



PLAGIARISM AND ACADEMIC MISCONDUCT PROCEDURES

Contents

1. How are accusations of plagiarism and academic misconduct treated?.....	3
2. What definitions does the University Use?	6
3. What is Academic Judgment?	10
4. What are student obligations to prevent allegations of plagiarism and academic misconduct?.....	11
5. How are allegations of plagiarism and academic misconduct dealt with?	12
6. What are the stages in the Process?	14
7. What are the arrangements for investigation?	17
Schedule 0 Introductory Stage	23
Schedule 1 Programme Level Investigation and Disciplinary Action (Stage 1)	26
Schedule 2 School Level Investigation and Disciplinary Action (Stage 2).....	30
Schedule 3 Faculty Level Investigation and Disciplinary Action (Stage 3)	33

1. HOW ARE ACCUSATIONS OF PLAGIARISM AND ACADEMIC MISCONDUCT TREATED?

WHY IS ACADEMIC INTEGRITY IMPORTANT?

- 1.1 The University must take steps to ensure that its assessments are equitable, valid and reliable. Any form of cheating poses a threat to the academic standards of our qualifications. We must protect the integrity of qualifications awarded to the vast majority of our students who achieve their qualification entirely by legitimate means.
- 1.2 A thesis, dissertation, report, essay or other form of assessment, including for postgraduate research students a review meeting as set out in the relevant postgraduate research handbook, which is undertaken as part of either an award-bearing programme or credit-bearing module, must be the student's own work. It must not contain plagiarised or duplicated material. 'Duplicated material' includes duplication of a student's work from any form of assessment previously submitted for examination at the University or other any other educational establishment.
- 1.3 The University prohibits any action by a student that
 - 1.3.1 gives or has the potential to give an unfair advantage in an examination or assessment; and/or
 - 1.3.2 might assist someone else to gain an unfair advantage; and/or
 - 1.3.3 is likely to undermine the integrity essential to scholarship and research

WHO AND WHAT DO THE PROCEDURES COVER?

- 1.4 These Procedures explain how the University will investigate and deal with accusations of plagiarism and/or academic misconduct.
- 1.5 The findings of plagiarism and academic misconduct investigations and panels will be binding upon the relevant Boards of Examiners.
- 1.6 The Procedures apply to all undergraduate and postgraduate programmes of the University. The Procedures apply to all cases initiated after 1 October 2019.
- 1.7 These procedures apply to all summative and submitted assessments. This may include. The procedures do not apply to formative or draft submissions.
- 1.8 The Procedures cover all behaviour that affects the conduct of assessments and examinations which breaches University processes and which
 - 1.8.1 is likely to give an unfair advantage to the student
 - 1.8.2 affects the integrity of examinations, whether oral, practical, coursework or time constrained written assessments

1.8.3 causes disruption of the examination process.

- 1.9 The procedures extend to allegations of plagiarism and/or academic misconduct in any submission, whether a first or subsequent submission, including a subsequent submission arising from a re-presentation whether or not there was an allegation of plagiarism in the original submission.

HOW WE USE THE PROCEDURES TO INVESTIGATE JOINT OR GROUP ALLEGATIONS OF PLAGIARISM OR ACADEMIC MISCONDUCT?

- 1.10 Under these procedures, the University may investigate joint or group allegations. These are allegations against two or more students. The University will deal with these cases in a way that is fair to all the students involved.
- 1.11 Where possible, the same interviewer, investigator or panel will consider the case against all the students involved either at a joint hearing or individually.
- 1.12 The University will enable all students involved to hear and respond to what the others have said, and the evidence provided. The intention is to consider joint or group allegations at a single meeting with all students in attendance. Students will also be given an opportunity to speak to the interviewer, investigator or panel privately so that they can raise matters relating to mitigation.
- 1.13 Where it is not possible or practical for matters to be considered at a single hearing, the University will ensure there is a consistent approach to all the students involved.
- 1.14 A decision will be made for each student individually, taking account of their particular circumstances. However, the intention is there should be broad consistency in the penalty given to all students who commit the same offence with similar circumstances.

WHAT IS OUR APPROACH TO THE BURDEN OF PROOF?

- 1.15 The burden of proof determines whose responsibility it is to prove an issue.
- 1.16 The student is at all times, responsible for indicating the inclusion of the work of others in their submissions. Plagiarism and/or academic misconduct does not require intent on the part of the student to deceive the examiner; the act of plagiarism and/or academic misconduct is sufficient for disciplinary procedures to be initiated.
- 1.17 Under these Procedures, the burden of proof rests principally with the University. The University must prove the student has committed the act of plagiarism or academic misconduct. The student should not have to disprove the allegation made by the University.

- 1.18 There are occasions when students need to prove they have or have not done something, or that something happened. For example, if two students are accused of cheating, and one student provides compelling evidence the other student cheated, the other student needs to rebut that evidence. Students will also need to prove any mitigating factors they rely on when the University considers the penalty.

WHAT IS OUR APPROACH TO THE STANDARD OF PROOF?

- 1.19 The standard of proof is the level of proof required.
- 1.20 Under this Procedure, the standard of proof is based on the balance of probabilities. The balance of probabilities means it is more likely than not that something happened. The standard of proof is higher than simply believing that something is likely to have happened. Furthermore, decisions must be supported by appropriate evidence.
- 1.21 The more severe the penalty, the greater the need for the evidence to support the decision to uphold the allegations of academic misconduct. This means that the more serious the allegation the stronger the evidence needs to be before concluding that the allegation is established on the balance of probabilities.

WHAT ARE THE ARRANGEMENTS FOR STUDENTS WITH DISABILITIES?

- 1.22 A disabled student might engage in plagiarism or academic misconduct for reasons unrelated to their disability. In such cases, the University might take disciplinary action in the same way as it would for any other student.
- 1.23 Students with disabilities should be told about the specific support services available within the University to assist them in responding to allegations of plagiarism or academic misconduct. If a student appears unable to engage effectively with the student disciplinary process, the University may agree with the student to suspend the disciplinary process until the student is able to receive appropriate support.
- 1.24 The University will consider whether to make reasonable adjustments to the procedures. This includes making reasonable adjustments for students where the disability relates to mental health. This is to take account of the particular requirements of individual students. There may be a need to make reasonable adjustments for misconduct hearings or agree with the student a longer period to respond to allegations.
- 1.25 The Student Procedures Office will record adjustments made within the formal procedures. The disciplinary officer will record adjustments made within Early Resolution.
- 1.26 It may be appropriate to consider a student's disability that might mitigate the seriousness of the offence when setting penalties.

2. WHAT DEFINITIONS DOES THE UNIVERSITY USE?

PLAGIARISM

- 2.1 Plagiarism is the act of presenting the material, ideas, and arguments of another person as one's own. To copy sentences, phrases or even particular striking expressions without acknowledgement in a manner which may deceive the reader as to the source is plagiarism; to paraphrase in a manner which may deceive the reader is likewise plagiarism. Plagiarism is identified in the composition of the work submitted by a student for assessment.
- 2.2 The definition of plagiarism, as it applies to these Procedures, does not include the permitted resubmission of the same piece of work in an improved form for reassessment purposes.

COPYING

- 2.3 Copying is an act of plagiarism. This includes including another person's material from books, journals, the internet, the work of another student or any other source into assessment material without acknowledgement. It includes either using exactly the same words as were originally or rephrasing by making slight adjustments.

COLLUSION

- 2.4 Collusion is an act of plagiarism through the submission of work for assessment that purports to be the student's own work but is in fact jointly written with another student or other students.

DUPLICATION

- 2.5 Duplication of material means the inclusion in coursework (including essays, projects, reports, dissertations and theses) of a significant amount of material that is identical or substantially similar to material already submitted by the student for the same programme or any other programme or module at this University or elsewhere.

ACADEMIC MISCONDUCT

- 2.6 Academic misconduct includes, but is not restricted to:
 - a) attempted or proven offering of financial or other inducements to those concerned with the examination process;
 - b) contract cheating (commissioning or attempting to commission others to produce assessments, including the use of essay mills and commercial websites for this purpose);
 - c) deliberate introduction into the examination room of any materials other than those permitted;

- d) making use of unauthorised items or texts during the examination;
- e) deliberate unauthorised removal of an examination script, any part of an examination script or blank examination stationery, from the examination room;
- f) any attempt to confer with, or gain access to the script of, any other student during the period of the examination;
- g) copying from the script of another student during the examination;
- h) inappropriately receiving help from or giving help to another person during the examination;
- i) any attempt to tamper with examination scripts or coursework after they have been relinquished by students;
- j) any use of prohibited materials during the period of the examination;
- k) any unauthorised absence of a student from the examination room during the period of an examination;
- l) impersonating or attempting to impersonate another student, or asking another person to impersonate the student, in any assessment;
- m) other conduct likely to give an unfair advantage to the student;
- n) unauthorised access to unseen examination papers;
- o) obtaining, or to seeking to obtain, any examination stationery or examination papers that are the property of the University;
- p) acting improperly in any way, whether before, during or after the examination, so as to obtain, or give to another student, an unfair advantage in the examination;
- q) falsifying data, evidence or experimental results;
- r) submitting fraudulent extenuating circumstances claims or falsifying evidence in support of extenuating circumstances claims;
- s) breaches of research and ethics policies – for example carrying out research without appropriate permission.

ACADEMIC MISCONDUCT IN POSTGRADUATE RESEARCH

- 2.7 In respect of any postgraduate research, misconduct includes, but is not restricted to
- a. fabrication or falsification, deception in proposing, conducting or reporting the findings or outcomes of research;

- b. deliberate, dangerous or negligent deviations from accepted research or ethical conduct
- c. failure to follow approved research protocols particularly if this results in unreasonable risk or harm to research participants, other researchers or others in the environment/institution.
- d. collusion in, or concealment of, actions by others will also be regarded as misconduct

GROSS ACADEMIC MISCONDUCT

- 2.8 Gross academic misconduct is deliberate wrongdoing by the student that is so serious that it fundamentally undermines the academic integrity of the student's work. Given the severity of the potential penalties and the impact this would have on a student's studies, there is a need for a higher standard of proof for gross academic misconduct.
- 2.9 Indicative examples of the factors to consider in determining whether the student potentially committed gross academic misconduct include, but are not limited to, the following:
- a. the alleged misconduct occurred in an important part of the work, considering the level of study;
 - b. more than 75% of the assessed work related to the alleged misconduct, For instance taken from published, the internet, or another student's submission without due acknowledgement, considering the relative weighting of the assessment and the level of study
 - c. the student sought to gain an unfair advantage through the alleged act;
 - d. the student was alleged to use technology to source answers during an examination or time constrained assessment, without being authorised to do so
 - e. the student was alleged to have fabricated or falsified research data in an assignment, a dissertation or a thesis, including the principal data on which the results of a postgraduate dissertation or thesis are based
 - f. the student was alleged to have engaged in contract cheating and/or the purchase or commissioning of work by another;
 - g. the student was alleged to be in possession of unauthorised items/materials during an examination or during a comfort break
 - h. the student was alleged to have cheated in written examinations or in-class tests that was extensive or systematic

- i. the student was alleged to have been found with an additional, completed, examination answer booklet
 - j. the student was alleged to have impersonated or attempted to impersonate another student, or asked another person to impersonate the student, in any assessment, including misrepresentation of identity
 - k. the student was alleged to have conspired or colluded with others to commit any of the above.
- 2.10 If, in the view of an interviewer, an investigator or a School panel, there was reasonable belief the student committed an act of gross academic misconduct the Dean of Faculty (or nominee) will receive notification of the Recommendation. The Dean will ensure that the correct procedure was followed before referring the case to a Faculty Panel. If the correct procedure was not followed, the Dean will refer the case back to the interviewer, investigator or School panel for further consideration.
- 2.11 If the Dean decides to initiate the procedures, written notification is to be sent to the student setting out:
- a. the allegation, the grounds for the allegation, and the possible penalties;
 - b. the stage of the procedures initiated, and where to obtain a copy of the procedures
 - c. any available supporting evidence;
 - d. the arrangements for undertaking the investigation;
 - e. the student's right to be accompanied by a friend, defined as a fellow student, a member of the Students' Union, or a member of staff of the University;
 - f. the right to seek support for their preparation for the meeting from the Department of Student Support, Health and Wellbeing or the Students' Union.
 - g. the right, if the student chooses, to present a written statement before any meeting with the panel

3. WHAT IS ACADEMIC JUDGMENT?

- 3.1 Academic judgment is the decision made by academic staff on the quality of the work itself or the criteria being applied. It is a judgment made about a matter where the opinion of an academic is essential. It is based on the scholarly and/or professional knowledge and expertise which academic staff and external examiners draw upon in reaching an academic decision. Identifying suspected academic misconduct and making decisions on academic disciplinary cases will often, but not always, involve academic judgment. Examples of academic judgment include:
- (a) interpreting text matching software reports, such as Turnitin
 - (b) deciding whether the standard of work so out of line with the student's other work to suggest cheating
 - (c) deciding whether student copied the ideas from someone else's work
 - (d) deciding the extent of the plagiarism or cheating
 - (e) deciding whether the student's working notes support a case that the submitted work was produced by them
 - (f) deciding whether the student's ideas represent common usage
- 3.2 Where an academic judgment is made it should be evidence based. For example, a judgment that the standard of an assignment is out of line with the student's other work should be supported by examples from the student's other work.
- 3.3 Deciding questions of fact does not involve academic judgment. Examples of fact include:
- (a) whether the student advertised someone else to do the work for them
 - (b) whether the student paid someone else to do the work for them
 - (c) whether there was intent to cheat
 - (d) whether the correct academic conventions were used
 - (e) whether the student used a prohibited mobile device in an examination
- 3.4 Deciding on the penalty does not normally require academic judgment.
- 3.5 There is no appeal against professional or academic judgment.

4. WHAT ARE STUDENT OBLIGATIONS TO PREVENT ALLEGATIONS OF PLAGIARISM AND ACADEMIC MISCONDUCT?

- 4.1 All work submitted by the student must be his/her own work. Therefore, the student must ensure that:
- a. the submitted work represents the student's own piece of work to be marked or graded for the purpose of assessment;
 - b. phrases, sentences and passages taken verbatim from a published work are placed in quotation marks, or indented, and the source is acknowledged;
 - c. any paraphrasing of ideas and arguments taken from a published work, including those published on the internet, are clearly referenced;
 - d. the inclusion of any other intellectual property, for example, illustrations, diagrams, designs, computer software, in written text or project work is clearly identified and acknowledged;
 - e. the inclusion of material from any electronic sources is carefully referenced;
 - f. where work is done collaboratively and a single piece of work is submitted, the collaboration must be permitted by the Programme Director and it must be declared on the work; and
 - g. the work being submitted, or any substantial amount of it, has not been presented previously or simultaneously for assessment in this University, or elsewhere.

5. HOW ARE ALLEGATIONS OF PLAGIARISM AND ACADEMIC MISCONDUCT DEALT WITH?

Initiation of the Procedures

- 5.1 The Programme Director is responsible for initiating the Plagiarism and Academic Misconduct Procedures. A Programme Director may nominate another member of staff to undertake the responsibilities set out in the Procedures. Any reference in these Procedures to a Programme Director applies to the Programme Director's nominee.
- 5.2 In the case of postgraduate research students, the Dean of the Graduate College or a Faculty Director of Research performs the same function of a Programme Director as set out in these procedures. Any reference in these procedures to the Programme Director applies to the Dean of the Graduate College or a Faculty Director of Research.

ACADEMIC OFFENCES RELATING TO ASSESSMENT BY COURSEWORK

- 5.3 As soon as an academic offence is suspected relating to assessment by coursework, the evidence will be given preliminary consideration by the module tutor, who will report any alleged academic offence to the Programme Director.
- 5.4 The module tutor is responsible for collecting appropriate evidence, including marking the student's work with annotations to indicate the plagiarised material.

ACADEMIC OFFENCES CONTRAVENING THE EXAMINATION REGULATIONS

- 5.4 The invigilator(s) will act in the case of any student suspected of contravening the examination regulations in a formal written examination, open book examination or other in-class test at the time.
 - a. A full report of the incident must be written immediately after the examination by the invigilator(s) and submitted to the Director of Planning and Academic Administration.
 - b. Upon receipt of such a report, the Director of Planning and Academic Administration will refer to the case to the Programme Director where there is sufficient evidence to support the allegation of academic misconduct.
 - c. The Programme Director, or nominee, will determine whether the case should be referred to an interviewer, investigator or panel in line with paragraphs 5.1 and 7.14.

PROVISION OF EVIDENCE

- 5.5 At all stages within the procedure, there is an expectation that the appropriate evidence held by the University in relation to the alleged plagiarism and/or academic misconduct will be shared with the student concerned in advance of any interview with the student or panel hearing.

FEEDBACK ON ASSESSED WORK

- 5.6 Where an allegation of plagiarism and/or academic misconduct is made, no feedback on the assessed work or provisional mark will be given to the student, either through Turnitin or other means.
- 5.7 Where the outcome of the investigation substantiates the allegation, and the student is permitted to make a re-presentation, no feedback on the assessment subject to the allegation will be provided. The exception is telling the student of the elements where the allegations of plagiarism and/or academic misconduct were substantiated. Only after completion of the re-presentation would the student receive the provisional mark and formal feedback.
- 5.7 Where the outcome of the investigation does not substantiate the allegation of plagiarism and/or academic misconduct, the student receives confirmation of the provisional mark and the feedback.

6. WHAT ARE THE STAGES IN THE PROCESS?

- 6.1 There is a staged approach to investigating allegations of plagiarism and academic misconduct, and normally students would be taken through these stages sequentially.
- 6.2 An option available at each of the stages is for the matter to be referred to a Stage 3 Faculty Panel for determination. This would only be for cases of gross academic misconduct (see 2.8-10). Referral should not be taken on a routine basis or because the student was at an advanced stage in their studies.

INTRODUCTORY STAGE

- 6.3 At the Introductory Stage, in recognition that students in their first year at the University (at any level, including postgraduate) may require tuition in academic conventions over and above the general briefings provided, there is an emphasis on support for the student. In their first year studying at the University, students will be given one opportunity at the Introductory Stage. The outcome of the Introductory Stage will normally not involve the application of penalties, except in cases of gross academic misconduct which would be treated as all other similar cases.
- 6.4 The outcomes at the Introductory Stage apply only to students studying at the University in their first year (at whatever level) as a registered student for one instance. Previous registration at the University means a student would not be considered under the Introductory Stage.
- 6.5 Following allegations of plagiarism and/or academic misconduct, the student would be interviewed by an investigating officer appointed by the Programme Director, normally a tutor from the programme team other than the tutor identifying the plagiarism.
- 6.6 The arrangements may only be applied on one occasion, even when a student changes programmes during a period of registration.
- 6.7 The arrangements for the Introductory Stage are set out in **Schedule 0**.

STAGE ONE

- 6.8 At Stage 1 investigations take place at the programme level and are undertaken by an investigating officer appointed by the Programme Director, who would also take disciplinary action. Stage 1 investigations take place on one occasion only during the student's period of registration on the current registration.
- 6.9 The investigating officer is usually a tutor from within the Faculty, but not from the programme team. In extraordinary circumstances, the investigating officer may be from another faculty. The programme director may be the investigating officer.
- 6.10 The arrangements for Stage 1 are set out in **Schedule 1**.

STAGE TWO

- 6.11 At Stage 2, the investigation will be undertaken by means of a review, instituted by the nominee of the Dean of Faculty on the recommendation of the Programme Director. The Dean of Faculty oversees the delegation of responsibility for reviews at Stage 2.
- 6.12 The review will be undertaken by a panel of two members at least one of which must be from another programme.
- 6.13 The review will be undertaken by any combination of members of the Faculty or other faculties, not connected with any previous investigation, including Introductory Stage.
- 6.14 Those undertaking the review will meet jointly with the student and the Programme Director or the nominee at the same time.
- 6.15 The arrangements for Stage 2 are set out in **Schedule 2**.

STAGE THREE

- 6.16 At Stage 3, the investigation and disciplinary action will be undertaken through a Faculty Panel, appointed by the Dean of Faculty, which will consist in all cases of three members. The Secretariat for the Faculty Panel will be appointed by the Director of Planning and Academic Administration.
- 6.17 Up to two members of the Panel may be from the Faculty initiating the proceedings.
- 6.18 All three members of the Faculty Panel may be from another Faculty, where this is deemed appropriate by the Dean.
- 6.19 The Faculty Panel will meet jointly with the student and the Programme Director or nominee at the same time.
- 6.20 The arrangements for Stage 3 are set out in **Schedule 3**.

SEQUENCING OF THE STAGES

- 6.21 No matter the level of study, the investigation is undertaken in sequence. The exception is that allegations of gross academic misconduct require reference to Stage 3.

- 6.22 If a Level 5, 6, 7 or 8 student faces allegations of plagiarism and/or academic misconduct for the first time, Stage 1 of the procedures would be operable as a matter of course, rather than Stages 2 or 3, during the period of current registration.
- 6.23 Where a student has been investigated at an earlier stage during the period of registration, and plagiarism and/or academic misconduct established, the subsequent investigation would be at the next stage, even if the allegation is made several years later.
- 6.24 Only when an allegation is proved at Stage 2, or there is an allegation the student engaged in gross academic misconduct, may the matter go to a Stage 3 Faculty Panel. A Faculty Panel may impose much harsher penalties such as withdrawal from the programme, the withholding of a qualification, a reduction in degree class or preventing the re-sitting of modules.
- 6.25 The stages in the process entail a progressive increase in the potential penalties. However, there would be no automatic recourse to the Stage 3 proceedings without consideration at an earlier stage. If there is an allegation of gross academic misconduct a Dean of Faculty (or nominee) may refer the matter to a Faculty Panel (see 2.10).

7. WHAT ARE THE ARRANGEMENTS FOR INVESTIGATION?

(A) GENERAL PROCEDURES AT ALL STAGES

All work submitted for assessment may be investigated

- 7.1 All the work of a student submitted for assessment may be investigated under these procedures. This includes work already submitted, marked, and returned to the student; in such a case any penalty awarded will supersede the original mark.

PLAGIARISM IN MORE THAN ONE PIECE OF WORK

- 7.2 Where a student is alleged to have plagiarised in more than one piece of work concurrently, and the submission dates for the work and the marking session are, in the view of the Programme Director(s) concerned, reasonably close together, the investigations will be conducted together at the same stage and be regarded as the same instance. The purpose behind regarding these as the same instance is that the student had not been made aware of the allegation of plagiarism and had not been given the opportunity to undertake study support.
- 7.3 Except for cases of alleged gross academic misconduct, any submission, including a subsequent submission as a result of an outcome, is open to action under these procedures and therefore, where appropriate, trigger the next stage in the procedures.

PERIODS OF REGISTRATION

- 7.4 All cases under these procedures are to be counted during a student's continuous period of registration. A repeat year would not be counted as the first year at the University. For students undertaking a repeat year, an accusation of plagiarism and/or academic misconduct would be handled under the next sequential stage of these procedures as appropriate.
- 7.5 Those undertaking investigations or sitting on panels must not have been engaged in the assessment of the work.

REQUEST BY A STUDENT TO RESCHEDULE A MEETING

- 7.6 A student may request the rescheduling of a meeting provided that it takes place within a reasonable period after the notification of the allegations. What is reasonable depends on the circumstances, but usually the meeting should take place within two weeks of the originally scheduled meeting.

NON-ATTENDANCE BY STUDENT A MEMBER OF STAFF AT MEETINGS

- 7.7 If the student or member of staff does not attend the meeting, the interviewer, investigator or panel may investigate the case and determine the penalty (if appropriate) in the absence of the student or member of staff.

COMMUNICATIONS AND RECORD KEEPING

- 7.8 A record of every meeting will be kept in accordance with the arrangements in the relevant Schedule and a copy of this is to be provided to Planning and Academic Administration for the purpose of management information.
- 7.9 The student is to be informed in writing of the outcome of the investigation in accordance with the arrangements in the relevant Schedule. The decision maker should give reasons for the decision and any penalty. They should explain why any lesser penalty was not suitable. The decision notice should give information about:
- (a) The student's right to appeal;
 - (b) The grounds on which they can do so;
 - (c) The time limit for submitting an appeal;
 - (d) The appropriate appeals procedure; and
 - (e) Where and how to access support; and
 - (f) The submission date of any required re-presentation
- 7.10 The Programme Director will be notified of the decision, and where appropriate inform the Board of Examiners.

(B) GENERAL PROCEDURES AT STAGES 1, 2 AND 3

7.11 The following procedures apply to all cases at Stages 1, 2 and 3. They do not apply at the Introductory Stage.

ROLE OF THE PROGRAMME DIRECTOR

7.12 The Programme Director (who can act through a nominee) will decide whether there is sufficient evidence to proceed with the case. The evidence considered at the preliminary stage should be as comprehensive as possible. In the case of coursework, even where Turnitin evidence is available, this should be supported by a short report from the examiner indicating why plagiarism or academic misconduct is suspected. Evidence can include extracts from the student's work that suggests changing writing styles within the assessment or where the writing style is clearly different from previously submitted work. Evidence may also include that provided by other students, members of staff from across the University and/or from outside the University, suitably anonymised.

7.13 Deciding whether to proceed to Stage 1 or Stage 2 may include, but does not require, a meeting between the programme director and the student to discuss the allegation and the available evidence. The purpose is to establish if the allegation was made in error. However, the Programme Director (or nominee) is not to undertake any form of disciplinary action on an informal basis, but to decide if there is sufficient evidence to initiate the procedures. The Programme Director will prepare a brief note of the meeting and inform the student of the outcome.

7.14 If the Programme Director decides to initiate the procedures, written notification is to be sent to the student setting out:

- a. the allegation, the grounds for the allegation, and the possible penalties;
- b. the stage of the procedures initiated, and where to obtain a copy of the procedures
- c. any available supporting evidence;
- d. the arrangements for undertaking the investigation;
- e. the student's right to be accompanied by a friend, defined as a fellow student, a member of the Students' Union, or a member of staff of the University;
- f. the right to seek support for their preparation for the meeting from the Department of Student Support, Health and Wellbeing or the Students' Union.

- g. the right, if the student chooses, to present a written statement before any meeting with an investigating officer or panel.
- 7.15 The Programme Director will identify the member(s) of staff who will prepare the case. If the Programme Director brings additional or alternative charges against the student during the disciplinary process, it is important the student is told about the new or amended allegations, and at least seven days before any meeting.

RIGHT OF THE STUDENT TO A HEARING AND TO BE ACCOMPANIED

- 7.16 The student will be invited to appear in person to make an oral presentation and answer questions. The student may be accompanied by a friend, defined as a fellow student, a member of the Students' Union, or a member of staff of the University. The friend may speak on behalf of the student. In exceptional circumstances, the student may participate in a telephone or video conference.
- 7.17 The student is to have notice of the meeting to prepare to the allegation and supporting evidence before the meeting. The periods of notice are set out in the relevant schedule.

PRESENTATION OF MITIGATING CIRCUMSTANCES

- 7.18 Students should have the opportunity to present any mitigating circumstances or factors that they believe should be considered when determining any penalty. Such factors are not relevant to determining whether a student committed an offence. They should only be considered when deciding on the penalty if the student is found to have committed an offence.

8. HOW CAN A STUDENT APPEAL?

Appeals Procedure

8.1 The student may appeal through the University's Appeals Procedure.

GROUNDS FOR APPEAL

8.2 The grounds for appeal are that the student can:

- identify a material administrative error or irregularity that occurred in the conduct of the investigation and as a result the decision was unreasonable; and/or
- provide new material evidence that, for valid reasons, the student was unable to provide earlier in the process and had a bearing on the penalty but not the finding of plagiarism or other academic misconduct; and/or
- demonstrate the penalty imposed was disproportionate or not permitted under the procedures.

8.3 There is no right of appeal by the student against the academic judgment of an interviewer, an investigator or a panel concerning the finding of plagiarism or other academic misconduct.

9. WHAT IF A STUDENT IS SUBJECT TO PROFESSIONAL DISCIPLINARY ACTION?

- 9.1 A student may be subject to professional disciplinary action in addition to plagiarism/academic misconduct procedures where the regulations of a statutory or regulatory body concerned with professional registration require plagiarism and/or academic misconduct to be reported for further investigation in line with the arrangements set out in the relevant fitness to practise or professional suitability procedures.
- 9.2 The Programme Director will make the report of an investigation under these procedures available to a Fitness to Practice or Professional Suitability Panel and, where required, any relevant statutory or regulatory body, together with any other information that is necessary to investigate the need for a professional disciplinary action. The student has the right to request any information provided by the University in respect of any professional disciplinary action.

10. WHAT SUPPORTING DOCUMENTATION IS AVAILABLE?

- 10.1 Supporting documentation is provided as guidance to those engaged in the investigation of plagiarism and academic misconduct.
- 10.2 The supporting documentation will be revised from time to time by the Student Procedures Office.

SCHEDULE 0 INTRODUCTORY STAGE

FOCUS	ADVISORY
INITIATION OF STAGE	<p>Plagiarism and/or academic misconduct is reported by the tutor marking the work to the Programme Director.</p> <p>The Programme Director appoints a representative to interview the Student ('the interviewer').</p> <p>The Programme Director can act through a nominee.</p> <p>The interviewer is a tutor other than the tutor identifying the plagiarism.</p> <p>The Programme Director may act as interviewer, as long as the Programme Director was not the tutor marking the work.</p>
METHOD	<p>The interviewer invites the student to a meeting. In exceptional circumstances, the student may participate in a telephone or video conference.</p> <p>At the meeting, the allegation is to be explained to the student and the student invited to respond.</p> <p>The arrangements may only be applied on one occasion during the student's first year at the University, even when a student changes programmes during a period of registration.</p> <p>On the second occasion, Stage 1 will be applied.</p>
TIMESCALES	<p>Where the decision is made to initiate the Introductory stage, the Programme Director (or nominee) should inform the student within seven days of receiving the information from the tutor or meeting with the student, whichever is the later.</p> <p>The interviewer should arrange the meeting with the student to take place within seven days of the notification from the Programme Director.</p> <p>The interviewer should inform the student of the outcomes within seven days of the meeting.</p>
PURPOSE	<p>To require the tutor to identify for the student the evidence giving rise to the allegations of plagiarism and/or academic misconduct when the student meets with the interviewer.</p> <p>The interviewer will discuss how the suspected plagiarism and/or academic misconduct came about, and to identify the means by which the student might overcome the issues identified.</p> <p>The purpose is advisory, rather than disciplinary, except where the interviewer considers the student may have engaged in</p>

FOCUS	ADVISORY
	gross academic misconduct.
OUTCOMES	<p>The Interviewer might require one or more of the following from the student:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Re-presentation of the piece of work (or pieces of work) with no penalty. • Attendance at study support sessions to enable the student to develop the appropriate style of presentation. • Re-interview with the tutor (or another representative of the Programme Director) following the marking of the work represented with a view to review progress and to identify further action points. <p>In the case of suspected gross academic misconduct, the interviewer recommends the Dean (or nominee) refers the matter to a Faculty Panel.</p>
PENALTIES	<p>No penalty may be imposed other than requiring the re-presentation of the piece of work (or pieces of work) that were the subject of the discussion.</p> <p>The represented work would be marked on its own merits and the mark and grade included in the student's profile.</p> <p>Where a student declines to re-present the work, or attend for re-interview, a mark of zero is awarded.</p> <p>In the case of suspected gross academic misconduct, the interviewer recommends the Dean (or nominee) refers the matter to a Faculty Panel.</p> <p>Where a student declines to re-present the work, a mark calculated on the basis of the originality of the work will stand, with a mark of zero for those plagiarised sections that are not assessed. [Note in most instances a mark of zero is likely to be awarded.]</p>
COMMUNICATION OF OUTCOME	<p>The student is to be informed in writing of the outcome of the interview. The interviewer should give reasons for the decision. The decision notice should give information about:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> (a) The student's right to appeal; (b) The grounds on which they can do so; (c) The time limit for submitting an appeal; (d) The appropriate appeals procedure; and (e) Where and how to access support; and (f) The submission date of any required re-presentation

FOCUS	ADVISORY
RECORDS	<p>The Interviewer is to record the decision arising from the discussion with the student, using the standard pro-forma.</p> <p>The interviewer is to send a copy of the recorded decision to the student, the tutor, the Programme Director and Planning and Academic Administration This should be normally within 7 days of the meeting.</p> <p>Where the student is taking a combined honours programme, the Programme Director is to copy the decision to the Programme Director for the other subject.</p>
RECORD RETENTION	<p>The programme undertaking the investigation retains the record within the Faculty for the duration of the student's study, and for twelve months after the student leaves the programme.</p> <p>Other programmes receiving a copy of the record should retain the record for twelve months after the completion of the level concerned.</p> <p>Planning and Academic Administration maintains an entry in the plagiarism log for six years.</p>
NOTE	<p>At this stage, only the student would attend the Introductory Stage meeting. The student would not be accompanied by another member of the University. This is an exception to the general provision that a student may be accompanied to disciplinary events. The reason is that the event is not a disciplinary action.</p>

SCHEDULE 1 PROGRAMME LEVEL INVESTIGATION AND DISCIPLINARY ACTION (STAGE 1)

FOCUS	INVESTIGATION AND DISCIPLINARY ACTION AT A PROGRAMME LEVEL. THE PROCEDURES APPLY AT ALL LEVELS OF STUDY.
INITIATION OF STAGE	<p>If the Programme Director decides to initiate the procedures, written notification is to be sent to the student setting out:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> a. the allegation, the grounds for the allegation, and the possible penalties; b. the stage of the procedures initiated, and where to obtain a copy of the procedures c. any available supporting evidence; d. the arrangements for undertaking the investigation; e. the student’s right to be accompanied by a friend, defined as a fellow student, a member of the Students’ Union, or a member of staff of the University; f. the right to seek support for their preparation for the meeting from the Department of Student Support, Health and Wellbeing or the Students’ Union. g. the right, if the student chooses, to present a written statement before any meeting with an investigating officer <p>The Programme Director appoints an investigating officer to look into the allegations.</p> <p>The investigating officer is usually a tutor from within the School. The Programme Director may appoint a tutor from elsewhere within the Faculty, or, in extraordinary circumstances, from another faculty.</p> <p>The investigating officer is not to have been responsible for assessing any part of the work concerned and to have sufficient independence to undertake the investigation.</p>
METHOD	<p>The investigating officer will meet jointly with the tutor identifying the plagiarism (or another suitable nominee of the tutor when the tutor is unavailable) and the student.</p> <p>At the meeting, the allegation is to be explained to the student and the student invited to respond.</p>

FOCUS	INVESTIGATION AND DISCIPLINARY ACTION AT A PROGRAMME LEVEL. THE PROCEDURES APPLY AT ALL LEVELS OF STUDY.
TIMESCALES	<p>Where the decision is made to initiate Stage 1, the Programme Director should inform the student within seven days of receiving the information from the tutor or meeting with the student, whichever is the later.</p> <p>The investigating officer should arrange the meeting with the student to take place within seven days of the notification from the Programme Director.</p> <p>The investigating officer should inform the student of the outcomes within seven days of the meeting.</p>
PURPOSE	<p>To investigate the allegation of plagiarism and/or academic misconduct, to discuss how the allegation came about and to consider action required to support the student in the development of the relevant academic conventions.</p>
OUTCOMES	<p>The investigating officer will determine whether there was a case for plagiarism and/or academic misconduct to be sustained and if so to determine the appropriate penalties.</p> <p>In the case of suspected gross academic misconduct, the investigating officer recommends the Dean (or nominee) refers the matter to a Faculty Panel.</p>
PENALTIES	<p>The investigating officer may impose one of more of the following:</p> <p>Re-presentation of the piece of work (or pieces of work) subject to the plagiarism enquiry, with the work capped at the marginal pass mark. The re-presentation would not count as a reassessment of the module and so should not constrain decision-making by a Board of Examiners which may make recommendations in accordance with the Regulations to enable a student to undertake reassessment or progress to the next level or to complete the award.</p> <p>Where a student declines to re-present the work, a mark calculated on the basis of the originality of the work will stand, with a mark of zero for those plagiarised sections that are not assessed. [Note in most instances a mark of zero is likely to be awarded.]</p> <p>Only the sections of the assignment determined not to be plagiarised or subject to academic misconduct are assessed, with a mark of zero for those sections that are not assessed.</p> <p>Requiring the student to attend specified study support sessions to address weaknesses identified through the investigation. (Failure by the student to attend would result in the mark of zero)</p>

<p style="text-align: center;">FOCUS</p>	<p style="text-align: center;">INVESTIGATION AND DISCIPLINARY ACTION AT A PROGRAMME LEVEL. THE PROCEDURES APPLY AT ALL LEVELS OF STUDY.</p>
	<p>for the re-presented work, irrespective of whether the work achieves a marginal pass mark.)</p> <p>Requiring re-interview with the tutor after the marking of the re-presented work to review progress. Failure by the student to engage would result in the mark of zero for the resubmitted work, irrespective of whether the work achieves a marginal pass mark.</p> <p>Students should have the opportunity to present any mitigating circumstances or factors that they believe should be considered when determining any penalty. Such factors are not relevant to determining whether a student committed an offence. They should only be considered when deciding on the penalty if the student is found to have committed an offence.</p>
<p style="text-align: center;">COMMUNICATION OF OUTCOME</p>	<p>The student is to be informed in writing of the outcome of the investigation. The investigating officer should give reasons for the decision and any penalty. The investigating officer should explain why any lesser penalty was not suitable. The decision notice should give information about:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> (a) The student's right to appeal; (b) The grounds on which they can do so; (c) The time limit for submitting an appeal; (d) The appropriate appeals procedure; and (e) Where and how to access support; and (f) The submission date of any required re-presentation
<p style="text-align: center;">RECORDS</p>	<p>The decision is to be recorded by the investigating officer.</p> <p>A copy is to be sent to the student, the Programme Director and the Student Procedures Office, using the standard pro-forma, by the investigating officer.</p> <p>If a student is undertaking a combined honours programme, the Programme Director is to copy the decision to the Programme Director for the other programme.</p>

<p style="text-align: center;">FOCUS</p>	<p style="text-align: center;">INVESTIGATION AND DISCIPLINARY ACTION AT A PROGRAMME LEVEL. THE PROCEDURES APPLY AT ALL LEVELS OF STUDY.</p>
<p style="text-align: center;">RECORD RETENTION</p>	<p>The Faculty and the Student Procedures Office retains the record of the decision for the duration of the student’s study, and for twelve months after the student leaves the programme.</p> <p>Planning and Academic Administration maintains an entry in the plagiarism and academic misconduct log for six years.</p>

SCHEDULE 2 SCHOOL LEVEL INVESTIGATION AND DISCIPLINARY ACTION (STAGE 2)

FOCUS	INVESTIGATION AND DISCIPLINARY ACTION AT A SCHOOL LEVEL.
INITIATION OF STAGE	<p>If the Programme Director decides to initiate the procedures, written notification is to be sent to the student setting out:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> a. the allegation, the grounds for the allegation, and the possible penalties; b. the stage of the procedures initiated, and where to obtain a copy of the procedures c. any available supporting evidence; d. the arrangements for undertaking the investigation; e. the student’s right to be accompanied by a friend, defined as a fellow student, a member of the Students’ Union, or a member of staff of the University; f. the right to seek support for their preparation for the meeting from the Department of Student Support, Health and Wellbeing or the Students’ Union. g. the right, if the student chooses, to present a written statement before any meeting with the panel. <p>The investigation will be undertaken by means of a School review instituted by the Programme Director.</p> <p>The review will be undertaken by a panel of two members, at least one of which must be from a Faculty where the student is not studying. Both members of the review can be members of other faculties, if this is deemed appropriate to ensure that the student receives a fair hearing.</p> <p>No member of the panel is to be connected with any previous investigation, including any Introductory Stage meeting. Those undertaking the review will meet jointly with the student and the Programme Director or nominee at the same time.</p>
METHOD	<p>The panel will meet jointly with the programme director (or nominee) and the student.</p> <p>At the meeting, the allegation is to be explained to the student and the student invited to respond.</p>

FOCUS	INVESTIGATION AND DISCIPLINARY ACTION AT A SCHOOL LEVEL.
TIMESCALES	<p>Where the decision is made to initiate Stage 2, the Programme Director (or nominee) should inform the student within seven days of receiving the information from the tutor or meeting with the student, whichever is the later.</p> <p>Normally, the Faculty Manager (Quality) will act as the nominee of the Programme Director.</p> <p>The Faculty Manager (Quality) should inform the student of the outcomes within seven days of the meeting.</p> <p>The Faculty Manager (Quality) should arrange the meeting with the student to take place within fourteen days of the notification from the Programme Director.</p>
PURPOSE	<p>To investigate the allegations of plagiarism and/or academic misconduct, and where the allegations are substantiated to determine the appropriate penalty.</p> <p>In undertaking the investigation, the review may take account of any previous investigation (but not any Introductory Stage meeting(s)).</p>
OUTCOMES	<p>The review will determine whether there was a case for plagiarism and/or academic misconduct to be sustained and if so to determine the appropriate penalties.</p> <p>In the case of suspected gross academic misconduct, the Panel recommends the Dean (or nominee) refers the matter to a Faculty Panel.</p>
PENALTIES	<p>If the allegation of plagiarism and/or academic misconduct is established, the School Panel will determine:</p> <p>The penalty, with a maximum penalty being an award of zero for the module, noting the consequences for the student.</p> <p>The nature and extent of the re-presentation or re-examination of assessment for the module, including the submission of new work for assessments that have already been deemed to have been passed. (Note: a re-presentation must be permitted subject to the maximum number of reassessment opportunities permitted and the module is capped at the marginal pass mark.)</p> <p>Whether the student is to undertake further study support to address the weaknesses identified. Failure by the student to attend would result in the mark of zero for the resubmitted work, irrespective of whether the work achieves a marginal pass mark.</p> <p>Whether the student is to undertake an interview with the</p>

FOCUS	INVESTIGATION AND DISCIPLINARY ACTION AT A SCHOOL LEVEL.
	<p>Programme Director after the completion of the marking of the resubmitted assessment. Failure by the student to attend would result in the mark of zero for the resubmitted work, irrespective of whether the work achieves a marginal pass mark.</p> <p>Students should have the opportunity to present any mitigating circumstances or factors that they believe should be considered when determining any penalty. Such factors are not relevant to determining whether a student committed an offence. They should only be considered when deciding on the penalty if the student is found to have committed an offence.</p>
COMMUNICATION OF OUTCOME	<p>The student is to be informed in writing of the outcome of the investigation. The Panel should give reasons for the decision and any penalty. The Panel should explain why any lesser penalty was not suitable. The decision notice should give information about:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> (a) The student's right to appeal; (b) The grounds on which they can do so; (c) The time limit for submitting an appeal; (d) The appropriate appeals procedure; and (e) Where and how to access support; and (f) The submission date of any required re-presentation
RECORDS	<p>A record of the investigation and the decision reached is to be prepared by the School.</p> <p>A copy of the investigation and the decision is to be sent to the student, the Head of School, the Programme Director and Planning and Academic Administration by the person heading the review.</p> <p>If a student is undertaking a combined honours programme, the Programme Director is to copy the decision to the Programme Director for the other programme.</p>
RECORD RETENTION	<p>Both the School and Planning and Academic Administration are to retain the record of the interview and the decision reached for the duration of the student's registration on the programme and for twelve months after the student has left the programme.</p> <p>Planning and Academic Administration maintains an entry in the plagiarism and academic misconduct log for six years.</p>

SCHEDULE 3 FACULTY LEVEL INVESTIGATION AND DISCIPLINARY ACTION (STAGE 3)

FOCUS	INVESTIGATION AND DISCIPLINARY ACTION AT A FACULTY LEVEL.
INITIATION	<p>Where the student was subject to a School Level (or a previous Faculty Level) Investigation leading to Disciplinary Action, the Programme Director decides whether to initiate the procedures.</p> <p>Where there is a recommendation from an interviewer, investigator or School Panel for establishing a Faculty Panel, the Dean of Faculty decides whether to initiate the procedures.</p> <p>Written notification is to be sent to the student setting out:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> a. the allegation, the grounds for the allegation, and the possible penalties; b. the stage of the procedures initiated, and where to obtain a copy of the procedures c. any available supporting evidence; d. the arrangements for undertaking the investigation; e. the student’s right to be accompanied by a friend, defined as a fellow student, a member of the Students’ Union, or a member of staff of the University; f. the right to seek support for their preparation for the meeting from the Department of Student Support, Health and Wellbeing or the Students’ Union. g. the right, if the student chooses, to present a written statement before any meeting with an investigator or panel. <p>Disciplinary action will be undertaken through a Faculty Panel, appointed by the Dean of Faculty, which will consist in all cases of three members.</p> <p>Up to two members of the Panel may be from the Faculty initiating the proceedings. (Note: all three members of the Faculty Panel may be from another Faculty, where this is deemed appropriate by the Dean).</p> <p>No member of the panel is to be connected with any previous investigation, including any Introductory Stage meeting.</p>

FOCUS	INVESTIGATION AND DISCIPLINARY ACTION AT A FACULTY LEVEL.
METHOD	<p>The Faculty Panel will meet jointly with the student and the Programme Director (or nominee) at the same time.</p> <p>At the meeting, the allegation is to be explained to the student and the student invited to respond.</p>
TIMESCALES	<p>Where the decision is made to initiate Stage 3, the Dean (or nominee) should inform the student within seven days of receiving the information from the programme director.</p> <p>The Student Procedures Office should arrange the meeting with the student to take place within fourteen days of the notification from the Dean.</p> <p>The Student Procedures Office should inform the student of the outcomes within seven days of the meeting.</p>
PURPOSE	<p>To investigate the allegations of plagiarism and/or academic misconduct and to determine the appropriate penalty, taking account of the reports of previous investigations, including prior School reviews and Faculty Panels (but not Introductory Stage meeting, except where the interviewer referred a case of gross academic misconduct to a Faculty Panel).</p>
OUTCOMES	<p>The Panel will determine whether the allegations of plagiarism and/or academic misconduct can be substantiated and determine the appropriate penalty.</p>
PENALTIES	<p>The Panel has the discretion to determine the range of academic penalties to be imposed. The following are indicative of the penalties:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> (a) That a person designated by the Panel informally reprimands the student and reminds the student of the need to observe strictly assessment/examination procedures. Such an informal reprimand shall not be entered on the student's record. (b) That the student be formally reprimanded and reminded of the need strictly to observe strictly assessment/examination procedures. Such a formal reprimand shall be entered on the student's record for a specified period, which will be no longer than six months after the completion of the programme. (c) That a reduced mark be given for the performance of the student in the assessment in question.

FOCUS	INVESTIGATION AND DISCIPLINARY ACTION AT A FACULTY LEVEL.
	<p>(d) That the student re-presents the work with a capped assessment or module mark.</p> <p>(e) That a mark of zero be given for the performance of the student in part or in all of the assessment in question.</p> <p>(f) That the mark of either the piece of assessment or the module be capped at the marginal pass mark.</p> <p>(g) That the student fails the module in which the assessment in question falls, with or without reassessment.</p> <p>(h) That the student be permitted reassessment in part or all of those assessments or examinations on the next scheduled occasion, either to enable the student to gain a marginal pass mark for the course or a marginal pass mark.</p> <p>(i) That the student not be permitted to reassessment or re-examination.</p> <p>(j) Recommend, in writing, to the Academic Board the award be reduced by one or more classification.</p> <p>(k) Recommend, in writing, to the Academic Board that no award is made or that the student be excluded from any future assessments or examinations of the University or that an award already made should be revoked.</p> <p>(l) Recommend the student be expelled from the University.</p> <p>Where the Panel permits the re-presentation of work (subject to the maximum number of reassessment opportunities permitted), the extent of the re-presentation required will be determined by the Panel and is not limited to the re-presentation of work for the module concerned. The Panel may determine that work from other modules may need re-presentation, even when the student had been deemed to have passed the work concerned. This includes cases where a Board of Examiners confirmed a mark.</p> <p>Where resubmission is not permitted, the consequences will be made clear to the student.</p> <p>Students should have the opportunity to present any mitigating circumstances or factors that they believe should be considered when determining any penalty. Such factors are not relevant to determining whether a student committed an offence. They should only be considered when deciding on the penalty if the</p>

FOCUS	INVESTIGATION AND DISCIPLINARY ACTION AT A FACULTY LEVEL.
	student is found to have committed an offence.
COMMUNICATION OF OUTCOME	<p>The student is to be informed in writing of the outcome of the investigation. The Panel should give reasons for the decision and any penalty. The Panel should explain why any lesser penalty was not suitable. The decision notice should give information about:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> (a) The student’s right to appeal; (b) The grounds on which they can do so; (c) The time limit for submitting an appeal; (d) The appropriate appeals procedure; and (e) Where and how to access support; and (f) The submission date of any required re-presentation
RECORDS	<p>A record of the proceedings of the Faculty Panel is to be prepared by a member of Planning and Academic Administration.</p> <p>Planning and Academic Administration is responsible for informing the student of the outcome and communicating the decision to those members of the University who need to be informed.</p> <p>A copy of the record of the proceedings and the decision is to be retained by the Faculty.</p> <p>If a student is undertaking a combined honours programme, Planning and Academic Administration sends a copy of the decision to relevant Programme Directors.</p>
RECORD RETENTION	<p>Planning and Academic Administration is responsible for retaining the records of the proceedings, together with the supporting evidence, for the duration of the student’s registration with the programme, and for twelve months after the student has left the programme.</p> <p>Planning and Academic Administration maintains an entry in the plagiarism and academic misconduct log for six years.</p>

<p>FOCUS</p>	<p>INVESTIGATION AND DISCIPLINARY ACTION AT A FACULTY LEVEL.</p>
<p>FURTHER ACTION UNDER THE PROCEDURES</p>	<p>If the student is permitted re-presentation of the work by a Faculty Panel, any subsequent events will be referred to a further Faculty Panel.</p>