HIGHER EDUCATION
ACADEMIC MISCONDUCT PROCEDURE

Originator: Academic Registrar
Approved by: Academic Board

Effective from: August 2022

Type: Procedure

Previous Version: August 2018

1. General

1.1 Academic Integrity and Responsibilities

The University has a duty to maintain academic standards by ensuring the integrity of all aspects of the assessment process. The University expects all members of the University to uphold the values of honesty and academic integrity at all times.

1.1.1 It is the responsibility of each Higher Education student to ensure that any work presented for assessment is their own work. To reinforce this responsibility students are required to sign at enrolment and/or re-enrolment a declaration of integrity. This declaration applies to every piece of work they present for summative assessment in that academic year.

1.2 Definition

Academic misconduct is defined as any improper activity or behaviour by a student which may give that student, or another student, an unpermitted and unfair academic advantage in a summative assessment.

1.3 Categories of Academic Misconduct

A non-exhaustive list of examples of academic misconduct which will be considered are included in the Academic Regulations and include the following:

1.1.3 **Plagiarism**

For example:

- Representing another person's work or ideas as one's own (including text, data, images, sound and performance), for example by failing to follow convention in acknowledging sources, use of quotation marks, etc. This includes the unauthorised use of one student's work by another student and the commissioning, purchase and submission of a piece of work, in part or whole, as the student's own;
- Reproduction of published or unpublished (e.g. work of another student or the student's own work submitted for a previous module) material without acknowledgement of the author or source;
- Paraphrasing by, for instance, substituting a few words or phrases or altering the order of presentation of another person's work, or linking unacknowledged sentences or phrases with words of one's own;
- Copying directly from a text (book, magazine, internet or printed source) without reference to its author;
- Direct copy of an image, a sound or performance without due acknowledgement of its source;
- Use of student's own work which has previously been submitted for assessment.

1.1.4 **Collusion**

This includes co-operation in order to gain an unpermitted advantage. This may occur where students have consciously colluded on a piece of work, in part or whole, and passed it off as their own individual efforts, or where one student has authorised another to use their work, in part or whole, and to submit it as their own.

1.1.5 **Falsification**

For example:

- Claiming to have carried out any form of research which the student has notundertaken;
- Falsification of results or other data.

1.1.6 **Ghosting**
For example, submission of work presented as the student's own which has been purchased, commissioned or otherwise acquired from another person (including internet sellers).

1.1.7 **Personation**
For example:

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

Tutors will encourage and help students to examine and check their own work to ensure that the work of others is correctly acknowledged before submission.

Advice about academic writing is available to students:

- Within their course;
- In the library.

1.4 **Procedure**
If a tutor suspects an occurrence of academic misconduct has taken place, they should in the first instance consult the relevant Course Leader. In the event that plagiarism is suspected, it is the tutors responsibility to identify the alleged source.

1.4.1 Following this discussion, the tutor should contact Academic Registry. An informal meeting with the student, tutor and a member of Academic Registry may be arranged if further information is required or it is appropriate to allow the student the opportunity to justify the work. An administrator will attend as a note taker. Following discussion and the informal meeting (if applicable), the tutor and member of Academic Registry will decide if academic misconduct may have taken place. If it is decided that academic misconduct has not taken place, no further action is required.

1.4.2 If the tutor and member of Academic Registry decide that this may be a case of academic misconduct, it will be referred to an investigation.

1.4.3 No panel meeting will be arranged until the matter has been investigated. In all but exceptional circumstances a student should be made aware that an investigation will be undertaken, and should be provided with a brief summary of the reasons for this and the practical measures involved. Investigators will give evidence at the panel meeting.

1.4.4 Investigations should be made as quickly as is practicable and without unreasonable delay in order to decide whether there is a case to answer. Unavoidable delays shall be reported on and wherever possible shall be rectified as soon as possible.

1.4.5 The investigation process will depend on the nature of the alleged academic misconduct, the initial evidence against the student. In cases where the facts are very clear and not in dispute, the investigation will be very short.

2. Notification of Formal Proceedings

2.1 Where there is found to be a formal case to answer, the student will be invited, in writing, to attend an academic misconduct meeting. The notice will usually be provided no later than 7

calendar days in advance of the meeting.

2.2 The student will be advised in the letter of the seriousness of the alleged academic misconduct and possible outcomes.

2.3 No less than 5 calendar days in advance of the meeting the student will be provided with all the evidence that will be referred to during proceedings. This may include written documents, depending upon the details of the case. The exact material to be provided shall vary according to the details of the case.

2.4 Where the student wishes to rely upon any evidence, they should provide this in advance of the academic misconduct meeting, with a minimum of 3 calendar days, wherever possible. This may include written documents.

2.5 If upon receipt of all the available documentation the student accepts that it is academic misconduct, they will be asked to advise the person calling the academic misconduct meeting.

3. The Academic Misconduct Meeting

3.1 The Academic Misconduct panel normally comprises:

- A Director - Undergraduate Study/Head of Postgraduate Studies) (Chair);
- Academic member of staff;
- A member of Academic Registry;
- A note taker.

3.2 At the meeting the Investigator will be invited to present the findings of their investigation to the panel.

3.3 The student will then be given the opportunity to state their case. The student will be invited to either accept or deny the academic misconduct allegation. If the student does not accept the allegation the meeting shall proceed as though they denied the allegation.

3.4 At appropriate points in the process, the student, Investigator and the Chair will have the opportunity to challenge the evidence provided. The Investigator and the student may each make a closing statement as to whether the allegation should or should not be upheld.

3.5 The panel will decide the case on the evidence provided and the balance of probabilities. If the panel decides that there is no academic misconduct no further action will be taken, the work will be marked and the outcome recorded. No paperwork relating to the panel meeting will be kept on the student's file.

3.6 If the panel finds that the case is proven and there is academic misconduct the following are examples of penalties that are available to the panel depending upon the severity of the offence:

3.6.1 Penalties - Postgraduate

- a formal written warning recorded on your transcript;
- failure of the module with an opportunity for a resubmission at the earliest possible;
- failure of the module with no opportunity for a resubmission;
- Qualification reduced; (e.g. MA to PGDip (PG));
- Recommendation to a Pro-Vice-Chancellor for expulsion from University with credits gained retained;
- Recommendation to a Pro-Vice-Chancellor for expulsion from University with credits

withdrawn.

3.6.2 Penalties – Undergraduate

- A formal written warning recorded on your transcript;
- Reducing the module mark awarded to not lower than a pass mark (i.e. not lower than 40%);
- Failure of the module with an opportunity for a resubmission at the earliest possible opportunity, the mark to be capped
- Failure of the module with no opportunity for a resubmission;
- Award classification reduced by one class;
- Qualification reduced; (e.g. Honours to Ordinary Degree);
- Recommendation to a Pro-Vice-Chancellor for expulsion from University with credits gained retained;
- Recommendation to a Pro-Vice-Chancellor for expulsion from University with credits withdrawn.

3.7 The student will be informed of the outcome in writing within 7 calendar days after the meeting. Where the usual timeframe is not practicable, this will be communicated to the student, with reasons and an alternative timeframe.

3.8 The outcome will be reported to the next Final Examination Board.

4. Review

4.1 A student's written outcome letter will include details of the arrangements to follow should the student decide to request a review of the decision.

4.2 Students intending to request a review against the decision of an academic misconduct panel meeting, must do so promptly, within 5 calendar days of the receiving the outcome.

4.3 The request for a review should be communicated in writing to the Quality & Standards Office, stating the grounds upon which the request for a review is based. Grounds might be:

- the process was not appropriately followed;
- there is new evidence relevant to the case which was not previously available;
- the panel's outcome is deemed to be disproportionate.

4.4 The University will, as far as reasonably practical, seek to arrange a meeting to review the decision within 14 calendar days of receipt of the submitted request. The notice will usually be provided no later than 7 calendar days in advance.

4.5 The review meeting is not a rehearing of the original decision, but rather a consideration of the specific area with which the student is dissatisfied in relation to the outcome of the original panel meeting. The review will therefore confine discussion to those specific areas rather than reconsider the whole matter afresh.

4.6 Where the review is against an outcome of expulsion, the review meeting will be chaired by the Vice-Chancellor, supported by a member of Academic Registry.

4.7 At the review meeting the documentary evidence made available at the original panel meeting will be made available for reference purposes. As the purpose of the review is not a reconsideration of all matters, it is the responsibility of the student to state their case and bring to the attention of the review meeting all relevant documentary evidence that should be

considered. Based on the review case presented and the associated evidence, the Review meeting may either uphold the grounds for review or reject the grounds for review.

4.8 Where appropriate the student will have the opportunity to comment on any new evidence arising during the review. All new evidence will have been disclosed in advance, usually within 5 calendar days of the meeting.

4.9 The student will be informed in writing of the review outcome, usually within 5 calendar days of the meeting. If the timescales are to be longer, this will be communicated.

4.10 There is no further process of review within Leeds Arts University.

4.11 A Completion of Procedures letter will be issued. This letter concludes the University's formal review procedure and provides the student with formal confirmation that they have completed all available stages of the internal procedure. It is issued at the end of the relevant stage of the procedure.

4.12 HE Students who are not satisfied with the outcome of the review procedure may take their complaint to the Office of Independent Adjudicator for Higher Education (OIA) provided that the complaint is eligible under its Rules. Should a student decide to make a complaint to the OIA, the OIA Complaint Form must be received by the OIA within 12 months of the date of the Completion of Procedures letter. Guidance on submitting a complaint to the OIA and the OIA Complaint Form can be found on the OIA's website http://www.oiahe.org.uk/making-a-complaint-to-the-oia.aspx. Students may also wish to seek advice from the Students' Union about taking a complaint to the OIA. The OIA will normally only review issues that have been dealt with through the University's internal procedures.

5. Other Provisions

5.1 Every effort should be made by all participants to attend meetings as arranged. Where a student fails to attend on one occasion the University may decide to rearrange the meeting. If the student does not attend, a decision may be made in their absence on the evidence available at the second scheduled meeting.

5.4 Students may seek advice and support from the Student Welfare team or the Students' Union The Student Welfare team will signpost students to external parties as relevant and students may also access a list of external organisations who may offer support through the Portal.

5.5 Where a student believes that they have needs which may impact on their ability to participate as appropriate in the procedure, it is the individual's responsibility to raise this with the person calling the meeting as soon as possible. In such cases the University will consider providing appropriate reasonable support/adjustments during formal proceedings. The Panel shall be advised of any reasonable adjustments to be made.

5.6 Time limits are indicated in calendar days and are included in the procedures in order to ensure that matters are dealt with promptly and without undue delay. Neither the University nor students should unreasonably delay meetings, decisions or confirmation of those decisions. However, Academic Registry may in some circumstances decide that it may be appropriate to extend time limits provided in the Procedure.

5.7 The Examination Boards and Academic Board will receive a summary of all cases of academic misconduct for the current academic year for monitoring purposes.