



ACADEMIC REGULATIONS

Universal Assessment Regulations

Academic Misconduct Policy

Document Control

Responsibility for Policy:	Registrar
Approved by and date:	22 nd June 2022
Frequency of Review:	5 years
Next Review date:	2027
Related Policies:	Appeal Policy
Minor Revisions:	<p>December 2022 Clause 2. Scope Extension of policy to include Postgraduate Research Students in the research phase of their studies. Removed June 2023 with approval of PGR academic misconduct policy.</p> <p>December 2022 Clause 6: Independent Consideration Amendment to process for first cases of misconduct at Levels F and C to remove the requirement for Independent Consideration.</p> <p>June 2023 Independent Consideration available at student request not applicable to all cases. Schools/ Departments determine penalty for misconduct.</p> <p>January 2023 3. Forms of Academic Misconduct Use of Essay Writing Service, wording amended to allow inclusion of Artificial Intelligence and confirmation that the penalty will be termination of studies in this case.</p> <p>June 2023 2.3 Clarification of how mitigating circumstances are dealt with.</p> <p>December 2024 Summary scheme amended to note when evidence is sent to the student.</p>

	<p>3.1 Definition of Third-Party misconduct amended to remove reference to use of Generative AI which has been added to the list as a separate entry.</p> <p>10. Penalties</p> <p>10.1 Reference to Indicative Penalties removed, now confirmed as the 'normal' penalties. Added clarity that mitigating circumstances should be resolved before any misconduct investigation.</p>
EIA:	The policy is monitored using an annual review of available data relating to academic misconduct cases.

Academic Misconduct is suspected and the case is referred to a School Senior Academic Adviser who will advise on the next steps. Investigation takes place in the School using two academic colleagues.

Case to Answer

School writes to student advising of Penalty **and providing all evidence to the student**

No Case to answer- student is advised of this

End of process – student is satisfied

Student is unsatisfied – referral to **Independent Consideration Panel**

ICP agree with School decision and Penalty - student is informed by appeals@hope.ac.uk of the outcome of Independent Consideration


ICP does not agree with School decision and/ or penalty. If resolution with the School cannot be reached. matter is referred to an **Academic Misconduct Panel** via appeals@hope.ac.uk

Case to Answer

School refer case to an **Academic Misconduct Panel**

If the student is not satisfied a review can be requested from **Deputy Vice Chancellor** if **certain grounds are met**. **Student is advised of DVC decision.**

If student is unsatisfied with the outcome the student may submit an Academic Appeal after formal publication of results (see appeals process)



1. Introduction

1.1. The University uses assessment to determine whether a student has met the essential outcomes of their academic program. Assessments are designed to be equitable for all our students, and likewise we expect our students to behave with integrity.

1.2. Academic misconduct is defined as:

“any action or omission which gives or has the potential to give an unfair advantage in an examination or assessment, or might assist someone to gain an unfair advantage, or any activity likely to undermine the integrity essential to scholarship and research”.

1.3. Academic misconduct includes unintentional acts, where students have not familiarised themselves with good academic practice.

1.4. Matters of academic misconduct are decided on a balance of probabilities. The university applies a strict liability policy whereby student's intentions are irrelevant when deciding if academic misconduct took place.

2. Scope

2.1. This policy applies to undergraduates, graduate, taught postgraduates, and taught phases of postgraduate research degrees. This policy applies to students enrolled on a course for assessments delivered in whole by the University, or in whole or part by a sub contractual partner institution (franchise provision).

2.2. Where relevant, other university policies and procedures (such as those relating to discipline, fitness to practise or research misconduct) may be used as well as or instead of this policy.

2.3. Mitigating circumstances cannot be considered in relation to academic misconduct. Any panel hearing held under this Policy is not permitted to take into consideration mitigating circumstances. These should be dealt with in accordance with the University Mitigating Circumstances Policy.

2.4. The University has a 'fit to sit' policy and as such mitigating circumstances can only be considered through the Mitigating Circumstances Policy, or, in exceptional cases, through the Academic Appeals Policy.

3. Forms of Academic Misconduct

3.1. Academic misconduct may take a number of forms. The following is not an exhaustive list:

Plagiarism

This happens where a student incorporates the work of others (published or unpublished) in their own work without properly acknowledging it. Students are effectively claiming ownership for

work that is not their own. This includes word for-word borrowing as well as copying with minor changes. 'Work' is not limited to text, but also includes statistics, assembled facts or arguments, designs, images, models, figures, computer programs, photographs, pictures or diagrams. Students must follow the correct referencing guidelines provided by their Academic team.

**Self
Plagiarism/
Recycling**

A student using the same work for a new assessment that was submitted for a previous summative assessment. The following cases ARE NOT considered (or, DO NOT fall) under the rubric of self-plagiarism/ recycling: students who are resubmitting or "re-presenting" failed work to reach a minimum threshold; students who are taking a block of study for a second time with attendance; students who include in examination answers material previously included in coursework answers, unless this is explicitly forbidden by the exam regulations.

**Use of third
parties**

Essay writing services, buying or otherwise obtaining work online or elsewhere through use of available software which a student then submits for assessment. Commissioning an essay from any third party is fraud.

**Use of
Generative
Artificial
Intelligence**

GenAI can be a valuable learning aid, but should never be used as a substitute for production of original assessed work. It is not acceptable to present AI-generated content; unacknowledged submission of summative assessment generated by AI is considered misconduct. Students should consult the acceptable uses policy of the University.

**Fraudulent or
fabricated
coursework**

For example: reports of practical work that is untrue and/ or made up; fabrication of research or dishonest interpretation of data; unethical research practice.

**Cheating in
examinations**

Through impersonation; taking into the examination unauthorised materials, mobile phones or other electronic devices; copying from other students or from notes.

Collusion

Submitting work produced jointly with another student (except where the terms of the assessment require collaboration).

Deception

Faking mitigating circumstances in relation to an assessment.

**Breaching
ethical
standards**

Where a student was explicitly required to obtain ethical approval before collecting data, they must not collect data without such permission having been granted. Beginning a research study without ethical approval will be considered in light of both academic misconduct and the student code of discipline. Students must not violate any condition imposed in writing as part of granting ethical approval for the project nor should they amend the study design without obtaining relevant approval.

Bribery

obtaining material relating to assessment, with the intention of gaining unfair advantage, through the offering of inducements.

- 3.2.** Being accused of academic misconduct is a serious offence in the University and has the potential to result in a number of penalties depending on the stage a student is at in their studies and the severity of the offence. It can mean that the student
- (a)** is required to resubmit the work;
 - (b)** is given a capped mark;
 - (c)** is given a mark of zero for either the assessment or the block of study
 - (d)** in the most serious cases, a student's studies may be terminated.
- 3.3.** If a student withdraws from the course during this procedure they will not be allowed to return to study until the University has investigated the matter and notified the student of the outcome. In any requests for a reference, it will record where a disciplinary matter is outstanding.
- 3.4.** Findings of academic misconduct may be recorded on a student's transcript. Where this is the case, the University may refer to this information in character references or notify any relevant professional body.
- 3.5.** Students subject to this Policy should seek independent advice from the Students' Union Advice Service because they have experience of supporting and advising students during academic misconduct proceedings. Students can be supported by one of the Student Union advisers at any stage of this Policy.
- 3.6.** The University recognises that in the early part of a student's studies mistakes may be made. At the same time, the University expects students to learn from these mistakes and not to repeat them. If the circumstances on any alleged misconduct suggests that if a student intended to gain an unfair advantage, the University will take this very seriously and may apply a more severe penalty.
- 3.7.** It is the university's responsibility to establish that academic misconduct is more likely than not to have taken place.

4. Investigating Academic Misconduct

The type of action taken will depend on the academic misconduct that is being investigated.

4.1. Examinations

- 4.1.1.** If a student is suspected of cheating in an examination, the invigilator will make a note on the student's examination script and remove any suspect objects.
- 4.1.2.** The student will be allowed to finish the examination.
- 4.1.3.** At the end of the examination, the student will be told that an investigation will take place. The matter will be reported to the student's School and an investigation will take place.

4.2. Assessments

If a student is suspected of academic misconduct in an assessment other than an examination, this concern will be reported to/ handled by the student's School, which will decide whether a further investigation is warranted, who will record the decision and the reasons for it.

- 4.3.** The person who is investigating the allegation will determine the best way of doing this. This person will normally be the School Senior Academic Adviser (SAA). The investigation may include the use of plagiarism detection software. The student may also be asked to provide their notes, drafts and any other records relating to their preparatory work for the assessment. They may be asked to attend a viva voce where this is appropriate to the investigation. Any failure to provide this material/ attend a viva voce is likely to be considered when a decision is made about potential academic misconduct. The student may also be asked a series of questions to be able to demonstrate that the work is theirs.
- 4.4.** The role of the SAA is to liaise with the person raising the initial concern, to guide them in collating the evidence and to make an academic judgment on whether there is a case to answer. The SAA does not decide that academic misconduct has occurred.

5. Role of the School/ Department

- 5.1** Once the investigation described above is complete, and normally within ten working days of the concern first arising, the student will be given a copy of all the evidence. The student will be invited to a meeting at the School. At least two members of the academic staff will be present at this meeting.
- 5.2** The student may be accompanied by a fellow student or officer of the Students' Union to provide support. The purpose of this meeting is to allow the student the chance to comment on the evidence and respond to the allegation of academic misconduct made against them.
- 5.3** At this meeting, which will be minuted and the minutes subsequently shared with the student, the School will decide from the following outcomes:

No further Action There is no case to be answered.

**Academic
Misconduct** There is a case to be answered

If there is a case to be answered: the student will be informed of the decision and the recommended penalty.

In serious or complex cases, the matter may be referred directly to an Academic Misconduct Panel as set out in section 7 below.

- 5.4** The School/ Department, in reaching a decision referred to in 5.3 above, may arrange an academic interview with a student in the form of a viva voce. The student may be accompanied by a fellow student or officer of the Students' Union to provide support. The purpose of this meeting is to establish whether misconduct has/ has not taken place in more complex assessments including dissertations/ research projects.
- 5.5** If the student wishes to dispute either the finding that they have committed academic misconduct or the appropriateness of the penalty, the student may choose to have their case referred for Independent Consideration. If the student chooses this review stage, they must inform the appeals@hope.ac.uk within ten working days from the date on Panel outcome letter.

6. Independent Consideration of the School/Department Outcome

If a student is unsatisfied with either the penalty or the outcome they may request their case is reviewed by two members of senior academic staff (usually one of which will be an SAA). This is known as the Independent Consideration Panel ("IC Panel"). These will be different from the people in section 5 above who initially considered the evidence.

6.1. This Panel will consider whether:

- (a)** The evidence is sufficient to justify the conclusion that the student has committed academic misconduct.
- (b)** The proposed penalty is appropriate in light of all the evidence and in accordance with the guidelines set out below.

6.2 The student will not be present at the IC Panel meeting, and no representative from the student's School will attend. The IC Panel may dismiss the case on the basis that the evidence does not justify a finding of academic misconduct, or it may ask the School to investigate further and provide additional supporting evidence for its view that academic misconduct has taken place.

6.3 If the IC Panel finds the evidence does justify a finding of academic misconduct, it may uphold the penalty recommended by the School or substitute another penalty. It may also decide that the matter would be more appropriately heard by a full hearing of the Academic Misconduct Panel (AMP).

6.4 The student will be notified in writing of the outcome within five working days of the IC Panel hearing. Completions of procedures notices will not be issued this stage, instead they will be issued after any appeal is complete.

7. Academic Misconduct Panel

- 7.1.** The Academic Misconduct Panel (AMP) will normally comprise the Registrar (Chair) or the Registrar's nominee, student administration representative (secretariat), two members of academic staff and a representative from the Student Union. In all cases

the AMP must be made up of staff who had no previous involvement with the case. The student will be notified at least five days in advance of the time and place of the meeting.

7.2. The AMP will not include any representatives from the student's School, in order to ensure that its decision-making is independent.

7.3. It will consider:

- (a)** Whether the evidence is sufficient to justify the conclusion that the student has committed academic misconduct.
- (b)** Whether the proposed penalty is appropriate in light of all the evidence and in accordance with the guidelines set out below.

7.4. A representative from the student's School will be present to represent the School perspective. The student is also entitled to be present to speak on their own behalf.

7.5. The student may choose to bring a supporter to the hearing. The companion will normally be a Students' Union officer or trained nominee of the Students' Union, a member of academic staff or a student of the University. The student will be asked to provide the name and capacity in which the supporter is attending in advance. It is not normally expected that the student will have legal representation, but if the student believes it is justified in the circumstances, the student should make these reasons known to the Registrar at least three working days in advance of the hearing. If the Registrar believes the **student has established compelling grounds for legal representation, it will be permitted.**

7.6. If it is not possible to make contact with the student or if the student chooses not to attend, the AMP may go ahead in their absence. Whether or not the student attends, the student may submit explanations or evidence about the case in writing at least three days in advance of the meeting, and this will be considered by the members.

7.7. The student will be informed of the outcome and of any penalty in writing, with reasons, within five working days of the hearing. Completions of procedures notices will not be issued this stage, instead they will be issued after any appeal is complete.

8. Academic Misconduct after a Student has Graduated

Where a case has been substantiated through the appropriate procedures the University may apply a penalty in relation to a student who has completed their award and graduated. The penalty may lead to the award being withdrawn either temporarily (pending completion of further work) or permanently. The University may notify a relevant body of the matter where necessary.

9. Right to Appeal

9.1. If the student remains dissatisfied with the confirmed academic misconduct outcome agreed by the University Assessment, Continuation and Award Board, the student has the right to appeal through the usual Academic Appeals process.

10. Penalties

10.1 The penalties that are normally applied are detailed below. Mitigating Circumstances should not be considered as these should be resolved prior to the misconduct investigation using the Mitigating Circumstances Policy.

Level	1 st Offence	2 nd Offence	3 rd Offence
F	Formative Penalty: assessment must be redone prior to a further presentation opportunity. Outcome is then on merit. Students choosing not to take up the opportunity will have their work marked on merit as originally submitted.	Resubmission of the assessment for a capped bare pass outcome. No block capping	As for a second offence at Level I/ H
C	Formative Penalty: assessment must be redone prior to a further presentation opportunity. Outcome is then on merit. Students choosing not to take up the opportunity will have their work marked on merit as originally submitted.	Resubmission of the assessment for a capped bare pass outcome. No block capping.	As for a second offence at Level I/ H
I	Resubmission of the assessment for a capped bare pass outcome. No block capping.	Block is awarded outcome of 0	Termination of Studies
H/ Integrated Masters Level 7 Year	Resubmission of the assessment for a capped bare pass outcome	Block is awarded outcome of 0	Termination of Studies
PG	Resubmission of the assessment to enable a capped bare module/ block pass outcome	Block/ module is awarded outcome of 0	Termination of Studies

If the case has been referred to a University level hearing, those Panels may also apply one of the Misconduct sanctions, which include:

- Withdrawal from the Course
- Permanent exclusion from the University.

10.2 If academic misconduct is identified after the student has graduated with an award, the award may be revoked or otherwise amended, for example by reducing the degree classification.