Academic Integrity Procedure

Procedure 05: 2024 Version 1.0
Effective from: 1 August 2024

PRIFYSGOL BANGOR UNIVERSITY

Date	Supersedes	Description of Change
26 April 2024	2019 Version 3.3	Minor changes to titles. Inclusion of guiding principles and reference to Generative Artificial Intelligence.
1 February 2021	2019 Version 3.2	Minor changes to job titles.
1 August 2019	2018 Version	General update.

Document Owner	Approved By	Date Approved	Review Frequency
Quality Enhancement Unit	Senate Regulations and Special Cases Committee.	26 April 2024.	Every three years.

Note: In exceptional circumstances, and subject to approval by the Chair of the Senate Regulations and Special Cases Committee, responsibilities assigned to Schools, Heads, of School, School Officers or School Committees in these Regulations may be assumed by the College, Head of College, College Officers or College Committees respectively, as appropriate.

Academic Integrity Procedure

PRIFYSGOL BANGOR UNIVERSITY

This Procedure seeks to strengthen academic integrity, and address academic misconduct in conjunction with schools, staff, and students. The guiding principle that underpins this procedure is that the content (e.g., the basic written expression, the composition, arguments, interpretations, conclusions etc.) of work submitted for assessment should be a student's own. This procedure sets out actions which may go against this principle, and may, if proven, represent an instance of academic misconduct.

Referrals and supporting evidence at all stages of this procedure should be sent to academicintegrity@bangor.ac.uk.

Definitions

1. Academic integrity means being honest, trustworthy, diligent, fair and respectful, and is about ensuring the integrity of a student's work and ultimately the award they receive from Bangor University. This Academic Integrity Procedure applies to issues in both examinations and coursework (including written, and oral work, dissertations and theses).

2. Academic misconduct includes (but is not limited to) issues of plagiarism, collusion, cheating, breach of examination regulations, fabrication of data, impersonation of others or the use of essay banks or mills for assessment.

3. Poor academic practice is weaknesses in the way that the work of others is referenced or over-reliance on referenced material with insufficient independent academic input from the student.

About this Procedure

1. This Procedure deals with allegations of academic misconduct in examinations and coursework, including assessment in non-award-bearing courses.
2. This Procedure relates to all registered Bangor University students, whether they are studying within the United Kingdom or internationally with one of the University's partner organisations. This Procedure does not apply to the University's validated provision; however, partner arrangements should reflect this Procedure.

3. The responsibilities of schools, staff and students are listed in Appendix 1 and Appendix 2. Prevention of instances of academic misconduct is always preferable to applying penalties, and Appendices 1 and 2 include guidance for schools, staff, and students on how to avoid instances of academic misconduct, and how to promote academic integrity. The use of Turnitin to detect plagiarism is described in Appendix 3.
4. When an allegation of academic misconduct is made, it is important that the student is treated as innocent of the allegation, unless there is sufficient evidence to prove, on

the balance of probabilities, that the allegations are true.

5. Allegations of academic misconduct can only be considered within the programme of study for which a student is registered. For example, proven allegations from an undergraduate programme must not be carried forward to a Master's programme.

If an allegation of academic misconduct is made after an award of the University has been conferred (or a non-award-bearing course has been completed), the allegation must be referred to the Quality Enhancement Unit. An authorised member of staff from the Quality Enhancement Unit will decide whether to convene a Panel of Enquiry to consider the allegation.

Examples

6. Examples of academic misconduct are shown below. These are examples, and other actions can fall within the general definition of academic misconduct.

A. Examples of Academic Misconduct in Coursework

[i] **Plagiarism**: using without acknowledgement another person's words or ideas and submitting them for assessment as though it were one's own work. This includes copying materials from the internet, unfair use of generative artificial intelligence software, rewriting published material without acknowledging the source and the translation of materials using unauthorized methods.

[ii] **Collusion**: working with another person to submit some or all the other person's work as their own. Offering to work with someone to help them by writing and/or proposing some or all the other person's work. This also applies where the work of one student is submitted in the name of another or where two or more students submit an identical or very similar piece of work. Where this is done with the knowledge of the originator, or if the originator has been reckless as to whether the work might be copied, both students can be at fault.

[iii] **Fabrication of data**: making false claims to have carried out experiments, observations, interviews or other forms of data collection and analysis.

[iv] Misrepresentation of data, including inventing data or omitting data.

[v] Presentation of false evidence of special circumstances to a Board of Examiners.

[vi] Conducting research without the required ethical approval and/or other relevant permissions.

[vii] Failing to obtain proper informed consent (as defined by the General Data Protection Regulation, the Data Protection Act 2018, and the University's Data Protection Policy, and also the research ethics procedures) from participants in research projects or failure to adhere to agreed protocols for obtaining and recording consent.

[viii] Obtaining documents, and / or assignment tasks from, individuals, companies or agencies and submitting them for assessment as though it were one's own work, usually paying for the work. Alternatively, offering to produce some or all of another student's work. These activities are known as contract cheating.

[ix] Self plagiarism: re-using work for which credit has already been achieved at the University or elsewhere (unless specific permission to do this has been granted). The guiding principle is that no one piece of assessed coursework may overlap substantially in material with any other piece of assessed work.

[x] Promoting ways to breach academic integrity by sharing information with other students about ways to commit academic misconduct, or by facilitating academic misconduct.

B. Examples of academic misconduct in examinations

[i] Taking unauthorised materials such as a book, loose papers, mobile phone or smart device into an examination room.

[ii] Concealing information on their person to take into the examination room e.g., writing information on hands, arms etc.

[ii] Copying from another person in the examination room.

[iii] Communicating with another person when in the examination room.

[iv] Impersonating a student or allowing oneself to be impersonated.

[v] Presenting an examination script as one's own work when the script includes material produced by unauthorised means including collusion.

[vi] Receiving restricted information relating to the assessment without the approval of the examination supervisor.

[vi] Presenting false evidence of special circumstances to a Board of Examiners.

Special circumstances

7. Special circumstances must be reported by students to schools at the time when they occur, so that deadlines for coursework can be extended or the arrangements for examinations can be altered.
8. Special circumstances cannot be used to justify academic misconduct but can be taken into account when a penalty is imposed.
9. Students can present details of special circumstances when an allegation has been made. Students must only present details that are directly relevant to the allegation and the time of the alleged offence. Students must present the details, with supporting evidence, before any meeting about the allegation. The Chairs of Boards of Examiners and Panels of Enquiry have the authority to determine and assess whether such evidence is genuine, taking into account the source of the evidence and the way it has been presented. Special circumstances submitted by the student will be kept confidential, and only shared as appropriate in order to consider the student's case.

Referring allegations of academic misconduct

10. Allegations of academic misconduct, in examinations or coursework, must be referred to the Chair of the Board of Examiners in the student's home school in the first instance, who in the case of franchised provision can forward the case to the partner school. The Chair must liaise with the school responsible for delivering the module if the allegation relates to a module outside the home school.
11. If a student is engaging in academic misconduct in an examination, the student must

be informed, preferably in the presence of a witness, that the circumstances will be reported. The student must be allowed to continue the examination. The details and time of the incident must be noted on the exam script. Wherever possible, the invigilator must confiscate and retain evidence relating to the alleged academic misconduct.

12. If, before an allegation has been considered by the Chair of the Board of Examiners, further allegations relating to the same student are received, the allegations (whether in examinations and/or coursework) can be treated as concurrent and can be investigated together.

13. When considering the allegation of academic misconduct, the Chair of the Board of Examiners must choose one of the following options:

    i. **Take no further action**: This option must be chosen if there is insufficient evidence to justify an allegation of academic misconduct.

    ii. **Conclude that the student has demonstrated poor academic practice**: This option must be chosen if the student's coursework contains examples of poor academic practice that fall short of academic misconduct. If this option is chosen, a record should be placed in MyBangor (where this is relevant, or otherwise kept on the student's file) noting the discussion.

    iii. **Conduct an investigation**: This option must be chosen if the alleged academic misconduct is in assessed work, including examinations and coursework, that:

    - Does not contribute to the overall mark upon which the award is classified. For example, assessed work at Level 4 in an undergraduate degree.
    - Amounts to 20 credits or fewer in assessed work that contributes to the overall mark upon which the award is classified. For example, assessed work at Level 6 in an undergraduate degree.

    The investigation must be conducted as described in Paragraphs 15-20. This option must not be used if a previous allegation against a student has been substantiated following an investigation by a school or by a Panel of Enquiry.

    iv. **Refer the allegation to a Panel of Enquiry**: This option must be chosen in all of the following situations:

    - If a previous allegation against a student has been substantiated following an investigation by a school or by a Panel of Enquiry.
    - The allegation is of collusion, and a previous allegation against at least one of the students involved has been substantiated following an investigation by a school or by a Panel of Enquiry.
    - The allegation relates to academic misconduct in work amounting to over 20 credits in assessed work that contributes to the overall mark upon which the award is classified.

    When an allegation of academic misconduct is referred, details on the specific allegation against the student must be included together with evidence which supports the allegation, which should be indexed and cross referenced as necessary so that its importance and relevance is clear to the Panel. The Quality Enhancement Unit can ask for more information before allowing an allegation to be presented to a Panel of Enquiry. Details of any

previous allegations must also be provided, on a separate sheet, so that these can be considered by a Panel of Enquiry if an allegation is substantiated. Schools may include on the sheet provided any information that may be relevant to the Panel of Enquiry when it decides on a penalty.

v. Where the allegation of academic misconduct relates to a Bangor University student studying at one of the University's partner institutions, the initial allegation must be considered by the Head of School (or equivalent senior academic member of staff). The options available to the Head of School (or equivalent) are as set out in section i-iv above.

Procedure for a school investigation by the Chair of the Board of Examiners

14. The Chair of the Board of Examiners must invite the student to present a written response, by letter or email, to the allegation. The student must respond within 10 working days, where practicably possible.

15. The Chair of the Board of Examiners must consider all the evidence that is available and can consult with academic members of staff. As part of the investigation, the Chair of the Board of Examiners can invite the student to a meeting. The student can be accompanied by a member of academic staff, a staff member or officer of the Students' Union, or by another student. At the meeting, the student can be asked questions to verify that the work is their own.

16. The Chair of the Board of Examiners must choose one of the following options:

- Conclude that the allegation of academic misconduct is not proven and that no further action should be taken.
- Conclude that the allegation of academic misconduct is not proven but that the student has demonstrated poor academic practice. A penalty as described below, and in Appendix 4 of this document, must be applied.
- Instruct examiners to assign a mark ignoring that part of the assessed work affected by academic misconduct (e.g. plagiarised text). This option is appropriate where only a small proportion of the work is affected by academic misconduct.
- Award a mark of zero (0%) for the element where academic misconduct occurred. This option is appropriate where a substantial proportion of the work is affected by academic misconduct **and/or** the academic misconduct is considered to be advertent.
- Award a mark of zero (0%) for the module in which academic misconduct occurred. This option is appropriate where (a) the academic misconduct is particularly serious or (b) there is evidence of extensive academic misconduct in most of the assessed elements within a module **and** the academic misconduct is considered to be advertent.

No penalty must be imposed that is greater than the award of a mark of zero (0%) for the module(s) where academic misconduct has been proven.

The Chair of the Board of Examiners must also determine whether students are permitted to submit work for reassessment (as described in paragraphs 17-19).

17. If a penalty is imposed (as described in paragraph 17 and Appendix 4) on students in the first two years of an undergraduate programme (or in the third year of a four year programme) the Chair of the Board of Examiners must consider whether any recommendations must be passed to the Senate Examination Board about reassessment in modules affected by academic misconduct. If no recommendations are provided, the procedures in the Regulations for Taught Programmes must be applied.

18. If a penalty is imposed (as described in paragraph 17 and Appendix 4) on students in the final year of an undergraduate programme or students on a postgraduate taught programme, the Chair of the Board of Examiners must determine whether the student will be allowed to submit work for reassessment, and which assessed elements of a module are to be resubmitted. The Chair must consider the potential implications of the decision on the ability of the student to fulfil the requirements for the award.

19. The Chair of the Board of Examiners must inform the student in writing of the decision and of the right to appeal within 10 working days, where practicably possible.

20. If an allegation of academic misconduct is upheld the decision must be recorded as a confidential note on MyBangor (where this is relevant, or otherwise kept on the student's file).

Procedure for a University Panel of Enquiry

21. A Panel of Enquiry will be convened by the Quality Enhancement Unit. Panels must be convened and must not consider the case based only on electronic communication.

22. Students and their Personal Tutor (or relevant member of staff at partner institutions) must be informed in writing by the Secretary of the Panel of the allegation and that a Panel of Enquiry will consider the case.

23. The membership of the Panel of Enquiry will consist of:

- Three members of academic staff appointed by the Senate (any one of whom can act as the Chair). The members must be from outside the student's school.
- The President of the Students' Union (or nominee).

24. The Secretary of the Panel must:

i. Inform the members of the Panel of Enquiry of the date, place and time of the meeting and supply them with details of the allegation and of any statements or documents.

ii. Inform the student of the date, place, and time when the Panel of Enquiry intends to meet and that the student has the right to be represented or accompanied, to hear all the evidence, to call and question witnesses and to submit other evidence, including evidence of mitigating circumstances.

iii. Inform the school that referred the allegation of the date, place, and time when the Panel of Enquiry intends to meet.

iv. Send documents to Panel members, the student and school representative.

vi. Where the Panel of Enquiry relates to a student studying at one of the University's international partners arrangements must be made to ensure that, where they wish to do so, that the student can join the meeting through online means / video conferencing.

25. A student who intends to be accompanied and/or represented must inform the Secretary of the name of the person accompanying and/or representing in writing a minimum of 3 full working days before the meeting. Student attendance by online means / video conferencing is permitted, and they can also send a representative; but the strength of the connection should be tested by the student beforehand, and a land line connection should be available as a back-up.

26. The student has the right to seek a postponement of the meeting where there are mitigating circumstances. Notice of a minimum of 3 full working days is required. A Panel meeting can only be delayed if the student is able to provide satisfactory documentary evidence of mitigating circumstances that prevent her/his attendance. The Secretary must confer with the Chair of the Panel to make a decision as to whether the mitigating circumstances presented are sufficient to warrant a postponement of the Panel meeting. The Secretary of the Panel will send all correspondence relating to the allegation to the student's email address. When (a) a student fails to attend the meeting at the appointed time or (b) has not contacted the Secretary at least 3 full working days before the scheduled time for the Panel meeting or (c) in the absence of sufficient mitigating circumstances, the Panel meeting will normally proceed in the absence of the student.

27. Any evidence made available on the date of the Panel meeting, including details of special circumstances, can only be presented with the permission of the Chair.

28. The functions of the Panel of Enquiry are to:

    i. Consider the evidence submitted to it about the allegation of academic misconduct.

    ii. Determine whether the allegation has been substantiated. Such a determination must normally be made on the balance of probabilities.

    iii. Determine, if the allegation is proven, the penalty to be imposed.

29. In cases where two or more students are accused of related offences, such as in the case of collusion, the Chair can decide to deal with the cases together. However, each student must be given the opportunity to request that the cases be heard separately.

30. At a Panel of Enquiry:

- The Chair must:
    - Ensure that each member of the Panel, the student and any other participants are introduced.
    - Outline the procedure to be followed at the Panel of Enquiry. Read out the allegation against the student.
- Students must be given an opportunity to state whether they wish to contest the allegation.
- A representative from the school responsible for the module will present the evidence that supports the allegation.
- The student must have the right to be represented or accompanied, to hear all the evidence regarding the allegation(s), to call and to question any witnesses, and to submit other evidence. The student can question the school representative. The Chair can invite contributions from the person accompanying the student.
- Members of the Panel of Enquiry can ask questions of the student, the Secretary and of the school representative.

31. The Panel of Enquiry must consider whether the allegation has been substantiated. The Panel is not required to prove intent on the part of the student to engage in an act of academic misconduct in order to substantiate the allegation, but additional proof of intent can be relevant to the Panel in arriving at an appropriate penalty.

32. The Panel of Enquiry must not normally be informed, before deciding whether an allegation is substantiated, of any evidence of previously substantiated allegations of academic misconduct. However, the Panel must be informed before determining the penalty. In exceptional cases, evidence of previous substantiated acts of academic misconduct can be disclosed prior to the verdict of the Panel where such evidence:

    i. Rebuts a claim of previous good character made by the student or their representative.

    ii. Is relevant to the allegation under consideration (other than merely showing that the student had a disposition to commit the acts alleged) and that its prejudicial effect does not outweigh its probative value.

33. The penalties will normally be as defined in Appendix 4, but the Panel can apply other penalties at its discretion and based on previous penalties/precedents. These penalties can include assigning a mark ignoring that part of the assessed work affected by academic misconduct, awarding a mark of zero (0%) for the module in which academic misconduct occurred, decreasing the degree classification by one class, and exclusion from the University.

34. Where an allegation has been proven and the Panel is concerned that this can affect the student's suitability for practice/ fitness to practise on a professional programme, the case can be referred for consideration under the Suitability / Fitness to Practise procedure (or its equivalent).

35. Where the Panel issues a formal reprimand, the Panel can recommend that the student must receive advice from an appropriate member of academic staff to ensure that the cause of the action (e.g. poor academic practice) is discussed with the student and that any future repeat offence cannot then be classed as 'inadvertent'.

36. The Chair of the Panel of Enquiry can inform the student orally of the Panel's decision. The Secretary must notify the student in writing of the Panel of Enquiry's decision and, where the allegation is proven, of the penalty to be imposed and of the student's right to appeal.

37. Where the allegation has been proven, the Secretary must inform the student's school so that the Board of Examiners can determine the student's overall result taking into account the penalty imposed by the Panel of Enquiry.

Examination Processes

38. If a case of alleged academic misconduct is under investigation at the time of the meeting of a Board of Examiners, the Board must defer consideration of the student's results until the Chair of the Board of Examiners or Panel of Enquiry has considered the case.

39. Boards of Examiners have authority to cancel a result previously published and to publish a supplementary pass-list, if academic misconduct is proven after the publication of the original pass-list.

Appeals against decision of Chair of Board of Examiners

40. Appeals against the decision of the Chair of Board of Examiners will be considered by the University's Panel of Enquiry. Appeals must be submitted in writing to academicintegrity@bangor.ac.uk within 10 working days, where practicably possible, of the date on which the student receives notification of the decision. A Panel of Enquiry will be convened to discuss the Appeal. The Panel of Enquiry will hear the Appeal as per any other academic misconduct case and will decide on whether to uphold the Appeal, uphold the decision of the Chair of the Board of Examiners, or uphold the allegation and amend the penalty imposed by the Chair of the Board of Examiners.

Appeals against decision of University's Panel of Enquiry

41. Appeals against the decision of a Panel of Enquiry will be considered by the Pro Vice-Chancellor (Education and Student Experience) or their nominee. Appeals must be submitted in writing to academicintegrity@bangor.ac.uk within 10 working days, where practicably possible, of the date on which the student receives notification of the decision.

42. Appeals will only be considered on the following grounds:

- Defects or irregularities in the conduct of the procedure used to consider the allegation of academic misconduct and where defects, irregularities or advice could have affected the decision.
- Special circumstances that relate to the decision. The appellant must explain why such special circumstances were not made known as part of the process of considering the allegation. Where a student could have reported special circumstances, but did not do so, those circumstances cannot subsequently be cited as grounds for appeal.

43. The Pro Vice-Chancellor will investigate the concerns in order to gather full and relevant information before making a judgment on the appeal.

44. The Pro Vice-Chancellor can reach one of the following options:

i. That the appeal is not upheld.

ii. That the original decision must be amended.

iii. That the appeal must be referred to a Panel of Enquiry with members that have had no previous involvement with the case.

45. Appeals against the decision of a Panel of Enquiry, convened under paragraph 44iii will not normally be permitted.

46. When the appeals procedure has been completed a student can submit a complaint to the OIA. A student can complain to the OIA if they are, or were, a student registered at Bangor University, or if they were studying for an award granted by Bangor University. The term "student" includes trainees, apprentices and those studying at a campus abroad for an award from Bangor University.

The Office of the Independent Adjudicator for Higher Education (OIA) runs an independent scheme to review student complaints. Bangor University is a member of this scheme. If a student is unhappy with the outcome from Bangor University, they may be able to ask the OIA to review their case. They can find more information about making a complaint to the OIA, what it can and cannot look at and what it can do to put things right here: https://www.oiahe.org.uk/students.

Students normally need to have completed this procedure before they complain to the OIA. Bangor University will send a letter called a 'Completion of Procedures Letter' when they have reached the end of these processes and there are no further steps they can take internally. If the complaint/appeal is not upheld, Bangor University will issue a Completion of Procedures Letter automatically. If the complaint/appeal is upheld or partly upheld a student can still ask for a Completion of Procedures Letter from Bangor University if they want one. They can find more information about Completion of Procedures Letters and when they should expect to receive one here: https://www.oiahe.org.uk/providers/completion-of-procedures-letters.

To bring a complaint to the OIA, you need to submit a completed OIA Complaint Form within 12 months of the date of Bangor University's final decision (usually the date of the Completion of Procedures Letter), and you will normally need to send the OIA your Completion of Procedures Letter. A Scheme Application Form can be downloaded from the OIA website www.oiahe.org.uk.

Appendix 1 School and Staff Responsibilities

1. The Head of School must make sure that mechanisms exist within the school to train all staff who mark students' work on matters related to academic misconduct, to promoting academic integrity and to identify training needs.
2. Staff must be made aware:
    a. Of the need for understanding of, and support for, students who commit academic misconduct because of external reasons e.g. stress, feeling unable to seek support, lack of study skills, poor time management, lack of confidence to express one's own ideas, lack of understanding of assignment requirements, disabilities (known or unknown), health or personal issues, language difficulties, and cultural variations;
    b. That any mitigation applies to the sanctions imposed after a finding of academic misconduct and not to the decision as to whether academic misconduct has occurred;
    c. Of the QAA guidelines on *Contracting to Cheat in Higher Education*;
    d. Of the existence of the major copywriting and contract cheating 'essay bank/mill' sites, and the need to ensure that any known advertising from such sites is immediately taken down and / or Digital Services are informed so that the sources can be blocked;

3. Each school must have a designated Academic Misconduct Officer.

4. Staff should:

    a. Consider how students are targeted by essay banks or mills and seek to emphasise transferable skills gained through examinations and assignments that can be utilised in a students' future career.
    b. Bring to the attention of students the known approaches undertaken by essay banks or mills which will include falsely sympathetic statements, friendly pop-up chats, fake testimonials, multiple company names giving the appearance of a free market but hiding market majorities, guarantees and flashing rewards to attract new and repeat customers.
    c. Discourage the use of proofreading, translating using unauthorized methods, and use of other external services that may lead to a heavily edited or rewritten work by those other than the student;
    d. Encourage students to report such approaches to tutors or other University staff.

    Staff should signpost students to the Study Skills Centre who can help both student and staff writers to improve their note-taking, exam and presentation skills, planning and time management skills, maths and statistics skills, use of and referencing evidence, locating relevant sources, essay/report structure and style, developing an argument, critical reading and writing, self-editing skills, and using feedback and assessment criteria, in a confidential one-to-one setting.

    Staff should be aware that the Library offers modules, workshops, and small group or individual appointments to provide assistance with utilising appropriate resources, guidance on search techniques, strategies for undertaking good quality research, advice on plagiarism and referencing, using referencing tools like Mendeley, support with systematic reviews, copyright, and getting published. Engagement and

attendance are highest when sessions are run in conjunction with tutors.

5. Members of staff who mark students' work are responsible for identifying plagiarism and academic misconduct and can use whatever methods are deemed appropriate and any specific procedures adopted by the school (in particular see Appendix 3 regarding Turnitin) to raise awareness of academic misconduct, and academic integrity.
6. All student handbooks must include statements about academic misconduct. Handbooks must also provide details of the support offered by schools and the University to students who are in any doubt about academic misconduct, or who require assistance with writing techniques.
7. At the beginning of each module, guidance must be provided on expectations relating to any academic activity where students are required to work together. Students must be informed explicitly about the extent to which collaboration is either required or forbidden.
8. It must not be assumed that students enter the University with an existing knowledge of academic conventions, of what academic misconduct is, or of how they can avoid it. Instructions about the use of primary and secondary sources, bibliographical techniques, referencing and avoiding self-plagiarism must be presented in clear and unambiguous language to all students. The instructions must include as many examples as possible drawn from the subject being studied. Opportunities for students to test whether they are committing plagiarism are considered to be good practice, for example, by allowing students to submit a draft version of their work into Turnitin.
9. For distance-learning students, and Bangor University registered students who are studying at one of the University's UK or international partners schools must provide clear guidelines of what academic misconduct is, or of how they can avoid it. Academic misconduct must be discussed in residential courses, study groups or other support meetings.
10. The first semester period of each student's study period must be regarded as developmental, providing opportunities to encourage and develop good academic practices. Incidences of poor academic practice must be dealt with as sympathetically as possible, accompanied by support from academic staff and/or personal tutors, to ensure that the student understands how further incidences could be avoided.
11. Particular attention must be paid to the possibility of plagiarism in the marking of first assignments for postgraduate courses, where very limited opportunities exist for remedial action. For students on taught Master's courses, procedures must allow the first written submission to be used developmentally, notwithstanding the fact that the work can contribute to the final assessment. This can be achieved by:
    - Assigning a relatively small number of marks to the assignment.
    - Allowing an immediate resubmission where students have failed to comply with good practice.
12. The cover sheets for assessed work must include a section where the student declares that the work is their own (subject to any specific guidance on collaborative work affecting specific pieces of work).
13. Schools must publicise the support services that are available to students, including the Study Skills Centre, and must reassure students that advice can be sought from academic and support staff at any stage in their studies.
14. Assignments must be designed to encourage critical thinking while minimizing the

opportunity for academic misconduct, including self-plagiarism. For example, assignments could expect students to solve problems or develop a hypothesis rather than to review information. Similarly, asking students to write for a different audience or in a different format will reduce the opportunity to simply reproduce published information.

15. Schools must ensure that students are given guidelines on how to correctly reference material, both in the text and in the bibliography. They must be provided with any subject-specific conventions regarding style/format of referencing.
16. Schools must provide students with guidance on any subject- or discipline-specific examples of academic misconduct. Where reasonably practical, this must place particular emphasis on examples other than those described in general guidelines on academic misconduct that are relevant to a subject- or discipline (e.g. unfair use of generative artificial intelligence; misuse of translation software).
17. Operate under the guiding principle set out at the start of this procedure.

Appendix 2 - Students' Responsibilities

1. Students must read and consider all guidance on academic misconduct provided by the University and schools.
2. Referencing other people's work demonstrates background reading and research and strengthens any arguments presented by students' in their own work. Such reading and research will be rewarded, but students must not copy another's work or use another's work without acknowledgement.
3. Paraphrasing another's work without acknowledgement is considered to be plagiarism. This includes making minor changes to somebody else's work by substituting words or deleting a few words. The sources of any materials that have been translated from the original into the language in which the assessment is submitted must also be acknowledged.
4. The best way to avoid plagiarism is to start assignments early and to ensure that the source of every piece of information contained in work produced for assessment is cited (including written and oral sources, images and tables of results). The only exception is obvious sources. The source is 'obvious' if the information is common knowledge either generally, or within some specific field of enquiry, e.g. 'The Norman Conquest occurred in 1066'. Sources of information include published sources, such as a book, periodical, newspaper, TV, radio, and internet. The source of unpublished information, for example, from a third-party must also be stated.
5. Where the work(s) of an author is quoted in several places, the exact source of the quotation must be given every time it is paraphrased or cited. If the ideas of several authors are quoted, paraphrased or summarised: it is not sufficient simply to state sources at the end of the assessed work. Each individual idea must be attributed to its author(s) in the relevant place(s) in the text where it is mentioned.
6. Students must not re-use work for which credit has already been achieved (unless specific permission to do this has been granted). This can be called self-plagiarism.
7. It is wrong to use other people's data without their permission, unless that data has appeared in the public domain. It is acceptable to re-analyse data from a previously-published study but the source of the original data must be acknowledged. It is not acceptable to use data from other sources, other students (unless collected as part of approved group work) or members of staff without permission. Even when data has been used with permission, the source of data must always be acknowledged.
8. Pay close attention to subject- or discipline-specific guidance provided by their School regarding academic misconduct and the use of translation software in submitted work.
9. Work under the guiding principle set out at the start of this procedure and make acknowledgements in submitted work as required by their subject or discipline (e.g. to sources, methods, translation, use of generative artificial intelligence software).

Appendix 3 - Detecting academic misconduct and the Turnitin detection software

1. Schools can employ whatever methods are deemed appropriate in order to detect academic misconduct. Suspected academic misconduct must be confirmed by producing documentary evidence that allows, for example, the source of plagiarised text/material to be identified unambiguously.
2. The University strongly recommends the use of electronic plagiarism detection systems, currently Turnitin. The University ensures that students' consent for submission of work to an electronic plagiarism detection service is obtained.
3. The reports produced by detection software must not be used by themselves to determine if academic misconduct has taken place. Members of academic staff responsible for marking assignments must interpret the results to determine whether an accusation of academic misconduct is to be pursued. Other indicators of academic misconduct, as outlined in paragraph 4, must also be considered.
4. Staff marking students' work must use their professional judgement to determine whether plagiarism, and other forms of academic misconduct, has occurred. Indicators of academic misconduct include the following:
    - The work, or portions of it, exceed the student's research or writing abilities, and can appear as too professional, journalistic or scholarly.
    - The student's paper contains complex or specialised vocabulary, technical terms, or other words and expressions beyond what would be expected from a student at that level.
    - The quality of writing is inconsistent. For example, the introduction or conclusion can be poorly written compared to the body of the paper.
    - The title page, font, references, format, or layout of the paper is inconsistent.
    - There are embedded links, page breaks, or incorrect page numbers in the paper.
    - The topic of the paper is not consistent with the assignment, class lectures, or class handouts.
    - The bibliography is odd in some way. For example, it can be long, the style used for the bibliography can be different from the one normally used, the citations are from older or remote sources, or few of the materials referenced are available in the University library's book, journal or electronic collections. It is possible to search the library catalogue to see if items listed in the bibliography are available to students.
    - The same searching techniques that students use for locating papers on the internet can also be used to retrieve plagiarised papers. A phrase from a student's work can be typed into a search engine to identify sources that have been copied.
    - When considering a student's work attention must also be given to text that is similar, though not necessarily identical, to other sources, including the work of another student. Students are guilty of plagiarism if they have only changed a few words and phrases, or changed the order of the original's sentences. Plagiarism also includes presenting a rewritten version of the original text without citing a source for any of the ideas or facts.

5. Students are allowed to submit work to Turnitin to check for plagiarism before the work is submitted to be marked. Students must only be prevented from doing this for an assignment or module if there is a very specific reason.

Appendix 4. Typical Penalties for Academic Misconduct Cases Referred to a Panel of Enquiry

Type of Academic Misconduct	Lower Penalty[1]	Normal Penalties[2]	Higher Penalties[3]
AM in Examinations or Coursework	• Award 0% for assessed work • Resit/resubmission allowed • Mark for assessed work capped at 40% (Level 4-6) or 50% (Level 7) • Option to allow student to resubmit without cap but should the Panel decide on this option they must provide the school with an explanation of the decision	• Award 0% for assessed work • Resit/resubmission allowed only if required and permitted under University rules • Module mark after resit capped at 30% (Level 4-6) or 40% (Level 7)[4]	• Award 0% for assessed work • Resit/resubmission not permitted except to redeem failure as a part-time/external student
AM in a Master's Research Project (Dissertation)	• Allow resubmission of the entire thesis, or only permitting changes to be made to defined sections/chapters	• Award 0% • Allow resubmission but mark capped at 50%	• Award 0% • Resubmission of Research Project not permitted (PG Certificate or Diploma permitted)
AM in a Postgraduate Research thesis	• Allow resubmission of the thesis, but only permitting changes to be made to defined sections/chapters	• Examiners to reconsider the thesis and determine whether the thesis, ignoring defined sections, must be awarded the degree (or a lower degree where that option exists)	• No reconsideration or resubmission of the thesis is permitted. Candidate must not be considered for a lower degree unless the candidate has already met the criteria for an exit award defined for the programme

Continued…

1. **The Lower Penalties** are applied if one or more of the following apply: actions were inadvertent or due to poor understanding of University regulations; actions were committed on impulse and were not pre-meditated; academic misconduct is very limited in relation to amount of work presented; there are relevant personal or other circumstances; and/or the Normal Penalty would have a disproportionate impact on the student's profile of marks.

2. **The Normal Penalties** are applied if one or more of the following apply: the student understands that what they did was wrong; actions were pre-meditated; academic misconduct has influenced the work presented, but not extensively; and/or there are no relevant extenuating circumstances.

3. **The Higher Penalties** are applied if one or more of the following apply: the student shows no remorse or regret for actions; actions show high degree of pre-meditation and planning; academic misconduct is extensive in relation to amount of work presented; academic misconduct is repeat offence after prior warning from Panel; there are no relevant extenuating circumstances; and/or the Normal Penalty does not adequately reflect the offence committed.

4. **Capping mark at 30% or 40%.** If a module is Core – the mark must be capped at 40% (Level 4-6) or 50% (Level 7).

Note: If a student falls between categories, for example is a higher penalty is suggested on the basis of one criterion but a normal penalty is suggested by another criterion, the higher of the two penalties should be applied.