



University of
Chester

**Procedures Governing the Occurrence of
Academic Malpractice by Students in the
Course of Assessment**

SECTION

6

Quality and Standards Manual

**HANDBOOK F:
The Assessment of Students
at Levels Z, 4, 5, 6, 7 and Taught
Provision at Level 8**

2014 – 2015

Authored By: Academic Quality Support Services
Date of Approval: June 2014
Version: 1.0

CONTENTS

SECTION 6 - PROCEDURES GOVERNING THE OCCURRENCE OF ACADEMIC MALPRACTICE BY STUDENTS IN THE COURSE OF ASSESSMENT	2
1. DEFINITION OF ACADEMIC MALPRACTICE	2
2. ACADEMIC MALPRACTICE AND DISCIPLINARY PROCEDURES.....	4
3. INITIAL WITNESSING AND ACCUSATION	5
4. ACCEPTANCE OF THE CHARGE OF ACADEMIC MALPRACTICE.....	8
5. UNIVERSITY ACADEMIC MALPRACTICE PANEL: COMPOSITION	8
6. REQUESTING A DEFERRAL OF THE ACADEMIC MALPRACTICE PANEL.....	9
7. THE MEETING OF THE UNIVERSITY ACADEMIC MALPRACTICE PANEL.....	9
8. DECISION AND SUBSEQUENT RECOMMENDATION OF PENALTY.....	10
9. THE ROLE OF THE ASSESSMENT BOARD.....	11
10. APPEAL AGAINST THE DECISION OF THE ACADEMIC MALPRACTICE PANEL.....	12
OFFICE OF THE INDEPENDENT ADJUDICATOR.....	13
GUIDANCE ON PENALTIES	14

Appendices

6A	Academic Malpractice in an Examination
6B	Chair MAB initial allegation letter
6C	Proforma Request for an Academic Malpractice Panel
6D	Guidance on Penalties
6E	Suspected Academic Malpractice - Guidelines for the conduct of a viva voce examination
6F	Letter instructing student to attend a viva voce examination
6G	Letter informing student of the arrangements for a viva voce examination (academic malpractice)
6H	Declaration of Acceptance of a Charge of Academic Malpractice
6I	Letter relating to an allegation of fabricating mitigating circumstances
6J	Status and Role of the Friend at Academic Malpractice Hearings
6K	Academic Malpractice Hearing guidelines
6L	Chair MAB exculpation letter

SECTION 6 - PROCEDURES GOVERNING THE OCCURRENCE OF ACADEMIC MALPRACTICE BY STUDENTS IN THE COURSE OF ASSESSMENT

The purpose of assessment is to determine the extent to which a student has acquired an independent understanding of the material on which he or she is being assessed. To this end, the University of Chester requires its students to fulfil the stated objectives of assessment as these are set out in section F1 of the Principles and Regulations. These procedures also apply to students studying under a collaborative partnership agreement at another institution or overseas on taught programmes, and the taught modules of research degrees, delivered by University of Chester.

1. Definition of Academic Malpractice

- 1.1 Academic malpractice may be deemed to have occurred where a student has gained, or sought to gain, advantage in assessment contrary to the established conditions under which students' knowledge, abilities or skills are assessed for progression towards, or the conferment of, academic credit.
- 1.2 Academic malpractice can occur whether or not the student intends to deceive.
- 1.3 Students may be penalised in the normal course of assessment for work which, in the judgement of the examiners, relies too heavily on the verbatim reproduction of work derived from other published sources where those sources are acknowledged. However, such over-reliance on work reproduced directly from published sources but acknowledged by the student to be taken from those sources may also be regarded as academic malpractice as defined in section 1.1, if a student is judged to be implying that the phraseology is her or his own.
- 1.4 Specific practices which shall be deemed to constitute academic malpractice are:
 - a) plagiarism, that is, where a student incorporates another person's work (including another student's as well as published sources) by unacknowledged quotation, paraphrase, imitation or other device, in a way which suggests that it is the student's original work. Work in this context is to be taken as any intellectual output being assessed for academic credit, and may include text, images, data, oral presentation, sound or performance.

Examples of plagiarism are:

- the verbatim copying of another's work without acknowledgement;
- the close paraphrasing of another's work by simply changing a few words or altering the order of presentation, without acknowledgement;
- unacknowledged quotation of phrases from another's work;
- the deliberate presentation of another's idea as one's own;
- copying or close paraphrasing with occasional acknowledgement of source may also be deemed to be plagiarism if the absence of quotation marks implies that the phraseology is the student's own;

- copying of data.

plagiarism in creative work

In arts practice the presentation, re-presentation and representation of extant material may explicitly refer to its sources. Where such references are artistically *implicit* they should be *extrinsically* stated in document or orally. The absence of such acknowledgement may constitute academic malpractice.

In arts practice stylistic or structural resemblance to extant material must be *explicitly* or *extrinsically* acknowledged to ensure fitness for purpose of submission for any given assessment.

Where a student is unclear on either point the onus will fall on them to discuss the particular issue with an appropriate member of academic staff prior to assessment.

- b) copying, that is, reproducing verbatim another's work, for example, downloading and incorporating material from the internet or other electronic sources;
- c) collusion, that is, the conscious collaboration, **without authorisation**, between two or more students in the preparation and/or production of work which is ultimately submitted by each in an identical, or substantially similar, form, and is represented by each to be the product of her/his individual efforts. Collusion also occurs where there is unauthorised co-operation between a student and another person in the preparation and/or production of work which is presented as the student's own;
- d) submitting, or assisting in submitting, false evidence of knowledge and understanding, for example by submitting coursework from an outside source or which has been completed by another student;
- e) commissioning another person or persons to undertake an assessment which is then submitted in whole or part of a submission for academic credit;
- f) fabricating references or primary sources;
- g) falsifying data or record, that is, where data or record presented in laboratory reports, projects, dissertation, journalistic interview and so on, based on work purported to have been carried out by the student, has been invented, copied or otherwise obtained by the student;
- h) incorporating material which has been submitted, previously or simultaneously, in support of an application academic credit from this or any other awarding body, except for the purposes of drawing attention, for reference purposes only, to such work, or where resubmission of previously failed work has expressly been permitted.
- i) obtaining data unethically, or by methods which are not in receipt of formal, ethical approval;
- j) communicating with, or copying from, another person by any means during an examination;
- k) copying or gaining information from any unauthorised source, by any means, from either inside or outside of the examination room;

- l) introducing any written or printed material into the examination room unless expressly permitted by the rubric of the examination;
- m) introducing any electronically stored information into the examination room, unless expressly permitted by the rubric of the examination;
- n) gaining access, or attempting to gain access, to unauthorised material before or during an examination;
- o) being a party to impersonation in an examination;
- p) preventing or attempting to prevent another student's assessment taking place properly;
- q) fabricating evidence in support of a mitigating circumstances claim;
- r) fabricating evidence in support of an academic appeal;
- s) any other dishonest practice resulting in, or intended to result in, a student gaining an unfair advantage in assessment, or disadvantaging other students' assessments.

1.5 No case for academic malpractice shall be made on the basis of an anonymous accusation by one student against another.

1.6 In cases of plagiarism, where identical or very similar source material can be found in more than one location, an example source shall be regarded as evidence.

2 Academic Malpractice and Disciplinary Procedures

2.1 Where a student is alleged to have committed an offence which could be considered under the University's disciplinary procedures, if the alleged offence potentially disadvantages other student's assessment in a particular module or modules, then the student may be brought before an Academic Malpractice Panel instead of or in addition to the disciplinary hearing, in consultation with the Chair of the Module Assessment Board. For example, if a student is accused of damaging or stealing books, documents or other resources belonging to the University which potentially has the effect of disadvantaging the assessment of other students in a particular module or modules.

2.2 Where a student is accused of bringing the University of Chester into disrepute by engaging in academic malpractice in a published article or book or in other media, then a disciplinary panel may take the above definitions of academic malpractice into account at the hearing.

2.3 If an Academic Malpractice Panel considers that the student's actions or inactions have brought the University into disrepute, the Panel may refer the allegation of bringing the University into disrepute to the University Proctor for consideration under the Disciplinary Procedures (in addition to, or in place of, reflecting the matter in a more severe academic penalty than the intrinsic charge of Academic Malpractice would suggest).

2.4 In cases of suspected academic malpractice by a student on a professional programme, these procedures should normally be used. However, where the Chair of the MAB considers that the

Professional Suitability Procedure to be the more appropriate procedure, advice should be sought from Senior Assistant Registrar (Student Affairs) in the first instance.

3. Initial Witnessing and Accusation

3.1 If a lecturer or other academic officer suspects that a student is engaging in academic malpractice, she/he must inform the Chair of the Module Assessment Board as soon as she/he becomes aware of the suspected offence. In cases of plagiarism, where identical or very similar source material can be found in more than one location, an example source shall be regarded as evidence. The assignment shall be submitted for assessment and, where feasible, marked in the normal way as for all other coursework submissions. However, the student's mark will be withheld until the case has been judged.

3.2 Level 4 and Level Z – coursework

- i. First (alleged) offences of academic malpractice at Level 4 and level Z will normally be dealt with initially by the Module Assessment Board, without recourse to University Academic Malpractice Panel
- ii. If the Chair, or nominee, of the Module Assessment Board is of the opinion that it is likely that academic malpractice may have occurred, the Chair, or nominee, will write to the student (using the format in Appendix 6B notifying her/him of the allegation and require her/him to provide a written response to the allegation within 7 days. The letter shall be accompanied by a copy of the evidence and will state that the student should attend an interview with the Chair, or nominee, where the allegation and the student's written reply will be discussed. The student may be accompanied by a fellow student of the University of Chester or an officer of the Chester Students' Union (CSU). A copy of this section of the Handbook should be included with the letter along with a copy of the relevant evidence.
- iii. If the student accepts that academic malpractice has taken place the Chair, or nominee, will inform the student orally that the Module Assessment Board will impose a penalty. The Chair should also counsel the student on approaches to study, and sources of study skills support, which could assist the student in developing academic skills and avoiding any recurrence of the offence in future.
- iv. If the student does not respond to the Chair, and does not submit a defence, the Chair may make a decision as to whether academic malpractice has occurred without the student's presence, and if academic malpractice has occurred, impose a penalty
- v. If the Chair decides that academic malpractice has not occurred. A pro-forma letter which may be used in this case can be found at appendix 6L
- vi. The penalty shall normally be recommendation that the student fail the piece of work in question. A copy of the letter containing confirmation of the offence from the Chair to the student should be sent to AQSS, together with notification of the penalty applied.
- vii. If the student contests the allegation, or if having been dealt with as in the previous paragraph, a student is accused of a second or subsequent offence at Level 4 and the Chair, or nominee, is of the opinion that there is a *prima facie* case, then the allegation will be referred to a University Academic Malpractice Panel, as described elsewhere in

this Handbook. The Chair will write to AQSS, using the form in Appendix 6C and request the convening of the University Academic Malpractice Panel.

viii. In the event of one or more offences of plagiarism, all cases at Level 4 will be regarded as concurrent, until formal written feedback about plagiarism has been given to the student. Any further academic malpractice in work submitted for assessment after this point will be regarded as constituting a subsequent offence.

3.3 Level 5, 6, 7, 8 (taught) and relevant levels 4 and Z – coursework

- a) The decision to accuse a student of academic malpractice shall be made only by the relevant Chair of the Module Assessment Board. Academic malpractice procedures may not be implemented if a mark has already been confirmed by an Awards Assessment Board.
- b) Within five working days of receiving notification of an allegation of academic malpractice, the Chair of the relevant Module Assessment Board will review the evidence submitted. The Chair may consult with other academic officers as appropriate.
- c) The Chair of the MAB may decide to conduct a *viva voce* examination where there is a suspicion that academic malpractice has been committed, but where no evidence can be produced. The *viva voce* examination is part of the assessment of the piece of work in question, and as such, normally the student may not be accompanied (although the student does have the right to be accompanied at the academic malpractice hearing – see section 7.5 and appendix 6J- should the case be referred to a Panel). Guidelines for the conduct of a *viva voce* examination in the case of suspected academic malpractice are available at Appendix 6E.
- d) If s/he is of the opinion that there is a *prima facie* case (sufficient evidence to proceed to a University Academic Malpractice Panel), the Chair of the Module Assessment Board will write to the student, by pro forma letter (Appendix 6F) notifying her/him of the allegation and requiring her/him to provide a written response to the allegation within seven days of the date of the letter. The letter shall be accompanied by a copy of the evidence and will state that the student should attend an interview with the Chair, or nominee, where the allegation and the student's written reply will be discussed. A copy of the relevant sections of this handbook should be included with the letter. In a case of suspected academic malpractice, the initial letter of accusation to the student shall stand in place of the normal feedback.
- e) If the Chair of the Module Assessment Board judges, if necessary after the conduct of a *viva voce* examination, that there is insufficient evidence to proceed, the case will be dismissed with no blame attached. Where, for any reason, the student has been made aware of the initial accusation, but where the case is dismissed by the Chair of the Module Assessment Board, the Chair shall inform the student by letter that she/he has been exculpated. A pro-forma letter which may be used in this case can be found at appendix 6L.
- f) If the Chair judges, on the basis of the evidence available to him or her, that there is a *prima facie* case for proceeding to the stage of a University Academic Malpractice Panel, the Chair shall write to AQSS, using the form in Appendix 6C and request the convening of such a Panel.
- g) The student shall then be informed by AQSS of the appointed time at which the panel will be held and shall be informed of her/his right to appear before the Panel and/or submit a

further written statement beyond that already made to the Chair of the Module Assessment Board. Before the University Academic Malpractice Panel meets, the student against whom the allegation has been made will be supplied with a copy of the written evidence submitted by the member of academic staff submitting the accusation. However, if further evidence of malpractice in the piece of work comes to light during or before the hearing, the University reserves the right to take this additional evidence into account, however, the student must be provided with a copy of the additional evidence against them and be given an appropriate amount of time to prepare a defence should wish to do so.

- h) Both staff and students have the opportunity to present their case in writing and in person to an academic malpractice panel. Other than through these channels, neither students, staff nor other individuals may seek to influence the Chair or Members of an Academic Panel, or in any other way seek to sway the operation of the University's academic malpractice procedures, regarding an academic malpractice case which has been submitted to a Panel, or is expected or proposed to be submitted. Doing so may lead to the case being deferred until a new Panel with a different Chair and members can be convened.
- i) For Level 5 and above a "second offence" **will normally** be considered simultaneously with a "first offence" if work from more than one assessment is brought before a Panel. Penalties may reflect the number of offences in addition to the volume of **academic malpractice** in each assessment.
- j) Where a formal accusation of academic malpractice has been made, the University shall not normally permit suspension of studies until the matter is resolved.

3.4 Initial Witnessing and Accusation: Examination – levels Z, 4, 5, 6 7 and 8 (taught)

- a) If an invigilator suspects that a student is engaging in academic malpractice:
 - i) Provided that the student is not disturbing other candidates, the student shall be allowed to continue the examination. However, the invigilator shall immediately require another invigilator to act as a witness and any unauthorised materials shall be removed. The script (or other assessment form where appropriate) shall be endorsed by the invigilator at the point where the occurrence of cheating is suspected, and on the front cover of the examination answer book. In a practical examination, the invigilator will take note of the stage reached when the infringement was observed.
 - ii) A student who, in the opinion of an invigilator, is behaving in a manner which may disturb other examination candidates or may disrupt the smooth progress of the examination shall be required to leave the examination room forthwith. At the discretion of the chief invigilator, examination candidates may be allowed additional time to compensate for the time lost as a result of any disturbance/disruption.
- b) The invigilator should instruct the student to report to them at the end of the examination when other students have been dismissed from the examination hall. The invigilator and student should then meet with the Examinations Officer (or other senior member of the Registry) who will make a written record of the circumstances and retain or make notes regarding any relevant materials. A form for this purpose may be found as Appendix 6A. A copy of this record should be sent to both student and invigilator for them to sign and record any comments as soon as possible and no later than 2 working days following the incident.

- c) Immediately after the examination/assessment, a full report shall then be made by the invigilator(s) to the Chair of the relevant Module Assessment Board. Any unauthorised materials should be attached to the report. The candidate shall be advised, after the examination/assessment, of the procedures for dealing with suspected cases of academic malpractice. Where feasible, the examination script shall be marked in the normal way as for all other scripts. However, the student's mark will be withheld until the case has been judged.

4. Acceptance of the Charge of Academic Malpractice

- 4.1 If the student accepts the charge of academic malpractice, and does not wish to appear before the University Academic Malpractice Panel then they may write to the Panel, using the form provided (Appendix 6H) accepting the charge, and any penalty applied.

5. University Academic Malpractice Panel: Composition

- 5.1 The Panel shall consist of a Chair and two members. The Panel shall be drawn from a pool of the following:

a) *Chair*

Each Faculty shall nominate a Chair who is normally either a head or deputy head of Subject or a Chair of a Module Assessment Board.

b) *Members*

Each head of subject shall nominate a member of academic staff who has experience of academic malpractice matters, and knowledge of assessment procedures. At least one of the members of the panel must be from a Faculty other than that of the student. Normally, the panel shall not contain anyone who is involved in the teaching or assessment of the programme in which the student is accused. Nominated panel members shall declare any interest they have in the student which may prejudice their membership of the panel and will entitle them to decline membership accordingly. The University reserves the right to involve such other individuals in the hearing as it sees fit.

- 5.2 The Dean of Academic Quality and Enhancement (or nominee) will be present and shall act as a procedural advisor. The panel will be serviced by AQSS. Formal minutes will be taken and kept in AQSS.

- 5.3 **A written submission shall be presented to the panel by the department, on a form provided by AQSS (Appendix 6C). If the department considers that the affected portion of the work is particularly significant to the assessed work, and merits a more severe application of a penalty than the guidelines would suggest, they may make application to the University Academic Malpractice Panel, before the hearing, providing a written rationale on the Appendix 6C form.**

- 5.4 **The Chair of the University Academic Malpractice Panel will normally request via the minuting secretary of the panel that a member of staff with knowledge of the alleged offence attend the hearing to present the case on behalf of the Chair of the Module Assessment Board.**

5.5 Upon initial consideration of the case, the Chair of the University Academic Malpractice Panel may request that additional evidence be sought from the department.

5.6 Normally the case shall be considered at the next meeting of the University Academic Malpractice Panel. The student shall be informed of the date of the hearing as soon as reasonably practicable. The student will normally be given 7 calendar days' notice of the University Academic Malpractice hearing.

6. Requesting a deferral of the Academic Malpractice Panel

6.1 The student may request a rescheduling of a hearing on one occasion only, and for good reason. Such reason for hearing scheduled during term time being, but not exclusively:

- a) a clash with an examination or class test;
- b) a clash with a field trip or with Work Based Learning;
- c) a clash with another academic requirement (application for deferral for an academic reason shall be accompanied by a written confirmation from the programme or module leader confirming the requirement);
- d) illness of the student, or someone for whom the student has a caring responsibility (application for deferral due to illness must be accompanied by a medical certificate).

6.2 A request for deferral of a hearing due to a holiday taken during term time will not be permitted.

6.3 For hearings during vacation time, requests may be made for the reasons stated above, because of a pre-booked holiday, or because of work commitments.

6.4 In either term or vacation time, a student may request that the hearing goes ahead in their absence.

7. The Meeting of the University Academic Malpractice Panel

7.1 At its meeting, the Panel shall consider:

- a) all evidence adduced in the course of the bringing of the allegation against the student; this might include evidence such as reportage from a *viva voce* examination held on behalf of an MAB in order to determine whether there is a *prima facie* case for academic malpractice;
- b) any written statement by the student in question;
- c) any oral statement the student may elect to make in person to the Panel;
- d) oral or written evidence from any other relevant sources, including members of the Assessment Board to which the student is subject.

7.2 The student shall have the right to see and comment on any evidence the University Academic Malpractice Panel intends to take into account, and the Chair of the University Academic Malpractice Panel shall adjourn the hearing if necessary to give the student the opportunity to do this.

7.3 If further evidence of malpractice in the piece of work comes to light during or before the hearing, the University reserves the right to take this additional evidence into account, however, the student must be provided with a copy of the additional evidence against them and be given an appropriate amount of time to prepare a defence should wish to do so.

7.4 The student shall respond to the allegation personally and cannot delegate the response to a third party, nor shall a third party be permitted to attend the hearing on behalf of a student without their presence. No discussions will be entered into with a third party about the matter.

7.5 Where a student elects to make an oral statement to the Panel, she/he may be accompanied by a member of the University of Chester, who should be either a fellow student or an officer of Chester Students' Union. The student's parent or guardian shall only be permitted to attend the hearing if the student is under 18 years of age. At the discretion of the Chair of the Panel, the person accompanying the student may be invited to make a statement. The name and status of the person accompanying the student shall be communicated in advance to the Chair of the Panel. Further information about the status of the person accompanying the student can be found in appendix 6J.

7.6 If the student elects not to make an oral statement, the case will be heard in their absence

7.7 If a student has previously been found to have committed academic malpractice, this shall be disclosed to the Chair of the panel, before the hearing. Members of the panel will be informed before the penalty is applied if the student is found to have previously engaged in academic malpractice.

7.8 Where a student is studying at a partner institution abroad, is an overseas student who is no longer resident in the UK, or is a student based in the UK but is overseas as part of their programme, the academic malpractice panel may be conducted via videolink.

7.9 An academic malpractice panel hearing may not normally be conducted via videolink because the student is on holiday, or overseas for personal reasons.

8. Decision and Subsequent Recommendation of Penalty

8.1 After the hearing, the University Academic Malpractice Panel shall make a decision based on the evidence presented. The decision of the Academic Malpractice Panel is one of academic judgement. The panel shall send a written report to the appropriate Assessment Board, detailing the outcome of the hearing and making recommendations accordingly. Typically, these recommendations will be one of the following:

- a) the student has not engaged in academic malpractice, and that the assessment marks should therefore be released in the normal way or;
- b) the student has engaged in academic malpractice and that the student receives a formal warning as to future conduct and shall be given the following academic penalty:

That the student:

- i) should fail (with a mark of 0%) the entire component of assessment within the relevant module (e.g. all the examination component or all the course work component);
 - ii) should fail (with a mark of 0%) the entire module;
- c) the student has engaged in academic malpractice in multiple pieces of work or in such a way that the panel deem the case to be exceptionally serious:
- i) has marks for all modules at a particular level capped at 40%;
 - ii) in the case of a Foundation degree student, should be barred from receiving a Merit or Distinction;
 - iii) should have their degree classification lowered;
 - iv) should fail (with a mark of 0%) the entire level;
 - v) at Level 7, the student shall only be permitted **a maximum** award of Postgraduate Diploma, and may not take further modules which may lead to the award of a Masters' degree.
 - vi) at Level 7, the student shall only be permitted **a maximum award** of Postgraduate Certificate, and may not take further modules which may lead to the award of Postgraduate Diploma
 - vii) be required to withdraw from the University and may not enrol for any other award at the institution. Where this penalty is applied, the penalty of a reduction of marks shall also be specified.

8.2 The penalty shall include a recommendation, where appropriate, about whether reassessment is permissible. In this case any resultant module mark must be capped at 40% and in the case of Bachelor's degree students at Level 5 and 6, the capped module mark may not be discounted in the calculation of the final degree classification; in the case of Foundation degree students, the capped module mark may not be discounted in the calculation for determining whether a merit or distinction shall be awarded.

8.3 In all cases of academic malpractice at Level 7, the student shall be barred from being awarded a merit or a distinction.

8.4 All judgements and recommendations relating to penalties for academic malpractice shall be ratified by an Assessment Board. Those penalties which relate to individual modules shall be ratified by a Module Assessment Board; where the penalty directly relates to progression or to an award, the decision shall be ratified by an Awards Assessment (or Progression) Board. (Chair's Action may be taken as necessary to expedite the outcome.)

9. The Role of the Assessment Board

9.1 The Assessment Board shall ratify the penalty judgement.

9.2 Normally, the final module mark(s) awarded shall be treated in the same way, and have the same consequences with regard to the assessment of the candidate's overall performance, as a similar mark awarded to other candidates. However, the result of any module in which a student has been found to have committed academic malpractice may not be discounted for the purpose of calculating the degree classification.

9.3 When reassessment is allowed in modules which the student is deemed to have failed on account of academic malpractice, the requirements governing reassessment shall apply (please refer to Requirements for the Conduct of Assessment by Awards Assessment Boards).

9.4 The permanent record of the student should record both the findings of the University Academic Malpractice Panel and the penalty imposed.

10. Appeal against the decision of the Academic Malpractice Panel

10.1 The decision of the Academic Malpractice Panel is one of academic judgement. A student may not therefore appeal against the decision on the ground of disagreement with the decision of the Academic Malpractice Panel.

10.2 A student (known as an appellant in the academic appeals procedure) may make an academic appeal based on the following grounds:

- a) that the appellant had personal illness or exceptional personal circumstances which affected her/his ability to mount a defence of the allegation, only if s/he was unable, or for valid and compelling reasons unwilling, to either request a deferral of the academic malpractice panel or divulge such illness or circumstance(s) to the academic malpractice panel, prior to or during the hearing;
- b) that the Academic Malpractice Panel was not conducted in accordance with the relevant regulations;
- c) that there was administrative error on the part of the University which had a demonstrable and substantial negative impact on the operation of the academic malpractice procedures or of the Academic Malpractice Panel;
- d) that some other material irregularity on the part of the University occurred in the conduct of the academic malpractice procedures or conduct of the Academic Malpractice Panel assessment outcome.
- e) That the penalty imposed unreasonably exceeded the penalty which would normally be applied for such an offence.

10.3 Appeals against the decision of the Academic Malpractice Panel shall be considered under the academic appeals procedure (see Handbook F, Section 10, Academic Appeals)

10.4 A student should lodge any appeal within 14 calendar days of notification of the decision of the Academic Malpractice Panel.

10.5 Where an appeal against the decision of an Academic Malpractice Panel has been upheld, the decision of the Appeals Committee (or Assessment Review Board) shall

normally be that the student shall be afforded the chance to defend the allegation at a hearing of the Academic Malpractice Panel as if for the first time.

Office of the Independent Adjudicator

- 11.1 Where a student has exhausted internal procedure, and a Completion of Procedures letter has been issued, there exists a right to take the case to the Office of the Independent Adjudicator for Higher Education (OIA). If the student wishes to take his/her complaint to the OIA, s/he must send a Scheme Application Form within three months of the date of the Completion of Procedures letter. A Scheme Application Form can be obtained from the Institutional Compliance Officer, from Chester Students' Union or downloaded from the OIA website www.oiahe.org.uk.
- 11.2 Where a student does not have grounds for making an academic appeal against the decision of the academic malpractice hearing panel but is nonetheless dissatisfied with the outcome of the hearing, they may request a Completion of Procedures letter from the Dean of Academic Quality and Enhancement.

ARCHIVED COPY
DO NOT USE

GUIDANCE ON PENALTIES

PLAGIARISM OR COLLUSION IN WRITTEN COURSEWORK

The Panel may wish to recommend penalties according to the following tariff.

First offence

At Level Four only, for cases dealt with by the academic department

If less than 10% of full text is involved, recommend that student be given written warning of bad practice by Chair of relevant Module Assessment Board.

If 10%-100% of full text is involved, recommend that the student should fail with a mark of 0% the work in question.

Any undergraduate level dealt with by the University Academic Malpractice Panel

If up to 50% of full text is involved, consider the recommendation at section 8.1b)i).

If 50-100% of full text is involved, consider the recommendation at section 8.1b)ii).

For second or subsequent offences at any level and all offences at postgraduate Levels 7 and 8 taught

Apply at least the recommendation at 8.1b) ii) for any of the categories above and consider subsequent recommendations 8.1c)i) to 8.1c)vii) where at least 50% of full text is involved and/or work in more than one module is affected (including second and subsequent offences where previous cases have been considered by an earlier panel).

In the event of one or more offences of plagiarism, all cases at **Level 4** will be regarded as concurrent, until formal written feedback about plagiarism has been given to the student. Any work submitted for assessment after this point will be regarded as a subsequent offence

For **Level 5 and above** a 'second offence' will normally be considered simultaneously with a 'first offence' if work from more than one assessment is brought before a Panel. Penalties will normally reflect the number of offences in addition to the volume of plagiarism or collusion in each assessment.

Guidelines for recommending reassessment following academic malpractice:

The penalty shall include a recommendation, where appropriate, about whether reassessment is permissible.

Academic malpractice at first assessment attempt:

Reassessment shall normally be permitted, except where the penalty applied is that the student is required to leave the University, or, at level 7, where the penalty applied is that the award is limited to a Postgraduate Diploma or Postgraduate Certificate.

Academic malpractice at second assessment attempt:

A discretionary third attempt shall normally be permitted in the following circumstance:

- Where the student is at level 4, 5 or 6;
- Where the offence is one of plagiarism or collusion;
- Where the academic malpractice is in one piece of work only;
- Where it is the student's first offence;
- Where the amount of work affected is less than 50%;
- And where the student is not otherwise barred from a third attempt due to professional body requirements or due to non-submission of reassessment in (an) other module(s).

All the above criteria must apply. Where these criteria do not apply, consideration should be given to whether reassessment is permitted, and a reason for the permission or denial of a discretionary third attempt shall be minuted and conveyed to the student.

Academic malpractice at third assessment attempt:

The University does not permit fourth assessment attempts.

OTHER FORMS OF ACADEMIC MALPRACTICE:

The Panel shall make a recommendation about penalties taking into consideration the following:

- a)The level of study of the student;
- b)The seriousness of the offence;
- c)Whether it is a first or subsequent offence;
- d)Precedent;
- e)Any other pertinent issues raised by the case.