student Administration (Assessment and Awards) team acting on behalf of the Executive Dean. Academic Misconduct panels conduct themselves in accordance with the University's Regulations for hearings by panels.

Communications with the student

47. Not less than five working days before a proposed Academic Misconduct Panel hearing the Student Administration (Assessment and Awards) team 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

48. The letter and/or email containing this information is sent to the student's University email address. The letter requests the student to acknowledge its receipt immediately.

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

49. 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 Student Administration (Assessment and Awards) team attempts to contact them by telephone and text message. If the student fails to respond to these communications the hearing by an Academic Misconduct Panel will proceed in the student's absence.

Timing of an Academic Misconduct Panel hearing

50. 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.

51. 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.

52. 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.
53. 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**

54. 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 an Academic Misconduct Panel**

55. Each Academic Misconduct Panel consists of three academic 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.

56. When the Student Administration (Assessment and Awards) team 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, that Panel member may be replaced with another member of the pool.

**Representation of students in academic misconduct hearings, including legal representation**

57. 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).

58. 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 however it is the normal expectation that the student will answer any questions from the panel for themselves. The friend may also ask questions of the Panel and those providing advice or evidence with the permission of the Chair.

59. 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**

60. 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 academic misconduct has been committed.
**Burden of proof**

61. In academic misconduct matters it is for the University to show that it is more likely than not that academic misconduct has been committed.

**Evidence**

62. Prior to the meeting of an Academic Misconduct Panel the Student Administration (Assessment and Awards) team 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 Regulations 33 and 41 above)

63. An Academic Misconduct Panel 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.

**Students who commit more than one form of academic misconduct**

64. Where a student appears to have committed academic misconduct in more than one of the different ways described in Regulations 6, 7, 8, 11, 16, 18 or 19 above within a short space of time (normally less than one calendar month) it is open to the Faculty, advised by the Student Administration (Assessment and Awards) team 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.

65. 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 Executive Dean of Faculty that the student’s registration be terminated.

**Findings and recommendations of an Academic Misconduct Panel**

66. 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

67. At the end of the Academic Misconduct Panel meeting the Chair announces the outcome to the student. Where the finding is that academic misconduct has been committed, the Chair explains the penalty that the Panel will recommend to the relevant Board of Examiners for ratification, 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 individual’s Student Progression Information record on SITS is amended if necessary.
Table 1: Penalties that may be recommended to a Board of Examiners by an Academic Misconduct Panel

<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. Regulations for taught programmes 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 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 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. Regulations for taught programmes apply.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Third instance</td>
<td>Termination of registration. Regulations for taught programmes apply</td>
<td>Termination of registration. Regulations for taught programmes apply.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

68. The penalties that an Academic Misconduct Panel may recommend to a Board of Examiners for ratification normally escalate in severity from a first instance of academic misconduct to a third instance.

69. 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.

70. 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 Executive Dean of Faculty or their nominee that the student's registration is terminated.

71. 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.

72. 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

73. At the close of a hearing by an Academic Misconduct Panel its secretary produces 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 Chair of the Panel, signs the letters on behalf of the Panel and sends them to the Student Administration (Assessment and Awards) team for registration and copying and transmission to their recipients.

Appeal against a finding of academic misconduct

74. The student may appeal against the Panel's findings through the University's Regulations for academic appeals; the Regulations include the grounds for appeal.

Records of Academic Misconduct Panel hearings

75. 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.