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NOTE: AMENDMENTS DETAILED OVERLEAF

Academic Standards and Quality
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COVID-19 – Regulatory Changes

Detailed in the table below are temporary changes which have been agreed and implemented within the 2020-21 academic year to mitigate against disruptions from the COVID-19 pandemic. Unless otherwise stated, changes are made with immediate effect.

Throughout the chapter, content has been highlighted in yellow to indicate affected clauses which must be read in conjunction with the table below.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Subject</th>
<th>Summary of change</th>
<th>Clauses affected</th>
<th>Regulation information</th>
<th>Date implemented</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| Temporary Summary Procedure     | Instituting a Temporary Summary Procedure for cases of plagiarism in remote exams that meet criteria; capping powers of TSP at failing individual element concerned and mandating resit. | AM 4.2           | AM 4.2.1 **For the 20/21 academic year only.** A summary procedure will be instituted for students undertaking remote examinations who: (a) are accused of plagiarism (as defined in AM 2.4 above); (b) are alleged to have plagiarised less than 50% of the piece of work concerned; and (c) have not previously been found to have committed an academic offence (that is, to be considered in ‘bad academic standing’ at the time of the alleged offence). Cases which do not exceed these criteria can be seen by a single member of SAC. In such cases, students may choose to either meet with the single member of SAC, or instead to submit a statement explaining their conduct in lieu of being seen. If the student is found to have committed the offence concerned, the powers of the summary procedure will be capped at the following: to fail the element (exam) concerned, and to permit a capped resit of this element. This summary procedure shall not prevent students from appealing a decision. If a student believes that they have been wrongly found to have committed an offence by the summary procedure, this decision can be appealed, and a full hearing of SAC will be convened. The SAC member involved in the initial decision will not form part of an appeal hearing, and the hearing shall in effect be a first hearing, with the usual further right to appeal, as in AM 5.2.6 below. | SCAR – 02/07/21  
ASCQ – 06/07/21 |
AM 1 PRINCIPLES

AM 1.1 The University values a culture of honesty and mutual trust in its academic endeavours (academic integrity) and expects all members of the University, staff and students, to respect and uphold these core values.

AM 1.2 Academic departments shall provide advice and guidance to students on academic integrity and what constitutes academic malpractice, and make students aware of these regulations and the possible outcomes of proven academic malpractice. Students have a responsibility to ensure they are aware of the University’s expectations and the regulations, and to take responsibility for the academic integrity of their own work.

AM 1.3 Any student who is alleged to have been involved in an act of academic malpractice shall have access to Lancaster University Students’ Union support and advice at all stages of the procedures contained in these regulations, and the department shall inform the student of this right.

AM 1.4 The University reserves the right to use electronic software for the purposes of detection of suspected academic malpractice. Examiners shall also have the right to request this.

AM 1.5 All students shall be given the opportunity to submit a defence against an allegation of academic malpractice and have the right to be accompanied by a friend/representative in any investigative meeting/Hearing.

AM 1.6 Decisions taken under these procedures by a member of staff, panel or committee of the University shall be made on the basis of the balance of probability and take full account of the principles of natural justice, fairness and equity.

AM 1.7 Where students who are under investigation for academic malpractice are also the subject of Fitness to Practise proceedings, the academic malpractice judgement must be available in order to inform the Fitness to Practise proceedings at the appropriate stage.

AM 1.8 In the investigation of potential academic malpractice by research degree students, a procedural distinction is made between misconduct in the way the research work is carried out (i.e. in the research practice) and academic malpractice in the research output(s). Suspected misconduct in research practice, as defined here, will be considered under the University’s procedures on research ethics and research governance. Suspected academic malpractice in research output(s), including the fabrication of results (as defined in AM 2.5), will be dealt with under these Academic Malpractice Regulations and Procedures.

AM 1.9 Where a member of staff is undertaking a research degree as a student of the University and is suspected of academic malpractice in the research degree this will be investigated under these Academic Malpractice Regulations and Procedures. This does not preclude
the University from also considering this a matter relating to employment, but that process should not be used to circumvent these regulations.

**AM 2** DEFINITION AND FORMS OF ACADEMIC MALPRACTICE

**AM 2.1** DEFINITION

It is an academic offence (termed academic malpractice) for a student to commit any act designed to obtain for themself an unfair advantage with a view to achieving a higher grade, mark or more favourable outcome than they would otherwise secure. Any attempt to convey deceitfully the impression of acquired knowledge, skills, understanding, or credentials, shall represent a contravention of the regulations of the University, and may constitute grounds for exclusion.

**AM 2.2** CHEATING IN EXAMINATIONS (INCLUDING REMOTE EXAMINATIONS1) AND CLASS TESTS

Cheating in examinations (including remote examinations) and class tests includes those occurrences when a student:

(a) communicates, or attempts to communicate, with anyone about the content of the assessment, including another student or any other individual who is neither an invigilator nor a member of staff;
(b) copies, or attempts to copy, from a fellow student;
(c) attempts to introduce or consult during the examination or test any unauthorised printed or written material, or electronic calculating or information storage device or mobile phone or other communication device;
(d) personates another student or allows themselves to be impersonated.

**AM 2.3** COLLUSION

Collusion occurs where a piece of work prepared by a group is represented as if it were the student’s own. This can also occur by enabling a fellow student to obtain academic credit to which they are not entitled. This includes providing material, especially electronic copies of work, or performing all or part of an assigned task so that unfair advantage or credit may be obtained by another student.

**AM 2.4** PLAGIARISM

Plagiarism is understood to include, in whatever format it is presented, including written work, online submissions, group work or oral presentations, the following:

(a) the act of copying or paraphrasing a paper from a source text, whether in manuscript, printed or electronic form, without appropriate acknowledgement (this includes quoting directly from another source with a reference but without quotation marks);

---

1 ‘Remote examination’ refers to a time-limited exam taken by students on their own and not in a physical group examination setting. A time-limit is specified for the completion and submission of the exam paper. Typically, remote examinations are administered electronically by the University.
(b) the submission of all or part of another student’s work, whether with or without that student’s knowledge or consent;
(c) the commissioning or use of work by the student which is not their own and representing it as if it were;
(d) the submission of all or part of work purchased or obtained from a commercial service;
(e) the submission of all or part of work written by another person, whether by another member of the University or a person who is not a member of the University;
(f) reproduction of the same or almost identical own work, in full or in part, for more than one module or unit of assessment of the same or another Lancaster University programme of study or for another institution’s qualification/award of credit. This does not include those programmes of study where the student is permitted or required to develop previously assessed work into a larger argument for the dissertation/thesis;
(g) directly copying from model solutions/answers made available in previous years.

AM 2.5  FABRICATION OR FALSIFICATION OF RESULTS

Fabrication or falsification of results occurs when a student claims to have carried out tests, experiments or observations that have not taken place or presents results not supported by the evidence with the object of obtaining an unfair advantage.

AM 3  ROLES AND RESPONSIBILITIES

AM 3.1  STUDENTS’ UNION

Appropriate Lancaster University Students’ Union staff may act as a representative of the student in any meetings or correspondence with the department, an Academic Officer or the Standing Academic Committee.

AM 3.2  STUDENT REGISTRY

AM 3.2.1 Student Registry shall be responsible for recording, or providing the means for departments to record, all alleged and detected cases of academic malpractice, including plagiarism in coursework and cheating in examinations.

AM 3.2.2 Student Registry shall also provide information and other support to departments to assist them in discharging their duties; communicating information between departments about academic malpractice as appropriate; and offering assistance and advice about procedures and best practices.

AM 3.2.3 Where the procedures require, as detailed in these regulations, Student Registry shall be responsible for undertaking prima facie investigations and for forwarding cases to Standing Academic Committee as appropriate. These initial investigations will normally be undertaken by the Deputy Head of Student Registry or their nominee.

AM 3.3  STANDING ACADEMIC COMMITTEE

AM 3.3.1 The Standing Academic Committee shall investigate all cases of alleged academic malpractice referred to it by the responsible member of staff and determine if an
Academic offence has been committed. (Standing Academic Committee procedures are detailed in the appendix to these regulations.)

AM 3.3.2 The Standing Academic Committee shall act on behalf of the Senate and the Committee of the Senate, and its decisions (subject to AM 8.1) shall be binding on boards of examiners.

AM 3.4 DEPARTMENT ROLES AND RESPONSIBILITIES

IN RELATION TO TAUGHT PROGRAMMES OF STUDY AND TAUGHT ELEMENTS OF RESEARCH DEGREE PROGRAMMES

AM 3.4.1. Academic Marker: Each Academic Marker identified as such by a department or equivalent shall be responsible for providing an appropriate mark and feedback for student work. They shall report where appropriate on cases for which they have marking responsibilities to the relevant Academic Officer, and produce evidence in support of such a claim. Where the Academic Marker is not permanently employed by the University in an academic position then these responsibilities shall be upon the named Module Convener or relevant Head of Department.

AM 3.4.2 Academic Officer: Each department or equivalent shall designate one academic member of staff, to be known as the Academic Officer, who shall take responsibility for the investigation of academic malpractice in coursework at undergraduate and postgraduate levels and for subsequent action where appropriate. The responsibilities of the Academic Officer shall include reporting cases of poor academic practice or academic malpractice and keeping a written record of all cases of alleged academic malpractice.

AM 3.4.3 Academic Officer (remote examinations): Each department or equivalent shall designate one academic member of staff, to be known as the Academic Officer (remote examinations), who shall take responsibility for the initial investigation of malpractice in remote examinations. The responsibility of the Academic Officer (remote examinations) shall be to decide whether the student has a case to answer.

IN RELATION TO THE RESEARCH ELEMENT OF RESEARCH DEGREE PROGRAMMES

AM 3.4.4 Supervisor: The supervisor shall be responsible for advising the student on the University’s regulations and procedures where it is suspected that academic malpractice may have been committed by the student.

AM 3.4.5 Chair/lead of the Confirmation of PhD/Transfer to PhD Panel: the chair/lead of the Panel shall be responsible for writing a report on the suspected academic malpractice in the work submitted for Confirmation of PhD/Transfer to PhD.

AM 3.4.6 Internal and External Examiners for the thesis: The Internal and External Examiners for the thesis shall be responsible for writing a report on the suspected academic malpractice in the work submitted for examination.
AM 4 ACADEMIC MALPRACTICE IN UNDERGRADUATE AND POSTGRADUATE EXAMINATIONS (TAUGHT PROGRAMMES AND TAUGHT COMPONENTS OF RESEARCH DEGREE PROGRAMMES)

AM 4.1 If a student is suspected of an academic offence as defined under these regulations the invigilator shall at once contact the Head of the Student Registry (or nominee) who will immediately go to the examination venue to investigate and will also inform the head(s) of the student’s major department(s) and, if different, of the department responsible for the examination. The student will be permitted to continue the particular examination in which they are suspected of malpractice, but the invigilator will request that the student remains behind at the end of the examination for interview by the Head of the Student Registry (or nominee), at which a representative of Lancaster University Students’ Union shall be invited to be present and written notes will be made. If after this preliminary interview it is clear that no offence has taken place then the investigating officer(s) shall take no further action. If it is decided to carry out a formal investigation the student shall be informed of this but also told that they will be permitted to complete all the examinations they would normally take at that stage in their course. The invigilator shall, immediately after the examination, provide the Head of the Student Registry with a written report giving full details of the alleged offence and enclosing any material evidence relevant to the case. The Head of the Student Registry shall inform the head(s) of the student’s major department(s) and, if different, of the department responsible for the examination.

AM 4.2 On receipt of the report, the Head of the Student Registry (or nominee) shall investigate the alleged offence, making such enquiries as they see fit and with access to all relevant documents. The student shall be interviewed and asked whether they wish to say anything or to provide any information relevant to the alleged offence. If after preliminary investigation the Head of the Student Registry (or nominee) is not satisfied that there is a prima facie case to answer, they shall inform the student and the other parties concerned, and the matter shall end there. If the Head of the Student Registry (or nominee) is satisfied that there is a prima facie case to answer, they shall formally notify the student in writing of the charge and inform them that the case will be referred to the Standing Academic Committee at which Hearing the student shall have the right to be heard, accompanied by a friend/representative if desired. The Academic Officer shall attend the Standing Academic Committee Hearing on behalf of the department.

AM 4.2.1 For the 20/21 academic year only. A summary procedure will be instituted for students undertaking remote examinations who:

(a) are accused of plagiarism (as defined in AM 2.4 above);
(b) are alleged to have plagiarised less than 50% of the piece of work concerned; and
(c) have not previously been found to have committed an academic offence (that is, to be considered in ‘bad academic standing’ at the time of the alleged offence).

Cases which do not exceed these criteria can be seen by a single member of SAC. In such cases, students may choose to either meet with the single member of SAC, or instead to submit a statement explaining their conduct in lieu of being seen. If the student is found to have committed the offence concerned, the powers of the summary procedure will be capped at the following: to fail the element (exam) concerned, and to permit a capped resit of this element.
This summary procedure shall not prevent students from appealing a decision. If a student believes that they have been wrongly found to have committed an offence by the summary procedure, this decision can be appealed, and a full hearing of SAC will be convened.

The SAC member involved in the initial decision will not form part of an appeal hearing, and the hearing shall in effect be a first hearing, with the usual further right to appeal, as in AM 5.2.6 below.

AM 4.3 The Standing Academic Committee, having considered the evidence, shall have the authority to impose one of the following penalties:

(a) decide that no further action is required;
(b) require the student to resit the examination in which they cheated and if deemed appropriate other examinations or units of assessment;
(c) award a mark of 0 or equivalent grade for the examination;
(d) award a mark of 0 or equivalent grade for the entire unit of assessment;
(e) direct that the student be awarded a classification lower than the one derived from the mark profile (after any 0 mark or equivalent grade awarded under (c) or (d) has been included);
(f) direct that the student be awarded no more than a Pass degree;
(g) in addition to one of (b) to (f) temporarily exclude the student from the University;
(h) permanently exclude the student from the University without a degree;
(i) exceptionally not impose a specific penalty, but refer the case to the appropriate board of examiners with a full statement of findings together with suggestions for appropriate action (see AM 4.4).

Procedures where the Standing Academic Committee refers a case of academic malpractice in an examination to a board of examiners

AM 4.4 Any student found by the Standing Academic Committee to be guilty of an academic offence as defined under these regulations and whose case is referred to a board of examiners, shall have the right to submit to the board a written plea in mitigation but they shall not have the right to appear or to be represented by another before the board. Boards of examiners have absolute discretion to take into account, in making their decisions, such evidence as they may consider relevant to a student’s academic performance and to decide whether to call for further oral or written evidence. They may also take into account, but shall not be bound by, the suggestions of the Standing Academic Committee. In considering the suggestions of the Standing Academic Committee, the decisions of boards of examiners shall be subject to ratification by the Committee of the Senate.

Academic malpractice in remote examinations

AM 4.5 All academic markers shall make a positive effort to identify academic malpractice in remote examinations. This is a responsibility of their academic employment and a vital part of securing the academic integrity of these examinations.

---

2 See footnote to AM 2.2 for definition of ‘remote examination’.
AM 4.6 Where an academic marker suspects that academic malpractice may have occurred, they shall report the matter to the Academic Officer as soon as practicable.

AM 4.7 Where an Academic Officer receives a report of possible academic misconduct, the Academic Officer shall use their professional judgement to decide whether poor academic practice has occurred or whether there is a case to answer that academic malpractice may have occurred.

AM 4.8 In reaching the determination in AM 4.7, the Academic Officer shall not discuss the matter with the student or students concerned. They should reach their determination by considering the evidence put forward by the Academic Marker and any other information within the knowledge of the department (e.g. Turnitin, the submission of another student, evidence of collusion etc.).

AM 4.9 Where the Academic Officer decides that there is a case to answer for academic malpractice, they shall report the matter to the Head of Student Registry (or nominee) as soon as practicable. The Head of Student Registry (or nominee) shall inform the department of what evidence or other documentation they require.

AM 4.10 If the work has already been marked, that mark shall not be entered into LUSI until the end of the investigation (if it remains relevant to do so).

AM 4.11 If the work has not already been marked, the piece shall be set aside and not marked until the end of the investigation (if it remains relevant to do so).

AM 4.12 Upon receipt of a report, the Head of Student Registry (or nominee) shall formally notify the student in writing of the charge and inform them that the case will be referred to the Standing Academic Committee, at which hearing the student shall have the right to be heard, accompanied by a friend/representative if desired. The Academic Officer (or nominee) shall attend the Standing Academic Committee Hearing on behalf of the department.

AM 4.13 The Standing Academic Committee, having considered the evidence, shall have the authority to impose one of the following penalties:

(a) decide that no further action is required;
(b) require the student to resit the examination in which they have been found to have committed academic misconduct, and if deemed appropriate other examinations or units of assessment;
(c) award a mark of 0 or equivalent grade for the examination;
(d) award a mark of 0 or equivalent for the entire unit of assessment;
(e) direct that the student be awarded a classification lower than one derived from the mark profile (after any 0 mark or equivalent grade awarded under (c) or (d) has been included);
(f) direct that the student be awarded no more than a Pass degree;
(g) in addition to one of (b) to (f), temporarily exclude the student from the University;
(h) permanently exclude the student from the University without a degree;
(i) exceptionally not impose a specific penalty, but refer the case to the appropriate board of examiners with a full statement of findings together with suggestions for appropriate action (see AM 4.14).
AM 4.14 Any student found by the Standing Academic Committee to be guilty of an academic offence as defined under these regulations and whose case is referred to a board of examiners under AM 4.13, shall have the right to submit to the board a written plea in mitigation but they shall not have the right to appear or to be represented by another before the board. Boards of examiners have absolute discretion to take into account, in making their decisions, such evidence as they may consider relevant to a student’s academic performance and to decide whether to call for further oral or written evidence. They may also take into account, but shall not be bound by, the suggestions of the Standing Academic Committee. In considering the suggestions of the Standing Academic Committee, the decisions of boards of examiners shall be subject to ratification by the Committee of the Senate.

AM 5 ACADEMIC MALPRACTICE IN UNDERGRADUATE AND POSTGRADUATE COURSEWORK (TAUGHT PROGRAMMES AND TAUGHT COMPONENTS OF RESEARCH PROGRAMMES)

AM 5.1 Academic Marker stage

AM 5.1.1 All Academic Markers shall make a positive effort to identify poor scholarship practices or academic malpractice, in all assessment items. This is a responsibility of their academic employment and a vital part of delivering the high quality learning experience that students expect.

AM 5.1.2 Academic Markers shall, when concern is identified, use their judgement to decide if some form of poor academic practice or some form of academic malpractice has occurred.

AM 5.1.3 Where it is decided that student work displays some form of poor academic practice but not academic malpractice the academic marker will deal with this as part of the normal feedback and assessment procedures. The academic judgement of the Academic Marker may be that the poor academic practice should lead to a significant reduction in the mark awarded or that the affected work should be set aside and the remaining work marked as normal. The student must be informed of the nature of the problem and why it is unacceptable and a note of 'Poor academic practice' shall be recorded by the department in the LUSI Student Record. Further guidance on dealing with poor academic practice is given in the Plagiarism Framework.

AM 5.1.4 Where the student work displays some form of poor academic practice as above, but the student has not taken note of previous advice of similar problems, then the student must be informed of the repeated problems, be required to meet with their Director of Studies and an 'Academic Warning' shall be recorded by the department in the LUSI Student Record.

AM 5.1.5 Where the Academic Marker decides that the quantity of affected text is too great to be dealt with by setting the text aside or that there is suspicion of some form of academic malpractice, then the case shall be referred to the Academic Officer as the first step in an investigation.
5.2 Academic Officer stage

AM 5.2.1 When a case is referred to the Academic Officer, the Academic Officer shall conduct an investigation of the matter and use their academic judgement and experience to decide if the case is one that would normally be dealt with by the Academic Marker and not warranting further investigation or a Hearing. Where this is the case, the Academic Officer should instruct that the work be given an appropriate mark with the affected passages set aside as above, along with the relevant communications about the reasons for a reduced mark being communicated to the student. The Academic Officer should ensure that a record is made in the student’s record in LUSI that marks have been lost through poor academic practice.

AM 5.2.2 Where the case is one that warrants further investigation, the Academic Officer should undertake this investigation and arrange for a Hearing with the student. The Academic Marker shall attend the Hearing to present the case. At least one other staff member from the student’s department shall attend in order to take a record of the Hearing.

Prior to the Hearing

(a) The student should be encouraged to be accompanied by a friend/representative (e.g. a Lancaster University Students’ Union representative or College advisor).
(b) The student should be able to review any documentary evidence prior to the Hearing, including in the case of plagiarism any Turnitin reports or coursework annotated by the Academic Marker.
(c) The Academic Officer shall check in the LUSI Student Record System for any previous offences.

At the Hearing

(d) The student will be asked to respond to the allegations regarding their work and may also wish to consider if there are any exceptional circumstances which should be made known to the Academic Officer.
(e) The Academic Officer will ask the Academic Marker or course convener to present evidence.

AM 5.2.3 The Academic Officer shall decide one of the following actions after hearing the case:

(a) that no action of any kind will be taken. Where appropriate this may mean that the Academic Marker shall be instructed to mark the work normally;
(b) that the matter should be considered as a matter of poor academic practice and dealt with as described in AM 5.1.3 and AM 5.1.4;
(c) that the student will be required to submit an alternative piece of work and such work shall be eligible to receive only the minimum pass mark appropriate to the student’s programme of study. If the student refuses or fails to repeat and resubmit the work, a mark of zero or equivalent grade shall be recorded. This choice is never available where the offence is in connection with cheating in a class test or an already granted resubmission opportunity;
(d) that no form of resubmission should be allowed and a mark of zero or equivalent grade should be recorded for the work. Where this leads to a non-
condonable fail for the module, the case should instead be referred to the Standing Academic Committee;

(e) that the case should be referred to the Standing Academic Committee because of its serious nature, or there being repeated offences.

AM 5.2.4 The Academic Officer should inform the student of their decision as soon as possible and at the latest, in writing within seven days. Where appropriate the record of ‘poor academic practice’, or ‘academic malpractice’ shall be recorded by the department in the LUSI Student Record.

AM 5.2.5 Where multiple offences are discovered after the Senate deadline (or postgraduate taught equivalent) the case shall be referred to the Standing Academic Committee.

AM 5.2.6 If the student does not accept the decision of the Academic Officer, they shall have the right to petition the Standing Academic Committee to rehear the case. At the Standing Academic Committee Hearing they shall have the right to be heard, accompanied by a friend/representative if desired. The Academic Officer shall attend the Standing Academic Committee Hearing to present the department’s case.

5.3 Standing Academic Committee stage

AM 5.3.1 The Standing Academic Committee, having considered the evidence, shall have the authority to impose one of the following penalties:

(a) to permit the student to repeat the work, subject to receiving only the minimum pass mark appropriate to the piece of work;
(b) to award zero or equivalent grade for the work in question;
(c) to award zero or equivalent grade for the whole coursework or dissertation;
(d) to award zero or equivalent grade for the unit or course module;
(e) to award zero or equivalent grade as under (AM 5.2.3(d) and, where the inclusion makes no difference to the class of award, to recommend that one class lower than the one determined by the arithmetic be awarded;
(f) to exclude the student permanently from the University, where the offence is detected before the final assessment is completed;
(g) not to award the degree, where the offence is detected after the final assessment has been completed.

AM 5.3.2 Where a mark of zero has been awarded as per AM 5.3.1(d), the exam board shall ordinarily exceptionally condone this mark provided that this does not lead to the student having more than the permitted number of condoned credits under the relevant assessment regulations. Where such condonation would lead to the maximum number of condoned credits being exceeded, the mark shall remain uncondoned, and the board of examiners shall deal with the student accordingly.
AM 6  ACADEMIC MALPRACTICE IN THE RESEARCH DEGREE

AM 6.1  APPLICABILITY

AM 6.1.1  For the degrees of:

(a) DSc, DLitt, PhD (including by published work), DClinPsy, DMgt, EngD, MPhil, MD; and
(b) for the degrees of MA, MSc, LLM, MMus if relating to a programme validated for such awards on the basis of research and titled ‘By Research’;

the definition of malpractice is as set out in section AM 1 above and includes: cheating in examinations (if applicable); plagiarism in the thesis or dissertation (or equivalent) (including in published works if submitted for the award of a PhD by Publication or in alternative format); and fabrication of results.

AM 6.1.2  In addition, for the awards listed above, plagiarism shall be deemed to include unacknowledged or unattributed concepts, proposals, interpretations, methodologies or conclusions, which take place beyond the verbatim reproduction of texts or material without explicit identification or the source of the reference.

AM 6.1.3  Reference to ‘thesis’ or ‘dissertation’ in these regulations includes those formats/outputs, as defined in the Postgraduate Regulations, which are deemed to be equivalent to the traditional PhD format.

AM 6.1.4  Academic malpractice suspected to have occurred in work submitted for the assessment of taught components of research programmes will be considered under the procedures for taught programmes (see sections AM 4 and AM 5).

AM 6.2  THE PRESENTATION OF MATERIAL AND SUBMISSION OF THE THESIS/DISSERTATION

AM 6.2.1  Each department or equivalent shall prepare guidelines, relevant to the discipline involved, for publication to the student on first registration for the award, concerning the appropriate presentation of text and data in a thesis or dissertation.

AM 6.2.2  If a student is under investigation for suspected academic malpractice they shall not be permitted to submit the thesis or dissertation for examination. Permission to submit will be conditional upon the outcome of this investigation.

AM 6.3  ACADEMIC MALPRACTICE IN THE SUBMISSION FOR CONFIRMATION OF PHD/TRANSFER TO PHD

AM 6.3.1  In the event that members of the Confirmation of PhD/Transfer Panel find evidence of academic malpractice in the student’s submission to the Panel, the Panel shall not make any decision but shall instead submit a written report on their findings to the Deputy Head of Student Registry and copied to the PGR Director and supervisor(s). Such a report shall set out the evidence that academic malpractice has taken place and may include a recommendation for re-submission to the Panel.

AM 6.3.2  The report from the chair/lead of the Confirmation of PhD/Transfer to PhD Panel shall be referred to the Standing Academic Committee by the Deputy Head of Student
The Committee shall set up a Hearing to test the recommendation of the
Panel members and the evidence of academic malpractice presented by them at which
the student shall have the right to be heard accompanied by a friend/representative if
desired. The chair of the Confirmation of PhD/Transfer Panel shall attend the Standing
Academic Committee Hearing to present the department’s case.

AM 6.3.3  The Committee shall, having considered all the evidence, have the authority to impose
one of the following penalties:

(a) that the accusation of academic malpractice is unfounded, the student’s
Confirmation of PhD/Transfer to PhD is void, and the student shall be
considered as for the first time by a new panel, at a date to be determined;
(b) that the accusation is upheld, such that the student is deemed to have failed the
requirements for Confirmation of PhD/Transfer with one opportunity for
revision and a second submission to the same panel, at a date to be determined;
(c) that the accusation is upheld, such that the student is deemed to have failed the
requirements for Confirmation of PhD/Transfer and the student shall be
permanently excluded from the University.

AM 6.3.4  A second or subsequent breach in work submitted to a Confirmation of
PhD/Transfer to PhD Panel will result in a decision by the Panel to refer the matter to
the Standing Academic Committee with a recommendation to exclude.

AM 6.4  ACADEMIC MALPRACTICE IN THE THESIS OR DISSERTATION SUBMITTED FOR
EXAMINATION

AM 6.4.1  This regulation shall be issued to all examiners for the awards set out above.

AM 6.4.2  In the event that the examiners find evidence of academic malpractice during the
preliminary assessment of the thesis or dissertation submitted for the award, the viva
voce examination shall be postponed pending the outcome of an investigation. The
examiners shall submit a written report on their findings to the Deputy Head of the
Student Registry. Such a report shall set out the evidence that academic malpractice
has taken place and may include a recommendation for outright failure with no
opportunity for resubmission or re-examination.

AM 6.4.3  In the event that the examiners find evidence of academic malpractice during the viva
voce examination the examiners shall not make an award but shall instead submit a
written report on their findings to the Deputy Head of the Student Registry and copied
to the PGR Director and supervisor(s). Such a report shall set out the evidence that
academic malpractice has taken place and may include a recommendation for outright
failure with no opportunity for resubmission or re-examination.

AM 6.4.4  The report from the examiners under either AM 6.4.2 or 6.4.3 above shall be referred to
the Standing Academic Committee by the Deputy Head of Student Registry. The
Committee shall set up a Hearing, which the student shall be invited to attend and to be
accompanied by a friend/representative. The Committee shall test the
recommendation of the examiners and the evidence of academic malpractice presented
by them. A representative from the department (who may be the internal examiner)
shall attend the Hearing to present the examiners’ case.
AM 6.4.5 The Committee shall, having considered all the evidence, have the authority to impose one of the following penalties:

(a) that the accusation of academic malpractice is unfounded, the student’s examination is void, and the student shall be examined as for the first time by a new panel of examiners, at a date to be determined;
(b) that the accusation is upheld, such that the student is deemed to have failed with one opportunity for revision and resubmission at a date to be determined, for re-examination for the award originally sought, by the same examination team;
(c) that the accusation is upheld, such that the student is deemed to have failed outright and shall be permanently excluded from the University.

AM 7 RETROSPECTIVE DETECTION

AM 7.1 Retrospective detection is defined as the discovery of alleged academic malpractice in work that has been subject to final moderation, including by a relevant board of examiners.

AM 7.2 The University shall reserve the right to review work retrospectively and to apply the appropriate procedures and, where reasonable, the appropriate penalties.

AM 7.3 Approval by an examination board of a degree classification shall not prevent the reasonable application of retrospective review.

AM 7.4 Where there are reasonable grounds to review work, the relevant Academic Officer shall initiate the process and shall have the right to require the student to resubmit work that has been finally assessed, and to refer the matter to the Standing Academic Committee with a recommended sanction.

AM 7.5 The Standing Academic Committee shall, in addition, have the right to require retrospective review of any assessed work of students referred to it under the Academic Malpractice Regulations and procedures.

AM 7.6 Failure by the student to produce the required material shall normally be treated by the Standing Academic Committee as leading to the assumption that academic malpractice had taken place.

AM 7.7 The University has the power to revoke an award under the procedures defined in its Charter and Ordinances: Provisions to deprive persons of degrees, diplomas, certificates and other academic distinctions.

AM 8 APPEALS AGAINST PENALTIES FOR ACADEMIC MALPRACTICE

AM 8.1 A student who has been judged to have committed academic malpractice by Standing Academic Committee or other appropriate University body shall have the right to appeal against the judgement under the University’s Academic Appeals regulations. A student’s right to have their appeal heard by an Academic Appeal Panel is conditional upon them fulfilling the criteria for a prima facie case for appeal.
APPENDIX TO THE ACADEMIC MALPRACTICE REGULATIONS

STANDING ACADEMIC COMMITTEE: GENERAL PROCEDURES FOR THE
CONSIDERATION OF ACADEMIC MALPRACTICE CASES

1. The Standing Academic Committee of the Senate shall hear cases:
   (a) referred to it by an Academic Officer or the Deputy Head of Student Registry (or their nominee);
   (b) relating to offences where the student does not accept the decision of the Academic Officer;
   (c) relating to alleged multiple offences after the Senate deadline for the final submission of coursework (or postgraduate equivalent). The Committee’s decisions shall be informed by the seriousness of the offence rather than by the time of year.

2. The Standing Academic Committee shall consist of three members (including the Chairperson), approved by Senate. In no case may a serving member of the Standing Academic Committee be a member of any of the departments in which the student has studied, or is studying, or be a witness for the Academic Officer or for the student.

3. All Hearings shall be held in private and a written record shall be kept of the evidence submitted to the Committee, the Committee’s decision and the reasons for arriving at the decision.

4. A member of Student Registry who has undertaken an investigation into a suspected case of academic malpractice may not act as secretary to the Committee for the hearing of that case.

5. The Committee will be convened with all possible speed. Once the time, date and place of its meeting are known the referred student shall be informed in writing:
   (a) that they will be called to a Hearing;
   (b) of the nature, date and time of the alleged offence;
   (c) that they may present evidence in their defence orally at the Hearing and/or in writing;
   (d) that they may be accompanied by a friend or representative if desired who will normally be a member of the University;
   (e) that they may call witnesses to support their case (whose identity must be notified to the secretary of the Committee prior to the Hearing in order that their attendance can be assured).

6. Where necessary, the student and/or their friend/representative may attend the Committee’s Hearing via a video-conference link.

7. The Committee shall have the power to adjourn, continue or postpone an investigation at its discretion but shall at all times endeavour to complete its examination of the matter at the earliest opportunity. If the student does not appear on the date and time or at the place appointed, reasonable notice having been given, the Committee may proceed to investigate the matter in the student’s absence.
8. If the student wishes to admit the charge, they may do so in writing to the secretary of the Committee. In this event the student will be advised that they should still appear before the Committee for the formal presentation of evidence by the department representative and for examination of the evidence by the Committee.

9. If the student wishes to deny the charge, they shall so inform the secretary of the Committee once notice of the Hearing has been received. If no letter of admission is received, it will be assumed that the charge is denied. The department representative shall present the case in person to the Standing Academic Committee.

10. The Committee may hear evidence in any way it sees fit. This includes the testimony of witnesses, and the production of documents or other relevant material evidence. The department representative and the student (or the person accompanying the student) shall be entitled at the Hearing to make an opening statement, to give evidence, to call witnesses, to cross examine witnesses and to address the Committee.

11. The Committee will find the charge proven if all or all but one of its members agree, on the evidence before it, that the offence was committed. If the Committee does not find the charge proven, it shall inform the student and all parties concerned immediately, and the matter shall end there.