

2024-2025 Senate regulation 11: Regulations governing student conduct and discipline: Academic Misconduct (11.105-11.169)

Definition

In this section: What is 'Academic Misconduct'? A definition and some examples.

11.105

'Academic Misconduct' refers to any behaviour by a student that may give them or another student an unfair academic advantage. The University will investigate any actions or behaviour that it considers academic misconduct based on this broad definition. Examples of misconduct are detailed below, but this list is not exhaustive.

- Plagiarism, including:
 - Submitting written work that contains material authored by another person or persons or generated by a platform (for example using artificial intelligence), whether published or unpublished, without appropriate acknowledgement. This includes online and print sources, prose, code, graphs, and University-owned teaching and learning materials. As well as verbatim reproduction of material, unacknowledged paraphrase and 'patchworking' (the use and rearrangement of several sources without appropriate references) is also plagiarism. Failure to acknowledge sources, even if caused by unintentional error, may be defined as academic misconduct and considered under these regulations.
- Self-Plagiarism (Recycling), including:
 - Submitting for assessment work that a student has previously submitted for assessment, whether in whole or in part, unless this is expressly permitted. This regulation applies to work submitted as part of the same programme or a different programme, in a different year, or at another institution.
- Collusion, including:
 - Cooperation between students to jointly produce work where there is a requirement that it be produced independently. This includes sharing ideas in person and/or online.
 - A student allowing another individual or individuals to copy their work.
 - A student sharing their work (in whole or in part) with a third party - for example, by uploading their work to a website - which may allow another individual or individuals to gain an unfair academic advantage
- Cheating in relation to supervised examinations, including:
 - copying from the examination script of another candidate; attempting to obtain or obtaining improper assistance from another person; taking unauthorised material or a device into an examination.

- a student allowing an individual to impersonate them in an examination or sitting an examination for another student.
- Contract Cheating, including:
 - A student paying an individual, individuals or third party to undertake work on their behalf. This may include buying a piece of work (in whole or in part) from an 'essay mill' or tutoring service, or in any way using answers advertised or provided by a third party.
 - A student entering the preliminary stages of an arrangement with a third party such as an individual, an 'essay mill' or a tutoring service, even if the student does not complete the transaction.
- Falsification, including:
 - Falsifying results, data, or references, or falsely claiming to have carried out experiments, interviews, or other forms of research.
 - Failing to obtain ethical approval when required to do so or failing to comply with conditions of such approval.
 - Submitting a claim for mitigating circumstances under false pretences, i.e., with fabricated evidence. If the claim results in an unfair academic advantage, it may be considered under the regulations governing academic misconduct.

11.106

If students do not demonstrate academic integrity the University will investigate their actions under these Regulations and apply appropriate sanctions.

11.107

In some cases, the University will be required to report proven acts of academic misconduct to the relevant accrediting body.

Procedures for the Investigation and Consideration of Allegations of Academic Misconduct

In this section: What happens if a student's work appears to show signs of Academic Misconduct?

Reports of Alleged Academic Misconduct

11.108

All staff and students have a responsibility to report any suspected instances of academic misconduct. Allegations of suspected academic misconduct therefore may originate from an internal source (such as an internal examiner, invigilator, or student of the University) or an external source.

Misconduct Identified and Reported by an Internal Examiner

11.109

Following a review of a student's submission, an internal examiner can:

- a) Conclude **Minor Academic Misconduct** has occurred. Specific feedback should be provided to the student about the issues in their academic practice. Errors at this level do not merit referral to the Academic Conduct Officer or a sanction for academic misconduct. However, the mark for the assignment may be reduced to an extent comparable to other minor errors the student should address and improve in future work.
- b) Refer the matter to an Academic Conduct Officer for further consideration if **Moderate** or **Major Academic Misconduct** is suspected.

11.110

Where an internal examiner suspects **Moderate** or **Major Academic Misconduct** (plagiarism and/or collusion as per the descriptors below), they will compile the appropriate evidence. This may include a summary of the academic misconduct identified, copy of the Turnitin report(s), annotated exam script(s), copies of or links to the original sources.

Misconduct Identified and Reported by Other Sources

11.111

Reports of alleged academic misconduct by a member of staff (outside of the marking process), third party or another student, will be considered as far as is reasonable and practical. Such reports must be made in writing and upon receipt will be referred to the Academic Conduct Officer.

Academic Conduct Officer's Investigation and Consideration

11.112

Having reviewed the report and evidence, the Academic Conduct Officer may:

- a) Determine there is no case to answer or there is insufficient evidence to support an allegation. No further action will be taken. However, information will be kept on file in line with the relevant data retention policy;
- b) Consider the matter to constitute Minor Academic Misconduct and request that the internal examiner provide relevant feedback to the student;
- c) Request more information from the reporting party or internal examiner;
- d) Determine that the matter requires further consideration.

11.113

If the Academic Conduct Officer determines that there may be a case to answer they will write to the student, presenting the evidence and inviting them to respond in writing to the allegation.

11.114

A deadline will be set for the student's response, which will be no less than five working days from the date of notification of this request by the Academic Conduct Officer.

11.115

When an Academic Conduct Officer writes to a student to present them with the evidence, they may also require the student to attend a meeting in addition to providing a written submission.

11.116

Where such a meeting is required, the student will normally be given no less than five working days from the date of notification of this request by the Academic Conduct Officer.

11.117

The Academic Conduct Officer may request that the internal examiner who reported the alleged plagiarism/collusion attends the meeting with the student.

11.118

The student may be accompanied to the meeting by a supporting individual or representative, who must not be a qualified member of the legal profession.

11.119

A member of staff may also be present to take notes at the meeting and make a record of the meeting, which will be made available to the student on request.

11.120

If, having been given due notice, a student does not submit a response to the allegations and/or fails to attend the meeting, the Academic Conduct Officer may proceed to determine an outcome to the case without offering further opportunity to the student to make representations.

11.121

Having considered the response (if any) received from the student along with the evidence submitted, the Academic Conduct Officer will determine one of the following in respect of the allegation:

- a) There is no case to answer and dismiss the case;
- b) That plagiarism or collusion have not been proven, but that there is evidence of **Minor Academic Misconduct** as defined in the tables below and the student should be directed to academic support within the School and required to undertake the University's on-line plagiarism tutorial;
- c) That there is evidence of **Moderate Academic Misconduct** and impose a sanction as permitted under these regulations;
- d) That there is evidence of **Major Academic Misconduct** and refer the matter for consideration by a Student Discipline Panel.

11.122

The Academic Conduct Officer will notify the student of the outcome of the case, including reasons for their

decision, normally within 10 days of the deadline for the student's written response.

Academic Conduct Officer: Outcomes and Sanctions

In this section: If plagiarism or collusion has been identified in a student's work, what happens next?

Principles for applying sanctions

11.123

The evaluation of **Moderate Academic Misconduct** (as defined by the descriptors below in section 11.127) is the responsibility of the School Academic Conduct Officer, who is well-placed to determine the severity of the case in the context of the academic discipline and the nature and scale of the assessment.

11.124

In applying the sanctions set out below, the Academic Conduct Officer will comply with the following principles and decision-making factors:

Principles:

- That students should only be awarded for work which is their own;
- That the operation of the sanctions for plagiarism or collusion or other forms of academic misconduct must not put a student in a better position than if the assessment in question was not plagiarised or created through collusion but did not merit a pass;
- Decisions about whether academic misconduct has occurred will be made on the balance of probabilities: i.e., based on available evidence, it is more likely than not that something has happened.
- For **Minor** and **Moderate** offences, the sanctions will normally be applied at the level of the assessment. A Student Discipline Panel may consider sanctions applying to the level of the overall module mark or above.

Deciding factors:

- The **Primary Factor** in deciding which sanctions to apply is the scale and extent of the problematic material (created through plagiarism, collusion or other forms of academic misconduct);
- **Mitigating Factors** – Mitigating factors will not excuse academic misconduct nor result in the dismissal of a case of academic misconduct. If students are experiencing serious or significant events beyond their control that have affected their health or personal life, they should apply for mitigation or support through the appropriate procedure. It is expected that this application will be made at the time the circumstances occur.
Repeat Offences - A repeat offence is considered to have occurred when a student has received two previous **Moderate 2** or **Major Academic Misconduct** sanctions. Contemporaneous offences or offences in which a student has had no opportunity to act upon advice arising from an earlier offence – due to adjacent submission dates, etc. – are not treated as repeat offences but may attract a sanction under **Moderate Academic Misconduct** in the normal way. Offences are normally considered to be repeated only in assessments contributing towards the student's award.
- **Intent** – Asserting that misconduct was unintentional is not normally a factor in deciding whether academic misconduct has occurred. However, in cases of **Major Academic Misconduct** (see the table at 11.128), intentional deception to gain academic advantage may be taken into account.

11.125

Following the determination of outcome and sanction, the case may be referred to the Board of Examiners to confirm the impact on the students' progression and award.

11.126

Where evidence is found that a student's behaviour has led to academic misconduct occurring, but they have gained no academic advantage, the Academic Conduct Officer may consider further disciplinary action under Senate Regulation 11 Part A Non-academic misconduct.

11.127

The categories of plagiarism and collusion and their associated sanctions are outlined in the tables below. Other forms of academic misconduct will be considered on a case-by-case basis taking into account extent and severity and may also result in a sanction as set out below:

CATEGORY OF PLAGIARISM^	EXTENT / TYPE OF PROBLEM MATERIAL~	REFER CASE TO A.C.O.	MANAGED BY	STUDENT INFORMED VIA	MEASURE / <u>SANCTION</u>	SUPPORT / GUIDANCE VIA	STUDENT MAY APPEAL?	SCHOOL / DEPT. RECORD?
<u>MINOR</u>	MIN: Errors in referencing and use of sources (<i>amounting to circa 10% of the assessment</i>) that should be brought to the student's attention so that they can improve their academic skills.	No	Marker	Assessment feedback	<u>MINS</u>: Mark for assessment may be reduced as appropriate within the assessment marking criteria. Any reduction will be proportionate to that applied for comparable minor errors (e.g., with expression, punctuation, presentation.	Feedback as per the School's standard procedures, e.g., in free text and/or standardised comments on Turnitin; pre-formed QuickMark on Turnitin; rubric on Turnitin; School's training materials; Centre for Academic Achievement.	No	No

CATEGORY^	EXTENT / TYPE OF PROBLEM MATERIAL~	REFER CASE TO A.C.O.	MANAGED BY	STUDENT INFORMED VIA	MEASURE/ <u>SANCTION</u>	SUPPORT / GUIDANCE VIA	STUDENT MAY APPEAL?	SCHOOL / DEPT. RECORD?
<u>MODERATE</u> (1)	MOD1: Pronounced (<i>amounting to circa 25% of the assessment</i>) recurring instances of material included without appropriate acknowledgement (i.e., in quotation marks, references, and/or bibliography). This includes verbatim material (potentially with some words substituted); patchwork; unacknowledged paraphrase; copied code; other computer files or experimental results.	Yes	Academic Conduct Officer	Email from Academic Conduct Officer	<p>MOD1S: If proven, <i>mark for assessment reduced by 10%</i> of actual mark achieved by the student.</p> <p>If this sanction results in failing the module overall, students may resubmit the affected assessment for a capped mark if available via the proper application of the relevant progression or award regulations.</p>	Personal Tutor; Students' Union Advice Centre; Centre for Academic Achievement	Yes SU (Students Union) can support.	Yes

CATEGORY^	EXTENT / TYPE OF PROBLEM MATERIAL~	REFER CASE TO A.C.O.	MANAGED BY	STUDENT INFORMED VIA	MEASURE / <u>SANCTION</u>	SUPPORT / GUIDANCE VIA	STUDENT MAY APPEAL?	SCHOOL / DEPT. RECORD?
<u>MODERATE</u> (2)	MOD2: Significant (<i>amounting to circa 35% of the assessment</i>) recurring instances of material included without appropriate acknowledgement (i.e., in quotation marks, references, and/or bibliography). This includes verbatim material (potentially with some words substituted); patchwork; unacknowledged paraphrase; copied code; other computer files or experimental results.	Yes	Academic Conduct Officer.	Email from Academic Conduct Officer.	MOD2S: If proven, mark of 0 for <i>assessment</i> . If this sanction results in failing the module overall, students may resubmit the affected assessment for a capped mark if available via the proper application of the relevant progression or award regulations.	Personal Tutor; Students' Union Advice Centre; Centre for Academic Achievement	Yes SU (Students Union) can support.	Yes

CATEGORY^	EXTENT / TYPE OF PROBLEM MATERIAL~	REFER CASE TO A.C.O.	MANAGED BY	STUDENT INFORMED VIA	MEASURE / <u>SANCTION</u>	SUPPORT / GUIDANCE VIA	STUDENT MAY APPEAL?	SCHOOL / DEPT. RECORD?
<u>MAJOR</u>	MAJ: Extensive and significant (<i>amounting to circa 35% or more of the assessment</i>) material that includes, but is not limited to, a	Yes	Academic Conduct Officer.	Email from Academic Conduct Officer.*	MAJS: A disciplinary panel has the power to impose penalties	Personal Tutor; Students' Union Advice Centre; Centre for	Yes	Yes

considerable portion of an assessment taken from a third party with or without their permission and/or any portion of an assessment being purchased from an essay mill or similar third party. Major academic misconduct refers in particular to material included in an assessment in a manner that appears *on the balance of probability* intended to deceive markers to gain unfair academic advantage.

(Academic Conduct Officer. refers case to Student Conduct & Complaints.)

Email from Student Conduct & Complaints.

that include any of the sanctions listed above and in addition: 0 for the module (resubmit for a capped mark for the module where permitted); reduction of the final degree classification; expulsion from the University for all students involved.

Academic Achievement

SU (Students Union) can support.



CATEGORY^	EXTENT / TYPE OF PROBLEM MATERIAL	REFER CASE TO A.C.O.	MANAGED BY	STUDENT(S) INFORMED VIA	MEASURE / <u>SANCTION</u>	SUPPORT / GUIDANCE VIA	STUDENT MAY APPEAL?	SCHOOL / DEPT. RECORD?
<u>REPEAT</u> OCCURRENCES	REP: A sanction as per Major Academic Misconduct for repeated plagiarism or other forms of academic misconduct is applied when a student has received a Moderate 2 or Major Misconduct sanctions for two previous submissions. The student should have received feedback on the previous two instances and had a reasonable opportunity to act on that feedback, seek advice and guidance where required.	Academic Conduct Officer.	Academic Conduct Officer. refers case to Student Conduct & Complaints.)	Email from Academic Conduct Officer.* Email from Student Conduct & Complaints.	REPS: A disciplinary panel has the power to impose penalties that include any of the sanctions listed above and in addition: 0 for the module (resubmit for a capped mark for the module) in which the third instance of Moderate 2 academic misconduct occurred.	Personal Tutor; Students' Union Advice Centre; Centre for Academic Achievement	Yes SU (Students Union) can support.	Yes

CATEGORY OF COLLUSION^	EXTENT / TYPE OF PROBLEM MATERIAL~	REFER CASE TO A.C.O.	MANAGED BY	STUDENTS INFORMED VIA	MEASURE / <u>SANCTION</u>	SUPPORT / GUIDANCE VIA	STUDENT MAY APPEAL?	SCHOOL / DEPT. RECORD?
<u>MINOR</u>	MIN: Limited (<i>amounting to circa 10% of the assessment</i>) collusion between students evidenced by a few instances of similarities in structure, source or copied text; this includes cases where the written work is original throughout. This should be brought to the students' attention so that they can improve their academic skills.	No	Marker	Assessment feedback. All students involved are alerted to the issues in order that they avoid repeating errors in future.	<u>MINS</u>: Mark for assessment may be reduced. Any reduction will be proportionate to that applied for comparable minor errors (e.g., with expression, punctuation, presentation	Feedback in free text and/or standardised comments on Turnitin; pre-formed QuickMark on Turnitin; rubric on Turnitin; School's training materials; Centre for Academic Achievement.	No	No

CATEGORY	EXTENT / TYPE OF PROBLEM MATERIAL~	REFER CASE TO A.C.O.	MANAGED BY	STUDENTS INFORMED VIA	MEASURE/ SANCTION	SUPPORT / GUIDANCE VIA	STUDENT MAY APPEAL?	SCHOOL / DEPT. RECORD?
<u>MODERATE</u> (1)	MOD1: Pronounced (<i>amounting to circa 25% of the assessment</i>) collusion between students evidenced by similarities in structure, sources, short blocks of copied text (including copied text subjected to minor linguistic changes), matching original text, or quite similar bibliographies, copied code, other computer files or experimental results.	Yes	Academic Conduct Officer	Email from Academic Conduct Officer.	<p>MOD1S: If proven, mark for assessment reduced by 10% for all students involved (of mark achieved by the student).</p> <p>If this sanction results in failing the module overall, students may resubmit the affected assessment for a capped mark if available via the proper application of the relevant progression or award regulations.</p>	Personal Tutor; Students' Union Advice Centre; Centre for Academic Achievement	Yes SU (Students Union) can support.	Yes

CATEGORY	EXTENT / TYPE OF PROBLEM MATERIAL~	REFER CASE TO A.C.O.	MANAGED BY	STUDENTS INFORMED VIA	MEASURE / SANCTION	SUPPORT / GUIDANCE VIA	STUDENT MAY APPEAL?	SCHOOL / DEPT. RECORD?
----------	------------------------------------	----------------------	------------	-----------------------	-----------------------	------------------------	---------------------	------------------------

<u>MODERATE (2)</u>	MOD2: Significant (<i>amounting to circa 35% of the assessment</i>) collusion between students evidenced by similarities in substantial areas of the work, including in structure, sources, substantial or numerous blocks of copied text (including copied text subjected to minor linguistic changes), matching original text, or very similar bibliographies, copied code, other computer files or experiment results.	Yes	Academic Conduct Officer	Email from Academic Conduct Officer	MOD2S: If proven, mark of 0 for assessment for all students involved. If this sanction results in failing the module overall, students may resubmit the affected assessment for a capped mark if available via the proper application of the relevant progression or award regulations.	Personal Tutor; Students' Union Advice Centre; Centre for Academic Achievement	Yes SU (Students Union) can support.	Yes
----------------------------	--	-----	--------------------------	-------------------------------------	---	--	---	-----

CATEGORY	EXTENT / TYPE OF PROBLEM MATERIAL~	REFER CASE TO A.C.O.	MANAGED BY	STUDENTS INFORMED VIA	MEASURE / <u>SANCTION</u>	SUPPORT / GUIDANCE VIA	STUDENT MAY APPEAL?	SCHOOL / DEPT. RECORD?
<u>MAJOR</u>	MAJ: Extensive and significant (<i>amounting to circa 35% or more of the assessment</i>) collusion between students in a manner that appears <i>on the balance of probability</i> intended to deceive markers to gain	Yes	Academic Conduct Officer (Academic Conduct	Email from Academic Conduct Officer	MAJS: A disciplinary panel has the power to impose penalties that include any of the sanctions listed	Personal Tutor; Students' Union Advice Centre; Centre for Academic Achievement	Yes SU (Students	Yes

unfair academic advantage. This is evidenced by pronounced similarities in the work, including structure, sources, sizeable blocks of copied text (including copied text subjected to minor linguistic changes), sizeable blocks of matching original text, highly similar bibliographies, copied code, other computer files or experiment results.

Officer refers case to Student Conduct & Complaints.)

Email from Student Conduct & Complaints.

above and in addition: 0 for the module (resubmit for a capped mark for the module where permitted); reduction of the final degree classification; expulsion from the University for all students involved.

Union) can support.

CATEGORY	EXTENT / TYPE OF PROBLEM MATERIAL	REFER CASE TO A.C.O.	MANAGED BY	STUDENT(S) INFORMED VIA	MEASURE / SANCTION	SUPPORT / GUIDANCE VIA	STUDENT MAY APPEAL?	SCHOOL / DEPT. RECORD?
<u>REPEAT OCCURRENCES</u>	REP: A sanction as per Major Academic Misconduct for repeated collusion is applied when a student has received a Moderate 2 or Major Misconduct sanctions for two previous submissions. The student should have received feedback on the previous two instances and had a reasonable opportunity to act on that		Academic Conduct Officer (Academic Conduct Officer refers case to Student Conduct & Complaints.)	Email from Academic Conduct Officer Email from Student Conduct & Complaints.	REPS: A disciplinary panel has the power to impose penalties that include any of the sanctions listed above and in addition: 0 for the module (resubmit for a capped mark for the module where permitted)	Personal Tutor; Students' Union Advice Centre; Centre for Academic Achievement	Yes SU (Students Union) can support.	Yes

feedback, seek advice and
guidance where required.

in which the third
instance of
Moderate 2
academic
misconduct
occurred for all
students involved.

Cases of Exam Misconduct

In this section: How investigations and outcomes of possible academic misconduct in examinations are managed.

11.128

Cases of examination misconduct will be referred to the Academic Registrar or authorised deputy.

11.129

Having reviewed the report from the invigilator and evidence, the Academic Registrar or authorised deputy may:

- a) Determine there is no case to answer or there is insufficient evidence to support an allegation. No further action will be taken.
- b) Request more information from the reporting party or other relevant witnesses.
- c) Determine that the matter requires further consideration.

11.130

If the Academic Registrar or authorised deputy determines that there may be a case to answer, they will write to the student, presenting evidence and inviting them to respond in writing to the allegation.

11.131

If, having been given due notice, a student does not submit a response to the allegations, the Academic Registrar or authorised deputy may proceed to determine an outcome to the case without offering further opportunity to the student to make representations.

11.132

Having considered the response (if any) received from the student along with the evidence submitted, the Academic Registrar or authorised deputy will determine one of the following in respect of the allegation:

- a) There is no case to answer and dismiss the case;
- b) That there is evidence that exam misconduct has occurred and impose a sanction as permitted under these regulations.
- c) That there is evidence of major misconduct and refer the matter for consideration by a Student Discipline Panel

11.133

For first offences of cheating in an examination, the Academic Registrar or authorised deputy shall determine the extent to which the circumstances of the incident impact upon the severity of the

breach of regulation. The determination of severity shall be a matter of judgement by the Academic Registrar or authorised deputy, considering previous decisions.

11.134

The Academic Registrar or authorised deputy may impose a sanction of a mark of zero for the assessment. If this sanction results in failing the module overall, students may resubmit the affected assessment for a capped mark if available via the proper application of the relevant progression or award regulations.

11.135

Repeat offences of cheating in an examination or cases where the circumstances of the incident are deemed to be exceptional will be treated as Major Academic Misconduct and the student will be referred to a Student Discipline Panel.

11.136

The application of sanctions resulting from cheating in an examination is not intended to have a disproportionate effect on upon overall progression and award decisions for individual students.

11.137

In determining sanctions, the Academic Registrar or authorised deputy may consider mitigating factors relevant to the case submitted by the student. Where the Academic Registrar or authorised deputy concludes that mitigating factors should be taken into account, an appropriate sanction shall be applied according to precedent. In determining relevance, consideration will be given as to whether the circumstances were disclosed in a timely manner, as required under these Regulations.

11.138

The Academic Registrar or authorised deputy will notify the student of the outcome of the case, including reasons for their decision, normally within 10 days of the deadline for the student's written response.

Discipline Panel Stage

In this section: Who is involved in a Discipline Panel? What happens at a Panel? What are the possible outcomes?

Panel Composition

11.139

Student Discipline Panels are appointed from the membership of the Senate Student Discipline Committee (SSDC) and from a wider group of trained academic and professional services staff and representatives of the Students' Union approved by the SSDC to act in this capacity.

11.140

A Chair will be appointed for each panel from an approved group of Chairs who have been trained to undertake the role in relation to the type of misconduct under consideration.

11.141

Each Panel will consist of three members, one of whom will act as Chair, all of whom are impartial and will have undertaken appropriate training. A Students' Union Sabbatical Officer may be a member of the Panel depending on the nature of the case under consideration.

11.142

Additional Panel members may be appointed at the discretion of the Chair of the Senate Student Discipline Committee according to the nature of the case under consideration and, if necessary, where particular expertise is required.

11.143

A Secretary will be appointed to each Panel. The Secretary is not a member of the Panel but will be present throughout.

Panel Procedures

11.144

Students will be notified of their required attendance at a Student Discipline Panel in writing at least five working days before the scheduled date.

11.145

The student is required to attend the hearing and it is expected that this will usually be in person, except in cases where the Chair of the Panel has agreed that attendance may take place by alternative means.

11.146

If a student does not attend the Panel hearing and has not notified the Secretary in advance, the Chair will determine whether, based on the evidence available to it, the Panel can proceed and reach a decision in the student's absence, or whether the Panel should adjourn.

11.147

Students will be advised that they may be accompanied by a supporting individual or representative at the panel hearing. As Student Discipline Panel hearings are internal University proceedings, not legal proceedings, students will not normally be permitted to be accompanied by a qualified member of the legal profession.

11.148

Students will be advised of the conduct and procedures for the Panel meeting in advance. This will include the opportunity to nominate witnesses. It is the decision of the Chair as to whether nominated witnesses should be invited to attend.

11.149

The procedures for the conduct of a Student Discipline Panel will follow those outlined in the Student Academic Misconduct procedures.

11.150

On conclusion of the hearing, the Panel will determine in private session whether the allegations of misconduct against the student have been proven on the balance of probabilities and, if proven, determine the imposition of any sanctions.

11.151

A decision, with reasons, will be notified to the student, in writing normally within five working days of the date of the Panel hearing, along with their right to appeal the decision.

Sanctions

In this section: What sanctions for academic misconduct can be imposed by a Student Discipline Panel?

11.52

In reaching their decision on appropriate sanctions following a determination that the academic misconduct allegations against a student have been proven, the Academic Registrar or authorised deputy or Student Discipline Panels will consider the individual circumstances of each case. The following factors and any others considered relevant may be factored into determination of the sanction:

- Scale and extent of the academic misconduct;
- Previous offences;
- Relevant mitigating factors. The Panel should be satisfied that these are exceptional, that there is good reason why they were not brought to the University's attention at an earlier point and, if appropriate, are supported by evidence.

Potential Sanctions (Academic misconduct)

11.153

The Panel may impose any of the sanctions listed under Senate Regulation 11.127 instead of or in addition to the sanctions below.

Sanction	Authorised to impose
Reprimand	Head of School or nominee, Academic Registrar or nominee, Student Discipline Panel
Formal written warning	Head of School or nominee, Academic Registrar or nominee, Student Discipline Panel
Written apology to those affected by the misconduct	Head of School or nominee, Academic Registrar or nominee, Student Discipline Panel

Requirement to attend or complete training/personal development/ educational resources	Head of School or nominee, Academic Registrar or nominee, Student Discipline Panel
Requirement to pay for damages	Head of School or nominee, Academic Registrar or nominee, Student Discipline Panel
A fine (£50 - £1000)	Academic Registrar or nominee (up to £250), Student Discipline Panel
Suspension of specific academic and/or non- academic privileges	Academic Registrar or nominee, Student Discipline Panel
Enforcement of No-Contact Order(s) with other named student(s)	Academic Registrar or nominee, Student Discipline Panel
Exclusion from Degree Congregation	Student Discipline Panel
Exclusion from specific buildings/use of facilities for a fixed period	Student Discipline Panel
Suspension from the University for a fixed period	Student Discipline Panel
Permanent exclusion from the University (i.e., expulsion)	Student Discipline Panel or the Academic Registrar in the case of criminal conviction
Prohibited to re-apply to the University	Student Discipline Panel
Revocation of University award	Senate

Appeals against the outcome of Student Discipline Panels or a sanction imposed by an Academic Conduct Officer

In this section: What happens if a student disagrees with the decision made by a Discipline Panel or Academic Conduct Officer?

11.154

Students may submit an appeal in writing against the decision of the Academic Conduct Officer or Student Discipline Panel within ten working days of the date of notification of its decision. Such appeals should be submitted to the Academic Registrar or nominee.

11.155

Students may not appeal against the finding of Minor Misconduct as this does not constitute a sanction for academic misconduct.

11.156

Appeals may be submitted on one or more of the following grounds:

- That there was a procedural irregularity in the consideration of the case by the Academic Conduct Officer, or Student Discipline Panel;
- That evidence available to the Academic Conduct Officer, or Student Discipline Panel was not fully considered;
- That there was prejudice or bias in the conduct of the Academic Conduct Officer, or Student Discipline Panel;
- That the decision was unreasonable;
- That the sanction imposed was excessive;
- That there is new material evidence that for good reason was not available for consideration by the Academic Conduct Officer, or Student Discipline Panel.

11.157

Appeals will be reviewed by the Academic Registrar or nominee, hereafter known as the 'designated officer' approved by the Senate Student Discipline Committee, to determine whether there are eligible grounds for appeal and whether the appeal should be referred for further consideration by a panel.

11.158

Where eligible grounds for appeal are not determined, the designated officer will notify the student that their appeal is not eligible for consideration and will issue notification that this concludes the University's process.

11.159

In such cases, a Completion of Procedures letter will be issued, notifying students of their right to submit a complaint to the Office of the Independent Adjudicator for Higher Education (OIA) if their case is eligible under its scheme, within twelve months of the notification.

11.160

Where eligible grounds for appeal are determined, an Appeals Panel may be convened to hear the appeal. In certain circumstances where there is evidence that there was procedural irregularity in the consideration of the case or that the sanction was excessive, the designated officer will take action to remedy the procedural irregularity or to reduce the sanction imposed. Provided that there are no further procedural irregularities in this part of the process, there shall be no further right of appeal within the University.

Student Discipline Appeals Panel

In this section: What happens at an Appeals Panel hearing?

11.161

An Appeals Panel will be established comprising three members who are impartial, appointed from the Senate Student Discipline Committee (SSDC). The designated officer who made the decision to refer the case to panel will usually act as Chair to any subsequent Appeals Panel.

11.162

Appellants will be notified in writing at least five working days before the date the panel is to be held.

11.163

The appellant and Panel members will receive the same set of documentation relating to the case.

11.164

Appellants will be advised that they are required to attend, but if they do not attend the panel hearing and have not notified the Secretary in advance, the Chair will determine whether, based on the evidence available to it, the Panel can proceed and reach a decision in the student's absence.

11.165

Appellants will be advised that they may be accompanied by a supporting individual or representative at the panel hearing. As Student Discipline Panel hearings are internal University proceedings, not legal proceedings, students will not normally be permitted to be accompanied by a qualified member of the legal profession.

11.166

The Chair may make such adjustments to the procedures they consider reasonable to ensure a fair hearing.

11.167

On conclusion of the hearing, the Student Discipline Appeal Panel will determine in private session whether the appeal is upheld or dismissed in whole or in part and any outcome to be imposed. The decision, with reasons, will be notified to the student in writing normally within five working days of the date of the Panel hearing.

11.168

On conclusion of its consideration of a case a Student Discipline Appeal Panel may determine one of the following outcomes:

- confirm the outcome of the original decision of the Student Discipline Panel;
- revise the sanction imposed to a lower sanction;
- conclude that the original outcome was unsafe and should be overturned and any sanction removed.

11.169

The Student Discipline Appeal Panel outcome concludes the University's process, and a Completion of Procedures letter will be issued to students, notifying them of their right to submit a complaint to the Office of the Independent Adjudicator for Higher Education (OIA) if it is eligible under its scheme, within twelve months of the notification.