

Regulations governing Academic Misconduct

Classification	Regulation
Version number:	4 14 Housekeeping
Status	Approved
Approved by:	
Approval date:	19 June 2024
Effective from:	01 September 2024
Next review date:	2028-29
Document author:	Registry Services/Quality Support Service
Document owner:	Director of Quality and Collaborative Provision
Contact:	Quality Support Service
Report Exemptions to:	Education Committee
Collaborative provision:	Mandatory
<i>State whether this document is applicable to the University's collaborative partners</i>	
Related documents:	Proof Reading Guidance https://libguides.hull.ac.uk/proofreading-guidance
University document:	Yes
<i>A University document applies across the institution, is approved by a committee of Council or Senate and is held in the University Policy Directory on SharePoint.</i>	
Published location:	https://www.hull.ac.uk/choose-hull/university-and-region/key-documents/quality

- The University has adopted the principles of Designing for Diverse Learners, and all policy documents **should** be written with reference to these principles. Further information is available at the **Designing for diverse learners website**.
- An Equality Impact Assessment (EIA) **must** be considered for all new and amended policies. Further information is available from the **EIA section of SharePoint**.
- This document is available in alternative formats from **policy@hull.ac.uk**.
- All printed or downloaded versions of this document are classified as uncontrolled

Regulations governing Academic Misconduct

Table of Contents

1	Introduction.....	3
	Scope	3
2	Definitions.....	3
3	Determining the level of Academic Misconduct.....	5
	Poor Academic Practice.....	5
	Academic Misconduct.....	5
	Severe Academic Misconduct	6
4	Procedure for the determination of allegations of Academic Misconduct.....	6
	Identification of plagiarism, collusion, false authorship and falsification of data	6
	Identification of examination room breaches	7
5	Procedure for the investigation of allegations of Academic Misconduct.....	8
	Investigation of allegations.....	8
	No case to answer.....	8
	Case to answer- taught programmes.....	8
	Case to answer- research by thesis degrees	9
6	Penalties: Students on taught programmes or modules.....	10
7	Penalties: Candidates on research by thesis degrees	11
8	Decisions of Programme Boards of Examiners	12
9	University Academic Misconduct Panel	12
	Informing the student of the panel meeting	12
	University Academic Misconduct Panel Constitution	12
	Conducting the Panel Hearing	13
10	Appeals.....	14
	Right of Appeal.....	14
11	Monitoring	14
12	Version control	15

Regulations governing Academic Misconduct

1 Introduction

- 1.1 Academic integrity is fundamental to the reputation of individual students and to academic institutions. The University of Hull is committed to supporting students to succeed and to develop high standards of academic practice. Equally it is committed to safeguarding the standards of its academic awards by detecting and acting upon cases which lack academic integrity in the form of academic misconduct. Proven academic misconduct could have professional implications for students in the future.

Scope

- 1.2 The Academic Misconduct Regulations apply to all credit bearing awards of the University and **should** be read in conjunction with the University Programme Regulations.
- 1.3 The purpose of these regulations is to outline the expectations of the University and the processes that are undertaken where these are not met. They facilitate investigation of cases of unacceptable academic behaviour by a candidate undertaking any qualification (academic, professional or combined) either delivered solely by the University of Hull or as collaborative provision. They outline the support and penalties that will be applied to any identified cases.
- 1.4 The term ‘collaborative’ in these regulations means programmes and modules which are delivered in whole or in part by the staff of a partner institution or organisation (whether further education institution or other, whether publicly funded or not) irrespective of the location or mode of delivery and leading to credit or an award of the University of Hull.
- 1.5 The policy and procedures for academic misconduct are monitored and reviewed by the University Education Committee (EC) which is the final arbiter of these regulations.
- 1.6 The University Research Degrees Committee (RDC) is the final arbiter for those programmes, modules or other awards classified as ‘research’, including modules undertaken as part of the Postgraduate Research Training Scheme (PGTS) and cover allegations against postgraduate research students.
- 1.7 These regulations do not apply to candidates studying at Hull York Medical School (HYMS), for which separate regulations apply as approved by the HYMS Joint Senate Committee.
- 1.8 These regulations are consistent with guidance published as part of the Academic Integrity Charter for UK Higher Education (QAA).
- 1.9 Correspondence with all students under these regulations **must** include reference to the availability of independent advice from the HUSU Advice Centre and support from the University Support Services.

2 Definitions

- 2.1 **Academic Integrity:** being honest about your work. University assessments require you to develop your own answers, resources, products, solutions and work. You are the creators of new works and knowledge. Working with integrity means that: within assessments you acknowledge when the ideas and work of others have been used

through the use of references and quotation marks; ensure you follow the University guidelines for examinations; work that is submitted for assessment is authored by you and has not been completed on your behalf or been taken from another student. You **should** be honest about your sources, respect the work of others and take responsibility by understanding and following the University Regulations on assessments and examinations.

- 2.2 Academic misconduct can take many forms. Definitions are given below, although academic misconduct covers more than this selection, and they are not intended to constrain the outcome of an academic misconduct allegation.
- 2.3 **Plagiarism:** using the ideas or work of another person (including experts, staff, and fellow or former students) and submitting them as though they are your own original work. By not acknowledging the source properly, or by not mentioning it at all, the true origin of the material is hidden from the reader and examiner. Plagiarism may take the form of direct copying, reproducing or paraphrasing ideas, sentences, drawings, graphs, code, online content or any other source and submitting this for assessment without appropriate acknowledgement. Plagiarism can also include copying another student's work without their knowledge or submitting work which has already been published in another language. The latter relates to copying of translated material, copying and re-arranging material, as well as taking ideas and findings of the material without attribution.
- 2.4 **Self-Plagiarism:** submission of work that is the same as, or broadly similar to, assessments for which you have previously been awarded academic credit unless this is explicitly permitted in the assessment specification/brief, without proper acknowledgement. This may include work submitted and awarded credit at this University or another institution. If at reassessment you are required to resubmit an improved piece of work, this is not self-plagiarism as you have as yet not been awarded credit for the work.
- 2.5 **Collusion:** unauthorised collaboration between one or more students in the preparation and production of an assessment, which is then submitted by each of you individually as your own work. It will be made very clear by academic staff members when collaboration is required in an assessment and the expectations of what **should** be submitted.
- 2.6 **Cheating in an exam:** either possessing or using materials prohibited in the examination venue and/or breaching any of the examination conditions. This may include but is not limited to actions such as:
 - a. Continuing to write after the invigilator has announced the end of the examination.
 - b. Copying, or attempting to copy, from any other candidate during the examination.
 - c. Communication of any kind with any other person other than an authorised invigilator or other member of staff during an examination.
 - d. Possession of any written, printed or electronic materials in the examination room unless expressly permitted or accessing these materials during the examination.
 - e. Involvement in impersonation of another during an examination or other assessment event, including arranging for someone to impersonate you.
- 2.7 **False authorship:** submission of assessed work that is claimed as your own but has been produced by a third party on your behalf. This includes work that has been

improved by, commissioned or purchased from human agents (e.g. family members, friends, essay mills (contract cheating), or fellow students) or assistive technology (such as generative Artificial Intelligence). This includes content generated by AI when the use of such technology is not part of the assessment requirement and without appropriate acknowledgement of the source.

- 2.8 **Fabrication, falsification or misrepresentation of data:** submitting work containing interviews or surveys, data measured in the field, in the laboratory or other setting, any part of which is untrue, made up, misrepresented, falsified or fabricated in any way. This includes the presentation of data in reports, projects, theses etc. based on qualitative, quantitative or experimental work falsely purported to have been carried out or data obtained by unfair means (including data generated by AI without appropriate acknowledgement). This also includes using false statements or presenting false evidence in support of a request to withdraw from an examination, obtain an assessment extension, or explain any form of absence.
- 2.9 **Research ethics misconduct:** conduct that does not conform to the University's Research Ethics Regulations, including the process of gaining ethical approval for research. You **must** obtain ethical approval for your project/dissertation/thesis through your faculty's research ethics committee. Research ethics cannot be gained retrospectively. Failure to gain research ethics before undertaking any research-related data collection may result in failure of the work, or sections of a thesis being unusable, and an academic misconduct case being raised. This also includes legitimately obtaining research ethics approval at the University of Hull for your research, but then changing or amending your ethics forms (aside from a straight language translation) for approval in another country to undertake this University approved research.

3 **Determining the level of Academic Misconduct**

- 3.1 The University of Hull recognises three categories which determine the seriousness of the alleged academic misconduct.

Poor Academic Practice

- 3.2 This may arise from a lack of understanding of the standard methods of acknowledging the source of words, ideas or diagrams in a piece of work or the appropriate levels of collaboration or the correct behaviour within an exam. It may also be applicable where the extent does not justify further investigative proceedings or a penalty, for example, for errors made through carelessness. This is more likely to occur when students are new to studying in Higher Education and at the University of Hull.

Academic Misconduct

- 3.3 This is behaviour which, if not detected, could give a student an unfair advantage in an assessment. The main difference between academic misconduct and severe academic misconduct is the extent of the alleged misconduct. Indicative examples of what constitute academic misconduct are:
- Failure to reference sources and claim an idea as original work (i.e. plagiarism).
 - Submitting for assessment an item which has been previously submitted for credit in another module with little change made to the assessment (i.e. self-plagiarism).
 - Submitting coursework in collaboration with another student (i.e. collusion).
 - Attempts to communicate with another candidate during an examination (i.e.

breaching examination room regulations).

Severe Academic Misconduct

- 3.4 This is where there is clear evidence of extensive or substantial attempts to gain an unfair advantage or where there has been a previous, proven case of academic misconduct or severe academic misconduct against a student. Any proven allegations of contract cheating, false authorship, impersonation or fabrication, or falsification or misrepresentation of data will always initially be considered as a case of severe academic misconduct. Most cases of severe academic misconduct will require an Academic Misconduct Panel.

4 Procedure for the determination of allegations of Academic Misconduct

- 4.1 Faculties and the Doctoral College are responsible for the monitoring of allegations of academic misconduct (apart from exam room breaches see section 4.12) and for keeping records to enable patterns of student behaviour to be gathered.
- 4.2 The faculty which owns the module, including the Doctoral College, will be responsible for investigating the case and issuing any penalties. For research degrees the penalties will be issued via the Research Degrees Committee.
- 4.3 Allegations of academic misconduct will be investigated and will be determined on the balance of probabilities (more likely than not). All cases will be investigated using the guiding principles of transparency and fairness. All allegations of misconduct covered by these regulations **must** be investigated in accordance with the principles of natural justice which are in essence, broad principles of fairness which anyone who decides anything **must** follow. In short, a fair consideration of the evidence **must** be provided, and the process **must** be impartial and free from bias.
- 4.4 If a third-party reports that there has been academic misconduct by a student, the University may decide to investigate the allegations, taking into account the nature of the academic misconduct, any evidence provided by the reporting third party together with any other supporting evidence obtained from sources independent of the reporting third party.
- 4.5 The University will not report any details about the investigation undertaken and the outcome of the investigation to the reporting third party. If a reporting third party insists on remaining anonymous, the University may not be able to rely on the anonymous information as evidence of academic misconduct. If the University cannot investigate an anonymous report, they may use the information to better understand the issues impacting the academic community to understand trends and inform proactive preventive work.

Identification of plagiarism, collusion, false authorship and falsification of data

- 4.6 Where an examiner marking a piece of summatively assessed work suspects academic misconduct, they **should** decide if it warrants further investigation. If they decide that it is poor academic practice, and it is not appropriate to investigate, they **should** complete the examining process. The feedback **should** indicate that poor academic practice has been identified and the student **should** be referred to appropriate sources of guidance. At this stage, no penalty may be imposed, and the work **should** be marked against the assessment criteria for that piece of work.
- 4.7 If the examiner decides that the severity of the poor academic practice is sufficient to

warrant an allegation of academic misconduct, they **must**, within 20 working days of the assessment event/deadline, complete the Academic Misconduct Form and forward it along with the work, the assignment brief, relevant supporting evidence and any other guidance given to the student to the Academic Misconduct Officer (AMO).

- 4.8 For the examination of research theses, a case of academic misconduct can be raised by a supervisor, reviewer or member of an examination committee or assessment panel during the research process, progression meetings, examination process, viva voce, or post award. Within 20 working days of identifying the academic misconduct, they **must** complete the Academic Misconduct Form and forward it along with the work, relevant supporting evidence and any other guidance given to the student to the Academic Misconduct Officer (AMO) within the Doctoral College.
- 4.9 Cases identified outside 20 working days of the assessment event/deadline (or for research degrees the identification of the misconduct as outlined above), will only be considered where there is evidence that academic misconduct could not have been identified earlier. This includes where collusion is suspected between students on the same module, but the collusion only came to light after the second student submitted at a later date than the first student. This does not include cases where the assessed work is marked late.
- 4.10 In exceptional circumstances where the University becomes aware of an allegation of severe academic misconduct against a student after they have been granted an award, the University may investigate and could consider withdrawal of credit or an award.
- 4.11 Any decision to revoke an award will be made by the University Secretary and Chief Compliance Officer.

Identification of examination room breaches

- 4.12 In the case of examination room breaches, Academic Services will undertake the role of the Academic Misconduct Officer. Breaches during online assessments and in-class tests follow the above process and are undertaken by the Faculty/Doctoral College.
- 4.13 During an examination, where an invigilator suspects that a candidate may have breached the examination conduct policy they **must**:
 - a. Confiscate any contraband materials and issue a receipt; any confiscated mobile phones will be available for collection following the examination.
 - b. Annotate the examination booklet/register.
 - c. Complete an Academic Misconduct Form.
 - d. Complete the Invigilator's Report.
 - e. Submit relevant documentation to Academic Services
conductandcomplaints@hull.ac.uk
- 4.14 On receipt of any confiscated items, Academic Services will copy the relevant items to be retained for evidential purposes. The confiscated items will then be labelled and made available at the Central Hub. The student will be notified when it is available for collection.

5 Procedure for the investigation of allegations of Academic Misconduct

Investigation of allegations

- 5.1 On receipt of the Academic Misconduct Form, the AMO will review the evidence and decide whether on the balance of probabilities there is evidence of a breach of the regulations i.e. that there is a case to answer. This decision will be made within 10 working days.

No case to answer

- 5.2 If the AMO determines that there is insufficient evidence to support the allegation, the matter shall be closed. It **must** be reported back to the examiner (or the person submitting the form for research degrees) within 5 working days of the decision. For examination room breaches, it **must** be reported in writing via email to the student and the examiner/s within 5 working days of the decision.

Case to answer- taught programmes

- 5.3 The AMO **must** determine whether the student is eligible for a Developmental Caution.
- 5.4 A Developmental Caution is issued to signal formally to a student that academic misconduct has been identified. The caution is intended to provide students with the opportunity to learn from this experience and to avoid academic misconduct in the future. The Developmental Caution is recorded by the faculty.
- 5.5 Alongside receiving the Developmental Caution, students will be directed to the Academic Integrity Course which they are required to complete.
- 5.6 Students have a right to respond to the issuing of a caution.
- 5.7 Cases of severe academic misconduct are not eligible for a developmental caution.
- 5.8 A student is eligible for a Developmental Caution for the first identified case of academic misconduct during an initial period of their programme of study leading to a University of Hull award:
- The student is undertaking the Pre-Certificate or Certificate stage of an Undergraduate programme of study – this includes students who are repeating that stage or have transferred to it from another programme.
 - The student is undertaking the first trimester (or equivalent) of the Diploma, post Diploma or Honours stage of an Honours degree, or Masters stage of an Integrated Masters Degree having been admitted as a direct entrant to that stage.
 - The student is undertaking the first trimester (or equivalent) of the Intermediate stage of a Foundation Degree having been admitted as a direct entrant to that stage.
 - The student is undertaking the first trimester (or equivalent) of a Postgraduate or Graduate Certificate in Education, or the first module on the PGTS.
 - The student is undertaking a University Foundation Certificate, University Certificate, University Diploma or University Advanced Diploma as defined in University Regulations.
 - The student is undertaking the **first trimester taught stage** of a **taught graduate or postgraduate Diploma or degree**.
- 5.9 If the AMO determines that a Developmental Caution cannot be awarded and that there

is clear evidence that academic misconduct has taken place the student **must** be informed via email advising them of the following:

- a. A summary of the allegation.
 - b. A copy of the evidence (with any work of other students anonymised).
 - c. A request for the student to respond to the allegation via email within 15 working days of the date of notification.
 - d. An opportunity for the student to offer an explanation and/or mitigation.
- 5.10 On receipt of a response from the student, or after 15 working days has passed since the student was informed, the AMO will consider all the material presented with regards to the matter. They may request further information from the student or examiner before making a decision on the most appropriate penalty. The following points may be considered in determining the most appropriate penalty:
- a. The nature of the assessment where an unfair advantage was attempted to be gained.
 - b. Any previous experience of academic study in a UK higher education institution.
 - c. The extent of the misconduct in relation to the assessment in question i.e. the amount of work affected.
 - d. Any prior proven allegations of Academic Misconduct.
 - e. Whether the student has accepted responsibility and/or acknowledged the Academic Misconduct.
- 5.11 Where the student is proven to have committed more than one breach of these regulations, but notification of the first breach had not been received by the student at the time of committing the subsequent breaches, they shall be considered 'simultaneous' breaches. Each breach shall be treated individually only for the purposes of awarding the penalty.
- 5.12 In cases where a more severe penalty may be warranted or for cases of severe academic misconduct, the AMO **must** refer the case to a University Academic Misconduct Panel.
- Case to answer- research by thesis degrees
- 5.13 If the AMO determines that there is clear evidence of academic misconduct, they will send the case file to the Secretary of Research Degrees Committee who informs the PGR student via email that an allegation has been raised within 10 working days.
- 5.14 The Secretary of Research Degrees Committee will appoint a Graduate Research Director (GRD) to investigate the case within 20 working days.
- 5.15 After receiving the case, the GRD has 30 working days to investigate and produce a written report.
- 5.16 During this time, the GRD will meet separately with the supervisor/reviewer/examiner/assessment/committee panel and with the PGR student to discuss the allegation(s) and to collect evidence and statements.
- 5.17 The GRD will make a recommendation on the most appropriate penalty and submit their findings to the Research Degrees Committee.
- 5.18 The Chair of Research Degrees Committee makes the final decision on the appropriate penalty.

- 5.19 Where an allegation is found proven, and the PGR is in receipt of external funding for their research degree, the relevant funding body **must** be informed of the finding of academic misconduct and the penalty imposed. Under normal circumstances, an external body **must** not be informed of any allegation which is not proven, except when required by a regulatory body or when the funding body requires to be informed that an investigation has been initiated and/or has reached a particular stage, even if no allegation has yet been proven.

6 Penalties: Students on taught programmes or modules

- 6.1 The following penalties may be issued by the Academic Misconduct Officer and will be applied in accordance with the severity of the academic misconduct as outlined in 3.1 – 3.4 above.

Developmental Caution

This is only available for a first offence and as outlined within sections 5.3-5.7. Student will be required to complete the Academic Integrity Course.

Penalty 1: Issue a formal warning

Warning will remain on the student record. The work will be marked against the assessment criteria. Student will be required to complete the Academic Integrity Course.

Penalty 2: Mark of 0 awarded in the assessment task with the right to reassessment if this was a first attempt

If the Academic Misconduct was for a first attempt at the assessment, the student will have the right to undertake a second attempt in the reassessment period. The result of this reassessment attempt for this component will be capped at the pass mark. If the Academic Misconduct was for a reassessment attempt this may affect the student's ability to progress on the programme of study.

Student will also be issued with a formal warning. Student will be required to complete the Academic Integrity Course.

Penalty 3: Mark of 0 in the module

If the Academic Misconduct was for a first attempt at the module, the student will be required to undertake second attempt in the reassessment period in all assessment components of the module. The result of these reassessment attempts will be capped at the pass mark. If the Academic Misconduct was for a reassessment attempt this may affect the student's ability to progress on the programme of study.

Student will also be issued with a formal warning. Student will be required to complete the Academic Integrity Course.

The following penalties can only be issued by a University Academic Misconduct Panel (a panel can also issue Penalties 1-3)

Penalty 4: Mark of 0 in the module with no right to reassessment

This will result in a failed module which may affect the student's ability to progress on the programme of study.

Student will also be issued with a University Warning.

Penalty 5: Termination of Study

This **should** only occur where there is evidence of sustained Academic Misconduct. Student would be entitled to the award based on the credits achieved up to this point.

7 Penalties: Candidates on research by thesis degrees

- 7.1 The following penalties may be proposed by the AMO and issued by the Chair of Research Degrees Committee and will be applied in accordance with the severity of the academic misconduct as outlined in 3.1 – 3.4 above. More than one penalty can be applied.

Penalty 1: Issue one of the following warnings

School/Departmental Warning

Warning letter will remain on the PGR record for 12 months.

Faculty Warning

Warning letter will permanently remain on the PGR record. An Emergency Progress Meeting to be held (following Termination of Candidature Code of Practice, section 3). For post-submission and post-viva circumstances, the Academic Misconduct Officer will review the viva outcome and/or thesis revisions and decide whether the viva outcome **should** be changed (which can include a FAIL) or whether additional corrections are required. In the case of revisions, all **must** be completed to the satisfaction of the examiners and the AMO before the degree can be awarded.

University Warning

Warning letter will permanently remain on the PGR record. An Emergency Progress Meeting to be held (following Termination of Candidature Code of Practice, section 3). For post-submission and post-viva circumstances, the Academic Misconduct Officer will review the viva outcome and/or thesis revisions and decide whether the viva outcome **should** be changed (which can include a FAIL) or whether additional corrections are required. In the case of revisions, all **must** be completed to the satisfaction of the examiners and the AMO before the degree can be awarded.

In the case of each warning, all work affected **must** be amended to remove the academic misconduct.

Penalty 2: Denial of eligibility for the award of Certificate or Diploma

The student will be unable to receive an award of Certificate or Diploma.

Penalty 3: Denial of progression from Masters to Doctorate

The student will be unable progress.

Penalty 4: Denial of progression from Doctorate to Masters or MPhil

The student will be unable to obtain an exit degree of a Masters by Thesis or MPhil.

Penalty 5: Recommendation of Termination of Research Degree Programme of Study

This **should** only occur where there is evidence of sustained or serious academic misconduct, such that would undermine the integrity of the award. Refer to Termination of Candidature Code of Practice.

8 Decisions of Programme Boards of Examiners

- 8.1 At the time of a Programme Board meeting:
- Where work for a module's summative assessment is currently under investigation for an alleged breach of these regulations and no decision has been made, the Board **must** defer its programme decision in respect of the student.
 - Where the Board has received a copy of the Academic Misconduct decision, it **must** apply the penalty imposed and **must** not impose any other penalty.

9 University Academic Misconduct Panel

- 9.1 Cases of severe academic misconduct will normally be referred to an Academic Misconduct Panel.

Informing the student of the panel meeting

- 9.2 The student **must** be informed via email of the date, time and venue of the panel meeting, at least 10 working days prior to the meeting. This email will include all evidence relating to the case including any witness details or statements.
- 9.3 The student can request that the meeting be held online, face-to-face or as a hybrid meeting, and the panel will seek to facilitate this wherever possible.
- 9.4 The student **must** confirm their attendance at the panel at least 7 working days prior to the panel. Should they be unable to attend, evidence will need to be provided as to why. If the student has a legitimate reason for being unable to attend on the specified date, the panel shall be rearranged. If no legitimate reason is given (as determined by the Chair), the panel will proceed as planned.
- 9.5 Students have the right to be accompanied by a supporter such as a friend or HUSU Advice Centre staff member. The student **must** notify the Secretary of the Panel of the details of any supporter at least 5 working days prior to the panel meeting. If no response is received, the meeting will go ahead as planned.
- 9.6 Legal representation is not normally permitted. However, in exceptional circumstances the student may seek permission to be accompanied by a practising member of the legal profession and **must** make the request in writing. When considering the request for permission the following criteria shall be considered:
- The complexity of the case.
 - The capacity of the student to present their case.
- 9.7 If permission is granted the University accepts no liability for the payment of legal fees incurred by the student irrespective of the outcome.
- 9.8 Where permission is granted for the student to be accompanied by a practising member of the legal profession, any panel may also be supported by a practising member of the legal profession for the purpose of providing advice and support throughout the duration of the panel process.

University Academic Misconduct Panel Constitution

- 9.9 The panel shall consist of:
- The Chair (normally an Associate Dean Education or an Academic Misconduct Officer) or nominated person.

- b. At least two Directors of Learning and Teaching (or equivalent) or nominated persons.
 - c. A secretary who is responsible for ensuring that all documentation and notifications are dealt with in accordance with these regulations but **must** not otherwise participate in the making of decisions by the panel.
- 9.10 At least one member of the panel (excluding the secretary) **should** be external to the faculty bringing forward the academic misconduct case.
- 9.11 No person who has been involved in the marking or investigating of the allegation shall be a member of the panel.
- 9.12 Where possible and without diminishing panel experience or expertise, consideration **should** be given to the diversity of the panel members to mitigate against factors such as unconscious bias.

Conducting the Panel Hearing

- 9.13 The student has the right to attend the panel meeting in person and to be accompanied by a person of their choosing (see section 9.5-9.6). This person may not speak on behalf of the student unless invited to do so by the Chair of the panel.
- 9.14 At the request of the student or the panel, the student's Personal Supervisor may be present throughout the giving of evidence and to provide advice to the student or panel as required.
- 9.15 The Academic Misconduct Officer will present the case to the panel.
- 9.16 The panel may call any witness to provide any relevant evidence or discipline context where required. Other than in exceptional circumstances as defined by the panel, the student shall be entitled to be present while such evidence is presented.
- 9.17 Once the panel is satisfied that sufficient evidence has been presented and the student has been given fair and reasonable opportunity to respond, the panel shall consider its decision in private. It will consider whether, on the balance of probabilities, the case has been proven, and if so, the penalty to be imposed. These deliberations will be fully recorded but appear in summary form in the minutes of the meeting.
- 9.18 The Panel Secretary **must**:
- a. Minute all proceedings of the panel and ensure they are agreed as an accurate record.
 - b. Inform the student, via email, of the decision, any penalties imposed, a summary of the reasons for the decision and the right to appeal. This information **should** normally be provided within 5 working days of the panel meeting.
- 9.19 A copy of the panel's decision **must** be sent to:
- a. The Chair of any relevant Module Board of Examiners.
 - b. The Chair of any relevant Programme Board of Examiners.
 - c. Relevant faculty staff.
 - d. Relevant Academic Administration staff to be entered on the student's record.

10 Appeals

Right of Appeal

- 10.1 A student may appeal against the decision and/or penalty imposed by either the Academic Misconduct Officer or by the Academic Misconduct Panel in accordance with the University's Code of Practice for Academic Appeals.
- 10.2 An appeal **must** be submitted within 15 working days of the date of notification of the decision of the Academic Misconduct Officer or the Academic Misconduct Panel.

11 Monitoring

- 11.1 Faculties, Academic Services and the Doctoral College shall monitor the number of cases of Academic Misconduct noting the mode, level of study, gender, disability, and ethnic origin recording:
 - a. The number of allegations rejected (no case to answer).
 - b. The number of Academic Misconduct Panels held.
 - c. The number and type of allegations upheld.
 - d. The number of penalties issued.
- 11.2 The Faculty and Programme Journals, part of the University's Continual Monitoring, Evaluation and Enhancement (CMEE), shall provide an overview of the previous academic session, but also note any ongoing patterns appearing on a continual basis and any outstanding issues.

12 Version control

Version	Author	Date approved	Relevant sections
4 14	Quality Support Service	March 2025, Housekeeping	Updated to reflect changes in committee structures.
4 13	UoH Working Group	June 2024, Senate	Revisions as part of the cyclical review schedule set by the Quality and Standards Committee. Revisions include but are not limited to: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • clarity of definitions (2). • inclusion of false authorship (including AI) (2.7). • inclusion of research ethical misconduct (2.9). • makes explicit where regulations differ to research degrees. • reintroduces a developmental caution (5). • references the UoH Academic Integrity Course (5.5). • penalties rephrased for clarity (6). • revisions to penalties for research degree provision (7). • revisions to attendance at panel meetings (9.9).
4 12	Lisa Tees, Quality Manager, Quality Support Service.	Aug 2022, Housekeeping	6.1 The terminology of 'university warning' replaced by 'formal warning' in UG Penalties 2&3. These are issued by faculties.
4 11	Lisa Tees, Quality Manager, Quality Support Service.	Nov 2021, Housekeeping	1.8 Added in alignment to Academic Integrity Charter 11.1 Revised monitoring to align to UoH Continual Monitoring, Evaluation and Enhancement (CMEE) process.
4 10	University Registrar, Registry Services	Academic year 2017-18 <i>RCPC April 2018</i> <i>ULTC May 2018</i>	The changes include the removal of the option of issuing a caution, clearer implications of levels of academic misconduct and

			penalties which reflect the severity of the academic misconduct. The new regulations also define the different types of academic misconduct and how it is identified.
4 09	Quality Officer, Learning Enhancement and Academic Practice	April 2017, Senate	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Introduces Reg 10. Possession or use of prohibited materials in the examination room. Provides clarity that the caution process is only for use for specific types of misconduct, plagiarism, collusion and possessing unauthorised materials in examination rooms (Reg 12,13b). Makes explicit the case for self-plagiarism (Reg 18b)
4 08	Quality Officer, Learning Enhancement and Academic Practice	Aug 2016, Senate	<p>Introduces a review of the Academic Misconduct Process including:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> the requirement for all schools to have at least one named Academic Misconduct Officer. Academic Misconduct panels to be held as central University panels . A change in penalties applied to academic misconduct cases Reg.25. Replaces calendar days with working days. Replaces wording of prima facie with no case to answer.
4 07	Quality Officer, Learning Enhancement and Academic Practice	Aug 2016, Housekeeping.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Replaces Unfair Means with Academic Misconduct. Replaces department and Head of Department with school and Head of School.

			<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Replaces semester with trimester. • Other minor amendments.
4 06	Quality Officer, Learning Enhancement and Academic Practice	May 2014, Senate	<p>Introduces the following changes:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Extends the scope of the Caution procedure to collusion and possession of unauthorised materials in the exam room (Reg. 10, 12, 13, 14, 25-27). • The renaming of minimal plagiarism as poor academic practice (Reg. 9).
4 05	Quality Officer, Curriculum Development and Teaching Enhancement	June 2013, Senate	<p>Introduces the following changes:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Clarifies the wording of and provides an explanatory note for Reg 9(d) and Reg 15(a). • Provides an explanatory note for Reg 42(a).
4 04	Quality Office	Sept 2011, Senate	<p>Introduces the following changes:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Requires that the outcome of allegations in partners be recorded on UoH student records system (para 3(b)). • Clarification of examples which may constitute unfair means (para 4(e)). • Confirms that software used to identify plagiarism must retain anonymity (para 9(a)). • Introduces a requirement for examiners to forward work suspectedly plagiarised to the Dean with 4 weeks of the assessment event having taken place (para 9(d)). • Introduces a requirement that separate panels be constituted in cases of

			<p>alleged collusion (para 19(d)).</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Redefines the standard of proof required from 'beyond reasonable doubt' to 'on a balance of probabilities' (para 21(f), 23(a)(d)).
4 03	Quality Office	October 2010, Housekeeping	Replacing references to Programme Approvals, Monitoring and Enhancement Committee (PAMEC) with Programme Approvals Committee (PAC) and Quality and Standards Committee (QSC) with University Learning, Teaching and Assessment Committee (ULTAC).
4 02	Quality Office	October 2008, Senate	Definition of plagiarism – removal of reference to 'fraud' – addition of statement making explicit that intention is not relevant to proof of plagiarism (ref 5(b)).
4 01	Quality Office	Jan 2008, Housekeeping	Replacing reference to Academic Approvals Committee with the 'Programme Approvals Monitoring and Enhancement Committee' (see QH:G1 for the role of PAMEC in programme approval) (reg 2(a)).
4 00	Quality Office	August 2007, Senate	<p>Made the following major changes:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Incorporates the Caution Procedure (superseding QH:F10) but extends its scope to direct entrants to the first semester of later stages of awards (subject to it being their first UoH programme of study) (see reg. 12). • Revises the penalties giving more discretion to Adjudication Panels (regs. 25-30).

			<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Introduces a presumption of termination for a second breach of the regulations (reg. 24(b)). • Replaces references to Graduate Research Committee with its successor Research Degrees Committee. • Removes offences relating to library materials from the regulations, as matters to be dealt with under Library Regulations not unfair means (reg. 1(c)). • Requires deans to consider whether a case should be under these regulations or those governing professional misconduct/unsuitability (QH:F17) for relevant programmes (reg. 1(d)). • Introduces explicit monitoring and reporting requirements (regs. 43-44).
3 00	Quality Office	Sept 2004, ULTC	Version 3 reflects a minor amendment to section 2.5.1 (definition of plagiarism) replacing the term 'copied' with 'taken' to demonstrate that it is the use of the ideas of another without acknowledgement and not just the copying of text which constitutes plagiarism.
2 00	Quality Office	June 2001, ULTC	