

ASSESSMENT, PROGRESSION AND AWARDING: TAUGHT PROGRAMMES HANDBOOK

Chapter 12 – Academic conduct and practice

12. Academic conduct and practice

12.1 Introduction

12.1.1 This Chapter is applicable for alleged academic misconduct by students only. It does not cover alleged academic misconduct by academic staff or students registered on research programmes who are covered by separate procedures, see Research Misconduct. For guidance or advice on the procedure please contact the relevant Faculty Cases Office:

- [Faculty of Environment, Science and Economy](#)
- [Faculty of Humanities, Arts and Social Sciences](#)
- [Faculty of Health and Life Sciences](#)
- For students based at our Cornwall Campus: [Penryn Faculty Cases Office](#)
- For all Postgraduate Research appeals – [PGR Student Cases Office](#)

12.1.2 Students based at one of our Exeter campuses, or studying remotely, needing help with their own case **should** contact the [Students' Guild Advice Unit](#). Students based at the Cornwall campus **should** contact the [Students' Union advice unit](#).

12.2 General Principles

12.2.1 The University takes poor academic practice and academic misconduct very seriously and expects all students to behave in a manner which upholds the principles of academic honesty. Academic honesty is fundamental to the values promoted by the University and no student **should** be allowed to obtain for themselves, or for another candidate, an unfair advantage. Academic honesty means never falsifying the results of any work and always giving full credit for any other persons' contributions to our own achievements.

12.2.2 The Student Cases Office, within the Office of Senior Vice-President and Registrar & Secretary, **must** have oversight of all cases of academic offences in order that they can carry out the University's reporting requirements. This will include responding to requests for information under the Freedom of Information and Data Protection Acts.

- 12.2.3 Information on proven cases of academic misconduct or severe academic misconduct will be available to staff who are asked to provide references for students.
- 12.2.4 All decisions taken under this chapter shall take full account of natural justice, fairness and equity, and all penalties **should** be applied consistently within, and between, proceedings at Faculty/Department level and proceedings at the University level.
- 12.2.5 When considering cases under this chapter the University will adopt the standard of proof 'on the balance of probabilities'.
- 12.2.6 This chapter shall apply to all currently registered students on taught programmes.
- 12.2.7 All students will be given the chance to submit a defence. See section on meeting arrangements.
- 12.2.8 Students **should** be kept informed of the progress of any case they are involved in.
- 12.2.9 When considering an allegation of academic misconduct or poor academic practice marking staff **should not** differentiate between formative and summative assessments. Where potential academic offences are found within formative work, a student would usually be invited to attend an academic honesty workshop and no penalties are normally applied (see Appendix B for more information).
- Assessments which are non-credit bearing, such as portfolios completed as part of a Degree Apprenticeship, are considered as summative work, as they form part of the End Point Assessment (EPA). The grade for the EPA determines whether a student passes their Degree Apprenticeship and, in the case of Integrated Degree Apprenticeships, contributes to the final classification of their degree. The principles of this procedure will be applied to these submissions with the discretion to adapt the outcome (for example the specifics of the tariff) falling to the relevant Senior Academic Conduct Officer (SACO).
- 12.2.10 All cases of academic misconduct shall, in the outcome sent to the student, be termed as either 'poor academic practice', 'academic misconduct' or 'severe academic misconduct'. In the case of Examination Offences, the outcome shall be termed as 'examination misconduct' or 'severe examination misconduct'.
- 12.2.11 The University provides guidance on the appropriate penalties. Each body which imposes a penalty has the discretion to vary the penalty it can impose within its set limitations, but **must** provide clear reasons as to why they have varied the penalty.

- 12.2.12 In all cases of academic offence it is possible that the appropriate penalty may impact or be applied to more than just the module, assessment or examination in which the offence took place.
- 12.2.13 Second occurrences of academic offence, which occur in different assessment periods, will normally be treated more harshly than a first offence.
- 12.2.14 In general, the University will not consider mitigation in determining whether cases of academic offence took place. Students who are unable to complete an assessment, through illness or other personal circumstances, should apply for mitigation through the appropriate channels at the time that the circumstances and/or illness occurs, and such circumstances cannot be considered as an excuse for academic offences. Adverse circumstances may provide context to the actions of the student, which may be considered by the relevant body at their discretion when determining the penalty to be imposed.
- 12.2.15 Students who commit academic offences are subject to the normal programme rules for progression, i.e. where programmes permit, affected modules may be condoned.
- 12.2.16 All cases considered under this procedure should be completed within 60 calendar days of the student being formally notified of the alleged offence. Where this is not possible, or where a case is deemed complex, students should be kept informed of the delay.

12.3 Offences and Definitions

- 12.3.1 An academic offence is defined as an act or failure to act that if undetected gives, or aims to give, an advantage over other students, or any behaviour which may deceive those setting, administering and marking a piece of work. Academic offences can take a number of forms (please note that the examples listed alongside each offence are intended to be illustrative and are not exhaustive):
- a. Plagiarism, i.e. the act of representing work or ideas as one's own without appropriate acknowledgement or referencing. For instance:
 - i. Direct copying of text, or illustrations, from a book, article, fellow student's essay, handout, thesis, web page, AI-generated content, or other source (including a source originally in another language) without proper acknowledgement.
 - ii. Claiming individual ideas derived from a book, article etc. as one's own, and incorporating them into one's work without properly acknowledging the source of those ideas. This

- includes, among many other things, insufficiently paraphrasing a source, or altering the material taken from the source so it appears to be one's own work, or mirroring the structure of the argument of another writer without correct attribution.
- iii. Overly depending on the work of others by constructing a significant part of an assessment by extracting large sections of text from another source. This could include copying another's bibliography and referencing, implying the research completed is the student's own.
 - iv. Self-plagiarism: the re-submission or re-use of the student's own work in another assignment whether this was submitted at the University of Exeter or any other academic institution worldwide without citing the previous work. (This is not intended to prevent a student from developing an academic idea over the course of their studies, for example stating an argument in an essay for a particular module and then developing this argument in a dissertation, but to prevent the counting of credit twice for the same piece of work, or sections of work, however this operates at the discretion of the Panel considering the offence).
 - b. Misrepresentation, i.e. misrepresenting work as your own, in whole or part. Examples may include:
 - Misrepresenting the authorship and / or academic competence of the work through the use of paraphrasing tools; translation tools, an AI-generated source, a translator or other third-party;
 - c. Collusion, i.e. the unauthorised working with another person(s), whether in person or via electronic device, on a piece of work, which is then submitted as part of an assessment, without acknowledgement of the other person's contribution. If a student decides to share material with another student, this is considered an offence, even if they appear not to have gained an advantage for themselves, as they have facilitated the gaining of an advantage for another.
 - d. Coercion, i.e. where a student puts pressure on another student or member of staff to act in a particular way, or attempts to do so, with the intention of gaining an academic advantage. Where this is initially investigated as collusion it will be possible for the offence(s), outcomes and penalties applied to differ between the parties involved. It is also

possible for an outcome to be reached for one party ahead of the final outcome for the student alleged to have coerced another.

- e. Fabrication, i.e. the creation of false data or other aspects of research or assessed work, including but not limited to documentation and participant consent forms. The inclusion of fabricated references.
- f. Falsification, i.e. the inappropriate manipulations and/or selection of data imagery and/or consents, or use of hidden characters (white text) within the work which may have been included to manipulate the word count, to avoid source matches or to otherwise mislead the marker.
- g. Contract Cheating, i.e. a student requesting a third-party to complete an assessment, or part of an assessment, on their behalf, which involves an exchange, for example, but not limited to, money, goods or services.
- h. The use or possession of unauthorised books, notes, software, electronic devices or other materials in an examination or assessment. This includes material obtained from essay sites, also known as 'Essay Mills'.
- i. Obtaining or sharing an examination paper or assessment question ahead of its authorised release. Or obtaining or sharing another student's answer to an examination paper.
- j. Impersonation or attempted impersonation of another individual, due to be sitting a specific assessment.

Note, evidence of an attempt to disguise or conceal any of the offences listed above will normally be treated more severely than that which is deemed to be unintentional.

12.3.2 Faculties (or delegated Schools) **may** extend these definitions for specific subject areas and provide students with examples as appropriate. The correct referencing system for making quotations used within assessed work **should** be indicated in the Faculty/Department handbook, alongside a link to the university approved [Referencing Guidance](#). Clarification **should** be available from Academic Tutors (also known as Personal Tutors), as well as through induction sessions within the Faculty/Department. Students are responsible for ensuring they reference correctly, in accordance with the

referencing style chosen by the department in which the assessment was set. Lack of awareness of the referencing conventions will not be deemed an excuse for academic offences.

- 12.3.3 Throughout this chapter, an examination is defined as an assessment within a formal examination room, subject to invigilation and a fixed time period for the candidate to complete the required work. These procedures can be seen in section 12.20.
- 12.3.4 Throughout this chapter, a piece of coursework is defined as any assessed work which is not an examination. The term coursework applies equally to formative and summative work.
- 12.3.5 Any other assessment such as timed exams undertaken in non-invigilated conditions, will be seen under the procedures outlined for the consideration of coursework, not the procedures for examinations.
- 12.3.6 Throughout this chapter at formal meetings reference is made to the Student's Supporter. The Student's Supporter will normally be a member of the University, or Students Guild /Falmouth and Exeter Students' Union and the role is defined as follows; the Supporter is there to provide moral support to the student and to support the student with asking and answering questions during the meeting. They may also take notes of the meeting for the Student. The Student is expected to speak from themselves, and there is no automatic right for the Supporter to address the Committee. Should a Supporter act beyond this definition, then the Chair **may** suspend the meeting and ask the Supporter to leave, in the event that the Student is unable to continue the meeting in the absence of the Supporter, then the meeting will continue in the absence of the Student, based on the verbal evidence heard to date and the written documentation. Should the Supporter be asked to leave this meeting, this will not affect the attendance of others at the meeting such as the marker, any witness or Faculty Representative.
- 12.3.7 A witness is a person who can testify their knowledge of a matter that is under investigation. A witness may not be called to provide a character reference, nor would they be able to act as the Student's Supporter, as described in section 12.3.6, within the meeting. A witness can be called by the Panel or Committee or by the Student. A witness may attend a meeting to testify about what they witnessed in respect of the matter under investigation, or as an expert in the subject matter of the assignment(s) being discussed in

the meeting. At the discretion of the Chair of the Panel, a witness may direct questions to the Student. A witness will answer questions put to them by the Panel, Committee and Student. A witness would not usually attend for the entirety of the meeting and would not be entitled to know the outcome of any proceedings in which they had given testimony.

12.4 Categories of Academic Misconduct

12.4.1 The University has developed three levels of severity for such offences, determining what category an offence falls into is an exercise of academic judgement. Where an offence is identified, then the Faculty Cases Team or the University Cases Team must ensure that it is correctly categorised. There are three categories:

- a. Poor academic practice.
- b. Academic misconduct.
- c. Severe academic misconduct.

12.5 Poor Academic Practice

12.5.1 Poor academic practice may arise from lack of understanding of academic protocols or a misunderstanding of expected academic conventions of the department.

12.5.2 It would not be acceptable to consider a case as “poor academic practice” where either of the following conditions applies:

- a. There is any indication that the student intended to gain an unfair advantage or had the intention to deceive the marker.
- b. The student had already been found guilty of a similar offence in a similar assessment and could therefore be reasonably expected to have familiarised themselves with the academic practice of the department.

12.5.3 Poor academic practice cases are handled at Faculty/Department level and may involve either a formal meeting with the student or student attendance at a workshop.

12.6 Academic Misconduct

12.6.1 Academic misconduct involves behaviour which, if not detected, would have deceived those setting, administering and marking the coursework and/or could have obtained advantage on the part of the student, or another student.

12.6.2 Academic misconduct cases are normally handled at Faculty level.

12.7 Severe Academic Misconduct

12.7.1 Severe academic misconduct may be a second offence, or involve evidence of extensive plagiarism or cheating, or clear evidence of behaviour which is designed to deceive those setting, administering and marking the assessment and/or behaviour designed to obtain advantage on the part of the student. Examples include:

- a. Taking notes into or using any unauthorised device in an examination.
- b. Impersonating another person during an examination or arranging for another person to impersonate any individual during an examination.
- c. An assignment that includes extensive, or otherwise significant quantity, of unattributed or incorrectly attributed copying.
- d. Any case where a student has previously been penalised for a significant amount of Academic Misconduct and are being referred for a second significant offence.
- e. The use by a student of essay sites that may involve a commercial transaction, with or without the author's consent.
- f. Misconduct within a dissertation or thesis of a taught postgraduate programme. Owing to the level of study, this would normally be placed within this category.
- g. Where the Faculty suspects that any of the underlying data used by the student has been either falsified or fabricated.

12.7.2 Suspected severe academic misconduct cases **should** be initially investigated by the Faculty (or delegated School), and referred to the University level at the Senior Academic Conduct Officer's discretion.

12.8 Responsibilities for Partner Institutions

12.8.1 All partner institutions delivering programmes validated by the University of Exeter are required to follow the procedures below, except that Associate Pro-Vice Chancellor (APVC) (Education) shall be taken to mean the head of the academic unit concerned, who shall keep the Principal of the partner institution and the [Academic Partnership Team](#) at the University of Exeter informed.

12.9 Responsibilities of the University

- 12.9.1 The University will ensure that all procedures and policies relating to academic offences are fit for purpose and widely available to both staff and students.
- 12.9.2 The University will ensure that all staff involved in handling cases of suspected academic offences have access to suitable training and development opportunities on academic conduct, which they should have attended.
- 12.9.3 The University will support Faculties (or delegated School) in developing methods to reduce the incidences of academic offences (particularly in the design of assessment and administering of examinations).
- 12.9.4 The University will ensure that students have access to appropriate levels of information, advice and guidance.
- 12.9.5 The University will provide appropriate online training for students in how to avoid academic offences.
- 12.9.6 The University will keep records of all cases of academic offence, providing annual reports to Faculty Boards and Senate.

12.10 Responsibilities of Faculties

- 12.10.1 All Faculties (or delegated Schools) will ensure that they have appropriate arrangements in place in order to comply with the requirements set out in this Chapter. All Faculties (or delegated Schools) will follow the procedures as laid out in this Chapter, when handling cases of suspected academic offence, including making sure that staff handling academic offence cases have had appropriate training.
- 12.10.2 All Faculties (or delegated Schools) will provide evidence which clearly demonstrate where a suspected offence may have occurred. Where an offence is suspected, but the evidence is not sufficient enough to demonstrate this the Faculty (or delegated School) may use the procedures set out in [Chapter 3.12](#) 'Dealing with suspected Examination Offences' and 5.4 'Viva Voce' of the Assessment, Progression and Awarding Handbook to investigate the matter further and gather evidence. All investigations should be timely, fair, proportionate and non-persecutory. All Faculties (or delegated Schools) will ensure that they have an appropriate named member of staff that an academic can contact if they suspect academic offences when marking. This should initially be the department Academic Conduct Officer(s), who will act in line with the role descriptor detailed in Appendix A.
- 12.10.3 In addition to appointing a named member of staff in each department, the Faculty (or delegated School) will appoint a Senior Academic Conduct Officer, and may appoint additional Senior Academic Conduct Officers if caseload requires it. Senior Academic Conduct Officers should have an overview of all academic offence cases within the Faculty (or delegated School), and will act in line with the role descriptor detailed in Appendix A.
- 12.10.4 All Faculties (or delegated Schools) will inform students at the start of their programme that they are required to complete the ELE 2 (Exeter Learning Environment) module 'Academic Honesty and Plagiarism'. All students **should** have completed this prior to the submitting of their first piece of work.
- 12.10.5 All Faculties (or delegated Schools) will provide students with assessment cover sheets for written work, or the opportunity to agree to a declaration for electronic submission, which certifies that their submitted work is entirely their own and appropriately referenced.

- 12.10.6 All Faculties (or delegated Schools) will ensure that Faculty/Department handbooks provide guidance on academic offence, and links to relevant University regulations on academic conduct and honesty.
- 12.10.7 All Faculties (or delegated Schools) will consider the issue of academic offences when designing assessments in order to minimise opportunities for academic offences, as per paragraph 2.1.2 of [Chapter 2, 'Setting and submission of assessments'](#), of the Assessment, Progression and Awarding: Taught Programmes Handbook.

12.11 Responsibilities of Students

- 12.11.1 Students will adopt the University's culture of academic honesty and encourage academic honesty in others.
- 12.11.2 Students will familiarise themselves with the University procedures relating to academic conduct, their Faculty/Department choice of referencing style and how to avoid academic offences in their work. Ignorance of these procedures and guidance will not be considered to be an excuse for academic offences.
- 12.11.3 When submitting work for assessment, each student will certify the work is their own.
- 12.11.4 Each student will complete the ELE 2 (Exeter Learning Environment) module 'Academic Honesty and Plagiarism' this should be completed prior to submitting their first piece of work and will seek guidance from their Academic Tutor (also known as Personal Tutor) if further advice is required.
- 12.11.5 Students should regularly re-evaluate their own understanding of the principle of academic honesty, seeking additional support if required from their Academic Tutor (also known as Personal Tutor) or other relevant staff as indicated by the Faculty (or delegated School) in their Faculty/Department Handbooks.
- 12.11.6 Each student will participate in any additional training recommended by their Faculty (or delegated School), such as the academic writing course or tutorial. International students and non-native speakers can get specialist support through the University's In-sessional English Language Skills Development programme, delivered by INTO/University of Exeter International Study Centre.

12.12 Delegation of Responsibility

- 12.12.1 Where the procedures refer to University officers and members of staff, it is standard practice that such procedures **may**, where appropriate, be handled through an appropriate person nominated by the stated officer/staff member to act on their behalf.
- 12.12.2 In the cases below where the University Cases Office is referenced, they are acting on the delegated authority of the Divisional Director of Education and Academic Services.
- 12.12.3 Where reference is made to the Student's Guild Vice President Education, this can mean any elected sabbatical officer of the Guild, acting as the nominee of the Vice President Education.
- 12.12.4 Where reference is made to a Dean for Taught Students, this **should** be taken to mean the Dean for Taught Students or the Dean of Graduate Research, acting on behalf of the Dean for Taught Students. Where no Dean is appropriate, as both Deans have had contact with the Student, then the Dean **must** delegate their role to an APVC (Education), who is not connected to the student or the student's Faculty (or delegated School).
- 12.12.5 Where reference is made to the Faculty Education PS Lead (or nominee), this **may** mean either the Senior Education Partner or a dedicated nominee, who is responsible for academic conduct and maintains a strategic overview of academic offence cases within the Faculty (or delegated School).
- 12.12.6 Formal responsibility for the implementation of this procedure, within Faculties (or delegated Schools), lies with the APVC (Education) and the Senior Education Partner.

12.13 Procedures at Faculty Level for Dealing with Suspected Poor Academic Practice, Academic Misconduct and Severe Academic Misconduct

- 12.13.1 Should the marker, module convenor or other member of a marking team of an assessment suspect or identify evidence of a possible conduct offence in a student's assignment then they **should** stop marking and should report any concerns about a piece of academic work to the named contact within their Faculty (or delegated School) responsible for academic conduct (normally this would be the Department Academic Conduct Officer). In doing so they may wish to also inform the module convenor if they are not them.

- 12.13.2 The Department Academic Conduct Officer will consider the assignment, and check the work to ascertain whether there is an issue of academic offence. They may also consult with the Senior Academic Conduct Officer and Professional Service Staff as required.
- 12.13.3 The Department Academic Conduct Officer, as a trained member of staff, will then form an academic judgment about the suspicions raised with them. They may determine that there is no evidence of an offence in the work and that no concerns need be pursued, in which case they should refer the case back to the marker or Module Convenor who will resume marking under the normal marking process. Or, the Department Academic Conduct Officer may find there is evidence of a suspected offence and determine that the work needs to be considered further, in which case the Department Academic Conduct Officer must make a formal referral of the work to their Senior Academic Conduct Officer, and the relevant professional services team.
- 12.13.4 In cases where evidence of a suspected offence is found, the Senior Academic Conduct Officer for the Faculty (or delegated School) concerned shall be responsible for the matter in the first instance.
- 12.13.5 Under the guidance of the Senior Academic Conduct Officer the relevant professional services team will retrieve all previous summative assessments deemed to be relevant to the case in question, and the Department Academic Conduct Officer should re-check these for academic offences. Normally this would include all summative work for the current academic year, but it may also include any or all work that counts towards the Student's degree from year two and onwards. This would apply particularly in cases of final year students or in cases of suspected severe academic misconduct. Any assessments in which possible offences are identified can then be subject to investigation under the formal process and will form part of the ongoing case.

12.13.6 The Senior Academic Conduct Officers will then consider the case and either agrees with the recommendation of the Department Academic Conduct Officer or makes their own recommendations. The Senior Academic Conduct Officer will make the final decision in the event that there is not a consensus on how to proceed. They will then direct the case to be dealt with in one of the following ways, at which point the student will be sent a 'Meeting Request Letter' informing them that an investigation is underway, the nature of the suspected offence(s) and which of the following procedures will apply:

- a. That the Student is requested to attend an Academic Honesty workshop.
- b. That the case is to be heard at Department Level for suspected Poor Academic Practice.
- c. That the case is to be heard at Faculty Level for suspected Academic Misconduct and/or Poor Academic Practice.
- d. That the concerns raised are sufficiently serious to refer the case directly to the University Cases Team under section 12.18 for suspected Severe Academic Misconduct: in cases where the Faculty (or delegated School) believes that severe academic misconduct may have occurred in the student's piece of work, the Faculty (or delegated School) can hold a Faculty Level meeting to gather further information and evidence for the referral of the case to the University; alternatively, where it is clear that the alleged offence is sufficiently severe and evidenced the Faculty (or delegated School) can refer the case directly to the University Cases Office in accordance with the procedure outlined in 12.18 below.

12.13.7 Examples of circumstances in which Academic Conduct Officers may be required to apply additional consideration to these steps of the process are outlined in Appendices B and C.

12.14 In cases where the Senior Academic Conduct Officer determines that the Poor Academic Practice should be seen at an Academic Honesty Workshop

12.14.1 This concludes the investigation and the Student's work can be returned for marking and feedback release as soon as possible within the department (note, this is no longer subject to the three-week marking turnaround).

12.14.2 The offer of an Academic Honesty Workshops, in place of an individual meeting (as per 12.19) allows the Department Academic Conduct Officer (or other suitable academic) to address the students' approaches to writing, or the way they have undertaken referencing, where it is concerning but not sufficiently bad to warrant a formal conduct

hearing. It recognises that such practices, if unaddressed, may lead to further instances of poor academic practice, which may in turn lead to further allegations of an academic offence. This workshop is therefore corrective and educational in nature and acts as an alternative to penalties as a way of resolving the issues.

- 12.14.3 The workshop may be facilitated by the Department Academic Conduct Officer or another suitable academic, such as the module convenor.
- 12.14.4 A record of this learning intervention will be kept by the Faculty Cases Team. It is not likely that a workshop would be offered as an outcome to an investigation of a second academic offence.
- 12.14.5 The Academic Honesty Workshops should cover why the students have been called to the workshop in general terms then talk through how to reference according to department conventions and how to avoid poor practice in the future, thus moving the emphasis away from punishment towards prevention and education.
- 12.14.6 Students who fail to attend or engage with their scheduled mandatory workshop will not be invited to a further workshop. It will be deemed as a learning opportunity even if a Student fails to attend, and this will be taken into consideration if the Student commits further offences.

12.15 In cases where the Senior Academic Conduct Officer determines that the Poor Academic Practice should be seen at a Department Level Meeting

- 12.15.1 Where the Senior Academic Conduct Officer refers a case of Poor Academic Practice to a Department Level Meeting then the Academic Conduct Officer will be supported by the relevant Professional Services team to take the following steps.
- 12.15.2 The Student should be invited to meet with an Academic Conduct Officer to discuss the alleged Poor Academic Practice; this is to ensure that the student is aware of why their academic practice is not meeting the department's requirements.
- 12.15.3 The Academic Conduct Officer must not be a member of academic staff responsible for marking, moderating or supervising the assignment to which the allegation refers.
- 12.15.4 The Academic Conduct Officer should meet with the student along with an administrator who will take notes of the meeting. The Academic Conduct Officer will discuss the alleged

offence and, if in attendance, will offer the student the opportunity to ask for further clarifications.

- 12.15.5 After the discussion, the Academic Conduct Officer will make a judgement on the case. They may apply a penalty from the Tariff of Penalties, or may find the student not guilty of the offence. If the Academic Conduct Officer wishes to apply a penalty, then they may apply up to and including penalty B from the Tariff of Penalties in section 12.19.
- 12.15.6 Exceptionally, where additional evidence is identified within the meeting, which leads the Academic Conduct Officer to consider that none of the penalties available to them in section 12.19 are appropriate then they may refer the case to a Faculty Level Meeting (see section 12.16). The Academic Conduct Officer will provide a report to the Senior Academic Conduct Officer explaining why they were unable to reach a decision, a copy of which will be provided to the Student prior to the Faculty Level Meeting. The Academic Conduct Officer shall not sit on the Faculty Level Panel, but may be called as a witness. The Faculty (or delegated School) shall write to the student to indicate that the Academic Conduct Officer has referred the case to a Faculty Level Meeting.
- 12.15.7 The student should be notified of the Academic Conduct Officer's judgement and the outcome of the meeting within ten working days of the meeting. A copy of the notes of the meeting will be included with this notification.
- 12.15.8 Students are entitled to appeal the decision of the Academic Conduct Officer as per section 12.23 with the exception of a decision to refer the case to a Faculty Level Meeting (see 12.15.9 below).
- 12.15.9 The student cannot appeal the Academic Conduct Officer's decision to refer them to a Faculty Level Meeting, as they will be entitled to appeal the decision of the subsequent Faculty Level Panel.

12.16 In cases where the Senior Academic Conduct Officer determines that the Poor Academic Practice and / or Academic Misconduct should be seen at a Faculty Level Meeting

- 12.16.1 When the Senior Academic Conduct Officer determines that a case should be heard at a Faculty Level meeting, they will be supported by the relevant Professional Services team to take the following steps.

- 12.16.2 The Student should be invited to meet with a Panel of staff, to discuss the alleged offences in their work.
- 12.16.3 The Panel will consist of three members, at least two of whom will be academic members of staff. It should be chaired by the Senior Academic Conduct Officer, and will include either other Academic Conduct Officers, or academics from within the department concerned, or the Senior Education Business Partner (or nominee).
- 12.16.4 The Panel must nominate a secretary (who may also be a Panel member) who will be responsible for taking notes of the meeting.
- 12.16.5 The staff on a Faculty Level Panel must not include those who are responsible for marking, moderating or supervising the assignment to which the allegation refers.
- 12.16.6 The Panel will discuss the alleged offence and, if in attendance, will offer the student the opportunity to ask for further clarifications.
- 12.16.7 After the discussion, the Panel will deliberate and make a judgement on the case.
- 12.16.8 The Panel should then determine whether an offence has taken place. The Faculty Level Panel should determine the exact offence the student has committed and whether this constitutes either poor academic practice or academic misconduct. When deliberating the offence Faculty Level Panels should give regard to the level of advantage which would have been gained by the student if the act or failure to act had not been detected. If during the course of the meeting, additional evidence of an offence not listed in the 'Meeting Request Letter' is identified, this will be taken into consideration by the Panel and the investigation may need to be extended. If this requires a postponement or rescheduling of the meeting the Student will be notified in writing. Alternatively, the Panel may decide to refer the case, including evidence of the additional offence to the University Cases Office (see 12.16.12. below).
- 12.16.9 They may apply a penalty from the Tariff of Penalties, or may find the student not guilty of the offence. Should the Panel conclude that there has been a case of either poor academic practice or academic misconduct, then they should impose a penalty from the tariff contained in section 12.19. They may impose up to and including Tariff D. Where a penalty clearly impacts on progression or the ability of the student to pass the module, the Faculty Level Panel should give a clear reason for imposition of the penalty.

- 12.16.10 The student should be notified of the Panel's judgement and the outcome of the meeting within ten working days of the meeting. A copy of the notes of the meeting will be included with this notification.
- 12.16.11 Students are entitled to appeal the decision of the Faculty Level Panel as per section 12.23 with the exception of a decision to refer the case to the University Cases Office (see 12.16.12 below).
- 12.16.12 If the Faculty Level Panel considers that none of the penalties available to them in section 12.19 are appropriate then they may refer the case to the University Cases Office (see section 12.18) so that the case can be considered under the University stage of the procedure. The Faculty (or delegated School) shall write to the student to indicate this.
- 12.16.13 The student cannot appeal the Faculty Level Panel's decision to refer them to the University Cases Office as they are entitled to appeal the decision of the subsequent University Committee of Academic Enquiry.

12.17 Arrangements for Department and Faculty Level meetings

- 12.17.1 The Meeting Request Letter should be sent at least 5 working days prior to the meeting.
- 12.17.2 All relevant documentation should be made available to the student five working days prior to the meeting.
- 12.17.3 If the Faculty (or delegated School) appointed an Investigating Officer, then their report should be made available to the Student as part of the relevant documentation sent to the student five working days in advance of the meeting. The Panel may call the Investigating Officer to present their findings but must notify the Student of their intention to call a witness at least one working day before the meeting.
- 12.17.4 A witness is a person who can testify their knowledge of a matter that is under investigation. A witness would not be called to provide a character reference, nor would they be able to act as the Student's supporter, as described in section 12.3.6, within the meeting. A witness can be called by the Panel or Committee or by the Student. If the Student intends to have a witness present, they must notify the relevant team at least one working day prior to the meeting.
- 12.17.5 The student may be accompanied by a supporter (please see the definition of such a person in 12.3.6) but will be asked and expected to respond to questions themselves in the

meeting. If the Student wishes for a supporter to attend the meeting with them, they will need to arrange this themselves and ensure that the meeting information is forwarded on to their supporter. The student must state whether they will be bringing a supporter with them (and if so, who the supporter is) and must notify the relevant team at least one working day prior to the meeting.

- 12.17.6 Should a student not attend their meeting this will not affect the attendance of others at the meeting such, with the exception of the Student's supporter; and/or any witness who has been called by the Student. Neither the supporter nor a witness called by the Student may attend in the Student's absence. If a student is not in attendance consideration of the case will take place in their absence and the outcome will be communicated to them as normal.
- 12.17.7 Students have the right to submit a defence and/or details of any mitigating circumstances they believe to be relevant. This **may** be in writing or in person, but is not a requirement. However, Students cannot prevent any hearing from taking place through non-submission of a defence or non-attendance at a meeting, providing reasonable steps have been taken to give the student the opportunity to attend or to submit a statement. The student must provide the Faculty (or delegated School) with their written statement and any evidence that they wish to have taken into consideration by the Panel at least one whole working day ahead of the meeting along with confirmation of whether or not they will be attending.
- 12.17.8 If a student provides details of mitigating circumstances, they believe to be relevant to the case (either in writing or in person), these will be taken into consideration by the panel. However, these circumstances would not normally be relevant to deciding whether a student is guilty of an offence, but will be taken into consideration when determining the appropriate penalty to be applied if the student is found to have committed an offence.
- 12.17.9 If a student provides evidence indicating that an offence other than those listed in the 'Meeting Request Letter' has been committed (either in writing or in person), this will be taken into consideration by the Panel and the investigation may need to be extended. If this requires a postponement or rescheduling of the meeting the Student will be notified in writing.

- 12.17.10 Meetings will only be rescheduled in the event of the Student providing evidence of exceptional circumstances preventing them from engaging with the procedure. Such circumstances might include hospitalisation.
- 12.17.11 All meetings will be conducted in English (with the exception of meetings in which a foreign language assessment is being discussed where it may be appropriate for sections of the meeting to involve discussion in the assessed language). Use of translation software is not permitted to be used during the meeting.
- 12.17.12 The Student shall be entitled to be present for the duration of the meeting. However, they are not entitled to be present for the Panel's deliberations and therefore the Chair may ask the Student and their supporter to withdraw, whilst reaching a decision.
- 12.17.13 The panel shall base their decision on the documentary evidence provided in advance of the meeting, any written statement provided by the student, the student's responses to the panel's questions, and any witness testimony that had been provided during the meeting. In cases that involve more than one student, such as those where collusion is being investigated or where group work is being considered, the panel may also consider the testimony of other students.
- 12.17.14 Normally, the decision of the Panel and outcome of the case will not be given verbally on the day of the meeting but will be communicated in writing within 10 working days of the meeting.
- 12.17.15 The use of electronic audio recording equipment will not normally be allowed and would only be permitted at the discretion of the Chair.

12.18 In cases where the Senior Academic Conduct Officer determines that the Poor academic Practice and / or Academic Misconduct and / or Severe Academic Misconduct should be seen at University Level

- 12.18.1 In cases referred to the University Cases Office after consideration at Faculty level under Sections 12.15 and 12.16 the Faculty (or delegated School) must submit a report to the University Cases Office. At the same time the student must be informed of the fact that they are being reported to the University Cases Office. If the student is suspected of plagiarism or collusion then the report should clearly indicate (by cross-referencing) what sections of text have been plagiarised and from what source.

- 12.18.2 A Committee of Academic Enquiry will be convened as soon as possible following receipt of the Faculty (or delegated School) report. The Committee shall comprise a Dean as Chair, who shall not be of the same Department of the Student, and two members drawn from nominated Academic Conduct Officers, who shall not be of the same Faculty (or delegated School) as the student.
- 12.18.3 Exceptionally (in cases where the scale of offence does not warrant a Committee hearing), on receiving a report from a Faculty (or delegated School), the Divisional Director of Education and Academic Services (or nominee) may, in consultation with the Dean for Taught Students, direct the Faculty (or delegated School) to deal with the suspected case as set out in section 12.16 of these procedures.
- 12.18.4 Where a student's conduct is to be considered by a University Committee of Academic Enquiry, the University Cases Office shall inform the student in writing of the Committee's meeting which they are invited to attend. Not less than five working days ahead of that meeting, the University Cases Office shall provide the student with a copy of the report from the Faculty (or delegated School), along with any other supporting evidence and a copy of these procedures. The student may make a written statement to the Committee, supply any evidence that they wish to have taken into consideration by the Committee, and may also call witnesses of their own, the details of which must be provided to the University Cases Office not later than one whole working day ahead of the Committee's meeting.
- 12.18.5 The student is entitled to attend the Committee meeting for its duration (except as detailed in 12.18.8 below). Should a student decide not to exercise their right of attendance, the hearing will proceed in the student's absence. Should the student subsequently, within five working days, present sufficiently exceptional mitigating circumstances explaining their absence to the Chair's satisfaction, the Committee may be reconvened to reconsider the case with the student in attendance. The student will be given five working days' notice of the Committee being reconvened. The student may be accompanied by a supporter (see definition of the role of 'supporter' in section 12.3.6). The use of electronic audio recording equipment will not normally be allowed and is at the discretion of the Chair. The student may direct questions to the Faculty (or delegated School) representative (and any

witnesses called) directly in an appropriate manner. Proxies or substitutes for the student will not be permitted.

- 12.18.6 The Faculty (or delegated School) will be invited to send a Representative to attend for the duration of the meeting (except as detailed in 12.18.8 below) to present the case to the Committee. The Faculty (or delegated School) Representative shall have the right to call other witnesses to appear before the Committee. The University Cases Office shall be notified of these witnesses no later than one whole working day ahead of the Committee meeting. The Faculty (or delegated School) Representative may also call the student as a witness and may then, at the Chair's discretion, direct questions to the student directly, in an appropriate manner.
- 12.18.7 The student should be given the opportunity to address the Committee in the absence of the Faculty (or delegated School) representative. The Committee may recall the Faculty (or delegated School) Representative following the student's statement, should the need arise. Following this the Committee shall retire to consider their decision.
- 12.18.8 If the Committee determines that an offence has taken place, it shall inform the student and the Faculty (or delegated School) in writing of its decision and of the penalty to be imposed. This may, in the first instance, be a summary of the Committee's deliberations. This will be communicated within five working days of the meeting, with the full report and formal outcome letter following in due course. A record of the Committee's decision will be kept both on the University's central records and by the relevant Faculty (or delegated School).
- 12.18.9 The Committee of Academic Enquiry can impose any penalty from the Tariff of Penalties range A to G. If the allegation of academic misconduct is proven, one of the penalties from the tariff of penalties contained in section 12.19 shall be applied. For all penalties, a record must be entered on the student's file by Student Records.

12.19 Tariff of Penalties

- 12.19.1 The description of offences is not intended to be an exhaustive list of each specific offence to which that tariff can be applied, but is considered to be an illustrative summary of particular offences for which the University considered the tariff to be appropriate. Academic Conduct Officers, Faculty Academic Conduct Panels and Committees of

Academic Enquiry are encouraged to consider the case before them, and how characteristics within their case match up to the description of the offence column, to reach the appropriate penalty. If the allegation is proven, one of the penalties set out in section 12.20.5 will be applied. The Panel **should** consider the impact of the penalty and ensure that the outcome is not disproportionate to the offence committed. Panels should also take into account any mitigating factors that have been presented and record in the notes of the meeting how consideration for these mitigating factors have influenced the penalty being applied. Where two penalty options are given the Officer, Panel or Committee has the discretion to select the most appropriate penalty. Academic Conduct Officers may impose up to and including penalty B, Faculty Panels may impose up to and including Tariff D, Review Panels and Committees of Academic Enquiry may impose any tariff.

- 12.19.2 Where a Penalty B or C is awarded the Officer, Panel or Committee should give consideration to whether the piece of work has sufficient potential for the Student to be able to demonstrate the ILOs of the assessment. Where the Panel does not consider it possible that the Student can successfully demonstrate they would be meeting the ILOS of the assessment, as the poor academic practice is too extensive, then they may mandate a new question.
- 12.19.3 Where a Penalty B or C is awarded for coursework the Officer, Panel or Committee should give consideration to setting an appropriate deadline for the Student, and should give guidance on what the student should be revising. Once the work has been resubmitted an Academic Conduct Officer should check to ensure that the work now complies with the Department's standards and then send to the marker for marking. If the work has not been remedied to the required standard then the Academic Conduct Officer should apply a mark of zero. It is a principle of the University that appeals cannot be made against the academic judgement of a marker, it is therefore not possible for a student to appeal this decision to apply a mark of zero except in cases where they believe that this judgement was not made fairly or according to the correct University process or where they experienced material circumstances which also prevented them from engaging with the mitigation processes at the point of submission.

12.19.4 Where a Penalty B or C is awarded for coursework and a deadline has been agreed for the resubmission, a student is entitled to apply for an extension on this deadline in line with the procedure for Mitigation as defined in [Chapter 10 – Mitigation](#). However, the student should not be permitted to apply for a deferral of the resubmission as this would result in a new assessment being set for the student in the next assessment period, and this would provide the student with an advantage.

12.19.5 Tariff of Penalties for Coursework and examinations sat in non-invigilated conditions. (For the tariff of Penalties applying to invigilated exams only please see 12.22.5 below.)

Tariff	Description of Offence	Penalty to be imposed for offences identified in coursework	Penalty to be imposed for offences identified in non-invigilated examinations (typically sat remotely and submitted online)
A	Misunderstanding of the academic conventions of the department	The Student will be issued a warning letter. This warning letter will remain on file. May also recommend action such as taking the ELE Module, on Academic Honesty.	The Student will be issued a warning letter. This warning letter will remain on file. May also recommend action such as taking the ELE Module, on Academic Honesty.
B	Minor amount of poor academic practice within the piece of work	When submission was the student's first attempt: The student will be formally reprimanded with a mark of zero being recorded for the submission. The student will be asked to resubmit	When submission was the student's first attempt: The student will be formally reprimanded and a mark of zero will be recorded for the examination in question. The candidate will be permitted a fresh attempt at this assessment in the next

		the piece of work with the poor academic practice removed. The penalty does not impose a cap on this resubmission. This will not be considered a referral attempt, nor will it affect the right of referral should the student fail the module. When the submission was the student's referral attempt: The student will be formally reprimanded with a mark of zero being recorded for the submission. The student will be asked to resubmit the piece of work with the poor academic practice removed. The penalty does not impose a cap on this resubmission However, the student's module mark should be capped as per the rules	appropriate assessment period. The penalty does not impose a cap and the subsequent attempt will not be considered a referral attempt, nor will it affect the right of referral should the student fail the module. When the submission was the student's referral attempt: The student will be formally reprimanded and a mark of zero will be recorded for the examination in question. The candidate will be permitted another attempt at this assessment in the next appropriate assessment period. The penalty does not impose a cap on this resubmission. However, the student's module mark should be capped as per the rules for referred assessments.
--	--	--	---

		for referred assessments.	
C	Significant amount of poor academic practice within the piece of work. OR Minor amount of academic misconduct within the piece of work. OR Minor inappropriate manipulation of data or source material to support the piece of work	When submission was the student's first attempt: The student will be formally reprimanded with a mark of zero being recorded for the submission. The student will be asked to resubmit the piece of work with the poor academic practice or academic misconduct removed. The mark will be capped at the pass mark. This will not be considered a referral attempt, nor will it affect the right of referral should the student fail the module. When the submission was the student's referral attempt: The student will be formally reprimanded with a mark of zero being recorded for the	When submission was the student's first attempt: The student will be formally reprimanded and a mark of zero will be recorded for the examination in question. The candidate will be permitted a fresh attempt at this assessment in the next appropriate assessment period but the mark will be capped at the pass mark. This is to prevent a student from gaining an advantage from committing misconduct. This will not be considered a referral attempt, nor will it affect the right of referral should the student fail the module. When the submission was the student's referral attempt: The student will be formally reprimanded and a mark of zero will be recorded for the examination in question. The candidate will be permitted a

		submission. The student will be asked to resubmit the piece of work with the poor academic practice or academic misconduct removed. The mark for the assessment will be capped at the pass mark. The student's module mark should be capped as per the rules for referred assessments.	fresh attempt at this assessment in the next appropriate assessment period The mark for the assessment will be capped at the pass mark. This is to prevent a student from gaining an advantage from committing misconduct. The student's module mark should be capped as per the rules for referred assessments.
D	Significant amount of Academic Misconduct detected within the piece. OR Data has been used by the student to support critical parts of their piece of work and this has not referenced. OR Inappropriate manipulation of data or source material to	D1 The student will be formally reprimanded. The student will be given a mark of Zero for the piece of work concerned. There will be no right of referral for this piece of work. (This will not affect the Student's right to reassessment of the module where the module is reassessed by way of one 100% examination; however	D1 The student will be formally reprimanded. The student will be given a mark of Zero for the piece of work concerned. There will be no right of referral for this piece of work. (This will not affect the Student's right to reassessment of the module where the module is reassessed by way of one 100% examination; however the student will only be able to be awarded the marks equal to the component where no

	support the piece of work.	the student will only be able to be awarded the marks equal to the component where no misconduct was detected. i.e. the student has received a mark of zero in 1 essay worth 40% of the module, therefore would be entitled to 60% of the marks from any reassessment of the entire module). Or D2 The module concerned will be given a mark of zero, and the student has a right of referral for the pass mark.	misconduct was detected. i.e. the student has received a mark of zero in 1 essay worth 40% of the module, therefore would be entitled to 60% of the marks from any reassessment of the entire module). Or D2 The module concerned will be given a mark of zero, and the student has a right of referral for the pass mark.
E	Severe Academic Misconduct detected within one piece of work, or across several pieces of work. OR The underlying data supporting the piece of work has been fabricated, or the	E1 The module concerned will be given a mark of zero with no right of referral. Or E2 Mark of zero for the year concerned with a right of referral, the referral will be capped at the pass mark.	E1 The module concerned will be given a mark of zero with no right of referral. Or E2 Mark of zero for the year concerned with a right of referral, the referral will be capped at the pass mark.

	results of experimentation have been falsified.		
F	Severe Academic Misconduct, detected within either one piece of work or within several pieces of work occurring within significant parts of the piece(s), or throughout a dissertation or large scale research project. OR The underlying data supporting the piece of work has been fabricated, or the results of experimentation have been falsified.	F1 A mark of zero will be recorded for the modules in which the misconduct occurred. The Student will also not be permitted to be awarded for the degree upon which they are registered, but may be awarded a lesser award in line with the credits which they have achieved. Or F2 Mark of zero for the year in question with no right of referral. Credits gained from previous years are unaffected, and may be counted towards an award from the University.	F1 A mark of zero will be recorded for the modules in which the misconduct occurred. The Student will also not be permitted to be awarded for the degree upon which they are registered, but may be awarded a lesser award in line with the credits which they have achieved. Or F2 Mark of zero for the year in question with no right of referral. Credits gained from previous years are unaffected, and may be counted towards an award from the University.
G	Severe Academic Misconduct, across several assessments, occurring in critical parts of the pieces of work.	Expulsion from the University with no credit received.	Expulsion from the University with no credit received.

	OR Widespread amounts of plagiarism or fabrication within a dissertation or large scale research project. OR Evidence that the entire essay has been purchased and submitted by the student.		
--	---	--	--

Please note that as per 12.2.15 above Students who commit academic offences are subject to the normal programme rules for progression, i.e. where programmes permit, affected modules may be condoned.

12.20 Managing Academic Misconduct – Procedures for Examination Offences

- 12.20.1 This element of the procedure applies to both formal invigilated examinations that are completed in examination venues under timed restrictions, and in class tests which are run by Faculties (or delegated Schools) under invigilated examination conditions. For offences identified in non-invigilated examinations (typically taken remotely and submitted online), please refer to Sections 12.13-12.19 for the relevant procedures.
- 12.20.2 Where suspected examination misconduct is discovered under formal invigilated examination conditions, the Invigilator **should** complete a report to be countersigned by all other invigilators who were witness to the suspected examination misconduct.
- 12.20.3 This report, together with any accompanying evidence, **should** be sent without delay to the University Cases Office who will inform the student in writing that they have been reported for suspected examination misconduct. The University Cases Office shall copy the Invigilator's report to the Faculty (or delegated School) responsible for the module being examined.

- 12.20.4 In cases where unauthorised materials were found on the student or connected with the student, then the University Cases Office will ask the Faculty (or delegated School) to complete a report to state whether the material was relevant to the examination in question and what (if any) advantage could have been gained by the student. Once the University Cases Office receives the report they will ensure it is provided to the student.
- 12.20.5 If it becomes apparent after an invigilated examination has finished (for instance when the work is being marked) that a Student may have committed an offence during that examination, then the same procedures are to be followed as in 12.20.4 and 12.20.5. In such cases the report shall be submitted by the Faculty (or delegated School) responsible for the module being examined to the University Cases Office.
- 12.20.6 In any case where a meeting of a Programme/Department Assessment, Progression and Awarding Committee is imminent, the Faculty (or delegated School) shall ensure that the Chair of the Committee receives a copy of the report which was sent to the University Cases Office. The Programme/Department Assessment, Progression and Awarding Committee shall consider the examinee's programme assessment profile purely on the marks available to it. Once the Programme/Department Assessment, Progression and Awarding Committee has reached its decision the Chair shall then inform the Committee of the receipt of a report regarding suspected examination misconduct for that candidate. The Programme/Department Assessment, Progression and Awarding Committee shall not include the name(s) of any candidate(s) in respect of whom it has received such a report, on any class or pass list until the Chair of the Committee is notified of the outcome of the case.
- 12.20.7 Upon receipt of a report of a case of alleged examination misconduct the University Cases Office shall appoint a nominee for the Divisional Director of Education and Academic Services an Investigating Officer. If the Investigating Officer determines that the offence constitutes Minor Examination misconduct (as per the Tariff of Penalties in 12.22.5, the University Cases Office will send a warning letter to the Student, which will be copied to the Faculty (or delegated School). This letter will also be copied to Student Records where a note will be made on the student's electronic record. Where a warning letter will count as examination misconduct and as such, a first offence.
- 12.20.8 If the Investigating Officer determines that there is a suspected case of

- a. Repeated Minor Exam Misconduct
- b. Exam Misconduct, or,
- c. Severe Examination Misconduct

The University Cases Office will complete Part 1 of the Student Allegation Form setting out the nature of the alleged offence.

- 12.20.9 The Student Allegation Form will be sent to the Student for Part 2 of the form to be completed. They will also be sent a link to the Assessment, Progression and Awarding; Taught Programmes Handbook, a copy of the Invigilator's report, and a copy of any supporting evidence. The Student will be invited to complete Part 2 of the form, including an opportunity to provide a statement of their version of the events plus details of any circumstances they believe to be relevant to the consideration of the alleged offence. The form **should** be returned to the University Cases Office within five working days of the date on the accompanying letter.
- 12.20.10 A Review Panel will then be established. If the Student fails to return the form within the five working day period without good reason, the Review Panel will proceed to consider the case and make a decision without any representations from the Student.

12.21 Establishment of a Review Panel

- 12.21.1 A Review Panel should comprise the Investigating Officer (as nominee for the Divisional Director of Education and Academic Services), the Students' Guild, Vice President for Education or nominee and the relevant Dean (this will be the Dean for Taught Students or nominee, or the Dean of Dean of Postgraduate Research and of the Doctoral College where the offence relates to an examination for a taught module on a Postgraduate Research programme) The Review Panel will consider the evidence and agree on an appropriate outcome according to the Tariff of Penalties in Section 12.22.
- 12.21.2 The Review Panel will only consider written evidence. There will be no right of attendance for either the Student concerned or for any other member of University staff. The Review Panel therefore **may** agree to meet virtually to decide the outcome.
- 12.21.3 The Review Panel will address a case as being a strict liability offence. This means that where a Student is found to have taken unauthorised materials or an electronic device to

their desk, the Student is guilty of an offence, irrespective of that Student's intent either to deceive or gain an advantage. Where alleged intent to gain advantage is also presented, this will be considered in addition to the strict liability offence.

- 12.21.4 The tariff sets a default penalty and if, for any reason, the Review Panel wishes to impose a different penalty, clear reasons for this decision **should** be specified in the written decision which is issued to the relevant parties. Further penalties **may** be given in addition to the default penalty if it is felt necessary, e.g. undertaking remedial work, taking a module on academic honesty etc.
- 12.21.5 The Investigating Officer will ensure that a written record is kept of the deliberations and the decisions reached by the Review Panel.

12.22 Outcomes from a Review Panel for Examination Offences

- 12.22.1 The Review Panel has the power to impose any of the penalties from A to G from the Tariff of Penalties.
- 12.22.2 A record **will** be held within the University Cases Office where a penalty is imposed.
- 12.22.3 If an allegation is proven, one of the penalties set out in section 12.22.5 will be applied. The Review Panel **should** consider the impact of the penalty and ensure that the outcome is not disproportionate to the offence committed. Panels should also take into account any mitigating factors that have been presented and record in the notes of the meeting how consideration of mitigating factors have influenced any penalty being applied.
- 12.22.4 The Student shall have the right to appeal any decision taken by a Review Panel as set out in section 12.23.
- 12.22.5 Tariff of Penalties for Examination Misconduct.

Tariff	Description of Offence	Penalty to be imposed for offences identified in invigilated examinations (sat in person in invigilated examination halls)
A	Minor Exam Misconduct.	A warning letter will be issued to the Student. This warning letter will remain on file. Action (e.g. taking a

		module on Academic Honesty) may also be recommended.
B	Repeated Minor Exam Misconduct.	When the examination was the student's first attempt: The Student will be formally reprimanded and a mark of zero will be recorded for the examination in question. The Student will have a right of deferral and the mark for the deferred attempt will not be capped at the pass mark. However, the Student is not permitted to attain a mark higher than that achieved at the first attempt – this is to prevent the Student from gaining advantage from committing an exam misconduct offence. When the examination was a referral attempt: The student will be formally reprimanded with a mark of zero being recorded for the submission. However the student's module mark should be capped as per the rules for referred assessments. The Student will have a right of deferral for their referral attempt and the mark will be capped at the pass mark. However, the Student is not permitted to attain a mark higher than that achieved at the previous attempt – this is to prevent the Student from gaining advantage from committing an exam misconduct offence.

C	Exam Misconduct, where the student has breached the guidance for candidates, but it is deemed they have not gained an advantage.	When the examination was the student's first attempt: The Student will be formally reprimanded and a mark of zero will be recorded for the examination in question. The candidate will have the right of referral but the mark will be capped at the pass mark, or at the mark achieved at the first attempt, whichever is the lower of the two marks – this is to prevent a Student from gaining advantage from committing an exam misconduct offence. When the examination was a referral attempt: The student will be formally reprimanded with a mark of zero being recorded for the examination. There will be no further right of referral.
---	--	---

D	Severe Exam Misconduct, where the student has breached the guidance for candidates, and it is deemed they have gained, or had the opportunity to gain, an advantage.	D1 The Student will be formally reprimanded. The Student will be given a mark of zero for the piece of work concerned. There will be no right of referral for this piece of work. (This will not affect the Student's right to reassessment of the module where the module is reassessed by way of one 100% examination; however the Student will only be able to be awarded the marks equal to the component where no misconduct was detected i.e. where a Student has received a mark of zero in one essay worth 40% of the module, therefore would be entitled to 60% of the marks from any reassessment of the entire module). Or D2 The module concerned will be given a mark of zero, and the Student has a right of referral for the pass mark.
E	Severe Exam Misconduct, where the student has breached the guidance for candidates, and it is deemed they have gained, or had the opportunity to gain, a clear advantage.	E1 The module concerned will be given a mark of zero with no right of referral. Or E2 A mark of zero will be given for the stage concerned with a right of referral, with referrals being capped at the pass mark.

F	Severe Exam Misconduct, where the student has breached the guidance for candidates, and it is deemed they have gained, or had the opportunity to gain, a significant advantage.	F1 A mark of zero will be recorded for the module(s) in which the misconduct offence(s) occurred. The Student will also not be permitted to be awarded for the degree upon which they are registered, but may be awarded a lesser award in line with the credits which they have achieved. Or F2 A mark of zero will be given for the stage concerned with no right of referral. Credits gained from previous years are unaffected, and as such may be counted towards an award from the University.
G	Severe Exam Misconduct such as impersonation.	Expulsion from the University with no credit received.

12.23 Appeals

12.23.1 A student shall have the right of appeal against any decision taken either by a Departmental Level Panel, by a Faculty Level Panel, by a Review Panel or by a Committee of Academic Enquiry. The appeal must be received by the University Cases Office within ten working days of the date on the formal outcome letter informing the student of the decision. The student should submit the appropriate Academic Misconduct Appeal Form (see Annex 1 of this Chapter) to the [University Cases Office](#), indicating the grounds of the appeal and attaching any supporting evidence on which the appeal will rely. The University will not normally gather evidence on the behalf of a student.

12.23.2 Students will not be disadvantaged as a result of making an appeal. However, if it is later discovered that an appeal was frivolous, malicious or vexatious, the University may consider referring a student to its Disciplinary Procedure – Non-academic Misconduct. This may include:

- appeals which are obsessive, harassing, or repetitive
- insistence on pursuing non-meritorious appeals and/or unrealistic, unreasonable outcomes

- insistence on pursuing what may be meritorious appeals in an unreasonable manner
- appeals which are designed to cause disruption or annoyance
- demands for redress which lack any serious purpose or value.

12.23.3 The University has a responsibility to protect itself against unacceptable behaviour and provide a working environment that is safe, respectful and tolerant. Consequently, it is expected that students, their representatives and staff members should act reasonably and fairly towards each other and treat the process with respect. Behaviour that is unreasonable, aggressive or abusive, either verbal or written, will not be tolerated and may result in a student's access to the procedure, or to staff connected with the appeal, being limited or withdrawn. The decision to limit or withdraw this access is not taken lightly. If this decision is taken, the University will provide this in writing, including the reason(s) why this decision has been taken.

In the event that a student's access to members of staff or to the appeals process is limited or withdrawn, the student may appeal the decision by submitting their grounds in writing to the Divisional Director of Education and Academic Services who will review the appeal with the Dean for Taught Students, or Associate Dean for Taught Students, or Director of the University of Exeter Doctoral College or Associate Dean of Postgraduate Research (as relevant).

12.23.4 This procedure is only available to students of the University of Exeter. The term "student" refers to students, trainees or apprentices who have registered or enrolled on their course. It also includes those who have recently left a provider (i.e. a student may be someone who, within the last 30 calendar days, has received notification of their final award or has been withdrawn).

Students are expected to adhere to the timeframes for the submission of appeals as set out in Section 12.23.1 of this Chapter.

Students are required to submit their appeals and represent themselves in this process. Students may seek help and support from third parties, but we are unable to accept appeals submitted by third parties, nor will we liaise with third parties regarding the content of appeals, unless explicitly stated in the procedure.

Anonymous appeals or evidence will not be considered. If you wish to raise a concern, but want to remain anonymous, you can make use of the Exeter Speaks Out anonymous reporting tool.

- 12.23.5 Appeals submitted outside of the timeframe set out above will normally be excluded from consideration, unless you can present reasonable grounds as to why the appeal was not submitted within the normal deadline. Typically, appeals submitted outside the standard timeframes will not be considered unless there are exceptional circumstances, such as medical issues which caused a student to be unable to engage in the necessary procedures at the appropriate time. If this is the case, it is anticipated that students should provide evidence to support why they were unable to engage within the appropriate timeframes.
- 12.23.6 Appeals will be treated with due diligence and confidentiality but, in order to come to an informed decision, those members of staff considering an appeal will normally require access to the documentation presented in support of the application. Furthermore, during the appeal process, it may be necessary to share with those members of staff considering an appeal relevant information held by other teams to enable them to offer the best support and most appropriate outcome.
- 12.23.7 The University Cases Team should normally aim to resolve an academic misconduct appeal within 30 calendar days of receipt of the appeal. If this is not possible, or if the case is complex, the University will inform the student of any expected delay.
- 12.23.8 Students should note that an appeal against a decision taken by a Departmental Level Panel, by a Faculty Level Panel, by a Review Panel or by a Committee of Academic Enquiry will only be accepted if:
- a. There is evidence of procedural irregularity.
 - b. There is evidence of bias.
 - c. The decision reached is one that no reasonable body (properly directing itself and taking into account all relevant factors) could have arrived at.

- d. The student submits evidence of new material circumstances, and an explanation of why this evidence could not reasonably be expected to have been submitted for consideration when the original decision was made.

12.24.9 A Student Cases Officer, in consultation with the Dean for Taught Students or Associate Dean for Taught Students or Dean of Postgraduate Research (as relevant) (both of whom will not have had any previous involvement with the case) will establish whether, on the face of it, there is a case for consideration before a Senate Appeal Committee.

12.24.10 If, on the face of it, no grounds for appeal are found, the appeal will be dismissed and the student informed, in writing, of the reasons. There is no further right of appeal against such a decision. As per Section 12.23.19, if the student feels that an appeal remains unresolved after the exhaustion of the University's processes, application may be made to the Office of the Independent Adjudicator for Higher Education (OIAHE)

12.24.11 If there is, on the face of it, a case for appeal, any investigation may be undertaken where it is felt is necessary to establish the facts of the case. The Divisional Director of Education and Academic Services (or their nominee) will request copies of all documentation from the Faculty (or delegated School) concerned.

In the event that an investigation reveals that a case for appeal has not been made, the appeal will be rejected and the student informed by letter. In the event that a case of appeal has been made, the Dean for Taught Students or Associate Dean for Taught Students, or Dean of Postgraduate Research (as relevant) may, in liaison with the appropriate Faculty (or delegated School) implement an appropriate remedy. In such cases the student is informed by letter.

Where an appellant does not accept the resolution as offered by either the Dean for Taught Students or Associate Dean for Taught Students or Dean of Postgraduate Research (as relevant) and Student Cases, the matter will be referred to a Senate Appeal Committee, as described below.

12.24.12 If it is decided that, on the face of it, there is a case for an appeal, and the appellant has not accepted a proposed remedy, a Senate Appeal Committee shall be convened. The Senate Appeal Committee has the power to confirm, to set aside or to vary the penalty

imposed by the Department or Faculty-level hearing, the Review Panel or the Committee of Academic Enquiry. There shall be no further internal right of appeal against the decision of the Senate Appeal Committee.

12.24.13 A Senate Appeal Committee shall comprise three members (including a student representative) of the Senate.

A Senate Appeal Committee shall comprise:

- The Dean for Taught Students or Associate Dean for Taught Students, or Dean of Postgraduate Research (as relevant), who shall Chair the Committee;
- An academic member of Senate;
- A Guild Sabbatical Officer.

No person shall serve as a member of the Senate Appeal Committee who is also associated with the student's Department and/or programme of study.

No person shall be entitled to be a member of the Senate Appeal Committee who is also associated with the appellant's Department(s) or who has previously been involved in the matters under appeal.

12.24.14 The appellant shall be informed of the date of the meeting of the Senate Appeal Committee not less than ten working days in advance. They may choose to appear before the Senate Appeal Committee but the Committee may also hear a case in the absence of the appellant. The appellant shall be entitled to attend the Committee meeting for the duration of the hearing, but will be required to withdraw once the Committee retires to reach its decision. Proxies for appellants are not allowed. The student may be accompanied by a supporter, see 12.3.6 of this Chapter which outlines the role of a supporter. The use of electronic audio recording equipment will not normally be allowed and where allowed is at the discretion of the Chair. The student may direct questions to the Faculty (or delegated School) Representative (and any witnesses called) in an appropriate manner at the discretion of the Chair.

12.24.15 The Senate Appeal Committee shall call either a Faculty (or delegated School) Representative or the Investigating Officer and shall be empowered to call other members of the University or partner institution, as it deems necessary.

- 12.24.16 The Senate Appeal Committee, having considered the evidence, may uphold or reject the appeal, with such a decision being final.
- 12.24.17 The Senate Appeal Committee shall minute its deliberations and decisions and submit a report to Senate. If the Committee's report includes a recommendation requiring action before the next meeting of the Senate, it shall be for the Vice-Chancellor to authorise action and then report to the Senate retrospectively.
- 12.24.18 The Secretary of the Committee shall notify the appellant in writing of the Senate Appeal Committee's decision within five working days, giving the reasons for it. The student will also be entitled to receive a copy of the Committee's report; if this cannot be provided with the outcome, it will usually be issued within ten working days.
- 12.24.19 There are no other University appeal procedures beyond those stages detailed above. If, in the opinion of a student, an appeal remains unresolved after the exhaustion of the appropriate processes, application may be made to the Office of the Independent Adjudicator for Higher Education (OIHE). For further details see the [Office of the Independent Adjudicator's website](#).