



UNIVERSITY OF ST ANDREWS
POLICY ON GOOD ACADEMIC PRACTICE

Policy Title	Good Academic Practice
Scope	Applies to all students: Undergraduate, Taught and Research Postgraduate
Relationship with other policies	Supersedes all previous versions of the Academic Misconduct policy
Owner	Proctor's Office
Approving Committee	Learning & Teaching Committee (LTC), then Academic Council
Policy approved date	4 June 2014
Policy effective from date	5 June 2014
Updates to policy December 2015	-New High Principle 14 -Addition of 'venue' when describing academic misconduct in examinations -Addition of 'supporting documentation' when describing evidence for a Board of Adjudication -Removal of reference to Turnitin, replacing with plagiarism detection software instead -Removal of description of group misconduct as more than 2 students -Clarification of misconduct in exam scripts

UNIVERSITY OF ST ANDREWS
POLICY ON GOOD ACADEMIC PRACTICE

The Policy on Good Academic Practice is divided into 4 parts:-

1. High Principles

2. What constitutes good academic practice?

3. Processes and penalties

- Undergraduate and Taught Postgraduates
- Postgraduate Research Students
- Appeals
- Record Keeping and anonymity
- Procedure if academic misconduct is suspected during an exam or class test

4. Dealing with academic misconduct flowchart

1. HIGH PRINCIPLES

1. The University of St Andrews expects, requires and promotes a culture of good academic practice.
2. All students are judged on their performance, and no student is allowed to gain an advantage unfairly over others.
3. The University recognises and embraces its duty to educate both staff and students in good academic practice.
4. The University protects the interests of those who engage in good academic practice.
5. The University recognises that not all poor practice is academic misconduct; the distinction between failure to observe good academic practice and academic misconduct is an academic judgement.
6. Academic misconduct is treated in a consistent manner across the University.
7. Students are treated as innocent until a case against them has been upheld.
8. The person raising an accusation of academic misconduct will not be responsible for determining whether the accusation is upheld.
9. In determining whether an accusation of academic misconduct is upheld, absence of intention to commit misconduct, extenuating circumstances or ignorance of the rules is not a valid defence.
10. The standard of proof that will normally apply in determining whether an accusation of academic misconduct is upheld is 'the balance of probability' of civil justice rather than 'beyond reasonable doubt' as in criminal justice.
11. Sanctions on those found guilty of academic misconduct will, as far as possible, reflect the severity of the offence that has been committed.
12. Any financial, academic, personal or other consequences resulting from a sanction applied are wholly the responsibility of the student.
13. A student against whom an accusation of academic misconduct has been upheld has the right of appeal in accordance with the [Policy on Student Academic Appeals](#).
14. Data relating to academic misconduct cases is treated confidentially. Information on outcomes is communicated only on a need-to-know basis.

These high principles will guide the University in all cases of academic misconduct. The regulations do not attempt to define every possible case; in cases that are not explicitly enumerated, the above principles will be used to determine appropriate actions.

2. WHAT CONSTITUTES GOOD ACADEMIC PRACTICE?

All work submitted by undergraduate and postgraduate students is expected to represent good academic practice. The University recognises that it has an obligation to students to make clear to them what constitutes academic misconduct, and it takes steps to ensure that all newly matriculated students are aware of both the nature of academic misconduct and the policies the University has in regard to it. In particular, all newly matriculated students are required to engage in a course on good academic practice at the start of their studies to familiarise themselves with such practice. The University undertakes to make refresher training available to students at regular intervals throughout their studies.

Misconduct: academic and non-academic

The University distinguishes between non-academic matters (for example, misconduct involving damage to the University's property or reputation) and academic matters (for example, allegations of plagiarism). This policy deals with the latter – the encouragement and assurance of good academic practice. However, in some cases, the boundary between academic and non-academic misconduct is unclear, for example, where a student fraudulently presents false information either verbally or in writing to the University in order to gain an academic allowance or advantage. This may include falsified medical documentation; an untrue explanation of circumstances affecting study; and false reasons for absence (for example, on a self-certificate). Such cases may be dealt with under this policy or the non-academic misconduct policy. This is at the discretion of the Dean of Arts & Divinity or Science as described in the Processes and Penalties section of this document. In cases where there is concern that the submission of falsified documentation may constitute a criminal offence, the matter may be referred to the Police for consideration in addition to any University proceedings.

Academic Misconduct

The examples of academic misconduct described here are not intended to be exhaustive. Students who are in any doubt about whether their conduct might constitute academic misconduct should either a) not engage in that activity or b) consult a member of the teaching staff such as their tutor, the module coordinator or the School's Academic Misconduct Officer (AMO) before engaging in the activity.

Plagiarism is the act of taking another's ideas and representing them as one's own. This may involve the use, without proper acknowledgement, of published or unpublished work, of work done partly or wholly by another person, of work obtained from an essay bank or a web site, or of recorded material from lectures and tutorials. Plagiarism includes not just the actual copying of text *verbatim* (which may also be a breach of copyright) or close paraphrasing of text, but also the unacknowledged presentation of ideas garnered from other sources as if they were original to the author or the assembling of pieces of the work of others into a new whole.

Multiple submission is the act of submitting for assessment a piece of work already (or simultaneously) submitted for assessment in the same module, another module or in another context. Multiple submission includes the submission of work that has substantial overlap with parts of work submitted elsewhere; this includes experimental results, substantive parts of essays or reports etc.

Falsification is the fabrication or alteration of data – for example, by changing data in order to confirm a hypothesis not supported by the actual data, or the invention or fabrication of the results of an experiment, which are then reported as genuine measurements. Included in falsification is the deliberate omission of data where, for example, experimental results or known facts are omitted in order to support an otherwise unsupportable hypothesis.

False citation is the citing of a source for information, when the source does not contain that information or when the information cited was not gleaned from that source.

Academic misconduct in examinations or class tests includes the following prohibited activities:

- Taking electronic devices, software or materials into an examination venue (other than those specifically permitted), irrespective of whether or not any use of the item(s) was made.
- Taking information (including notes in any format, books, electronically stored data or illegitimately annotated copies of dictionaries, set texts, annotations made on or concealed on parts of a student's body, etc.) into an examination venue (including toilets etc.), except where such items are left in an area designated by an invigilator, irrespective of whether or not any use was made of the item(s).
- Providing University staff with incorrect or misleading information related to the examination (prior to, at or after an examination).
- Unauthorised removal of an examination script, papers or blank examination stationery from the examination hall.
- Unauthorized exit from the examination hall during the period of an examination.
- Unauthorised acquisition of examination questions prior to an examination, whether or not the student is a candidate for that examination.
- Failure to follow the rules for an examination, in a way that might result in the gaining of an academic advantage.

Aiding and abetting is any form of assistance with another person's academic misconduct. This may involve, for example, collusion with another person (whether or not a student) during an examination; assisting any student in academic misconduct relating to an examination or class test; writing an essay for a student; providing one's own work that could be submitted for marking (either an entire piece of work or a part); having a third party take the place of a student, for example in an examination.

Coercion is where a student puts pressure on another student or member of staff to act in a particular way, or attempts to do so, with the intention of gaining an academic advantage.

Contract cheating is where a student commissions or seeks to commission another party (either paid or unpaid) to perform academic work on their behalf.

3. PROCESSES AND PENALTIES

Markers of work may raise the issue of poor academic practice with a student when this does not constitute academic misconduct. If a marker brings poor academic practice to the attention of a student, they should specify which aspects of the work are not good practice. Such informal discussions are not part of the process for dealing with allegations of academic misconduct and cannot form part of any such

allegation. Poor academic practice is, however, likely to lead to a lower mark for a piece of work, whether or not that poor practice is the subject of an allegation of academic misconduct.

Work that is submitted for informal feedback as part of the educational process rather than as a required component of a module or degree programme, such as feedback on drafts, will not be penalised under the University's policy on Good Academic Practice even if it constitutes seriously poor academic conduct. For example, a draft chapter required for progress review at PGR level, or a pass/fail report will be regarded as formal and may come under the Good Academic Practice policy, whereas an outline essay plan or rough chapter draft submitted for informal feedback will not. Where any doubt as to the status of such work is possible, tutors should make it clear at the start of the exercise.

Undergraduates and Taught Postgraduates

If anyone suspects academic misconduct in a piece of work, that person should inform the School's Academic Misconduct Officer (AMO)¹. For interdisciplinary modules the School that provides the module coordinator will also provide the AMO. The AMO will determine 1) if there is a case to answer 2) if the case can be dealt with by a written warning issued by the AMO or 3) if it should be referred to a School or University Board. The Guidance sections of this Policy will aid AMOs in deciding on the appropriate level of Board to which to refer the work. If the AMO herself/himself raises the allegation, the Director of Teaching or Head of School will fulfil the responsibilities of the AMO. The AMO or acting AMO must not have had prior involvement in any aspect of the process such as marking, invigilation, supervision etc.

In judging whether or not there is a reasonable case, the AMO may scrutinise all work in the module in association with which the allegation of misconduct has been raised, even if that work has already been marked and returned to the student. In accordance with the High Principles (no.7) marks for coursework can be released to a student under investigation.

If the AMO finds there is no case to answer, no further action is taken. If it is found that there is no case to answer, the allegation can form no part of any future investigation into academic misconduct.

If the AMO finds that there is a case to answer, she/he should contact the Dean of Arts & Divinity or Science as appropriate to check if a sanction for academic misconduct has previously been applied to the student. If a written warning has been previously applied, the AMO may decide to issue another written warning or refer the case to a School or University Board. If a sanction more severe than a written warning has been applied, the current case must be referred to a University Board. In the case of an allegation against a group, if any member of the group has received a sanction greater than a written warning, the case must be referred to a

¹ Schools may, with the knowledge of the relevant Dean, delegate this responsibility to Departmental level Academic Misconduct Officers.

University Board. If the case is referred to a Board, a brief note of previous sanctions applied, and the nature of the misconduct concerned, will be circulated to members of the Board along with other relevant paperwork. At this point the Dean will confirm whether the case should be pursued under the Good Academic Practice policy, or as a case of non-academic misconduct.

If there is a case to answer, and the AMO regards the nature of the misconduct to be such that a written warning is the appropriate sanction, the AMO may issue the written warning. This decision must be reported to the Dean of Arts & Divinity or Science as appropriate. The student's name will be held on the Academic Misconduct Register. The student must retake the online *Training in Good Academic Practice* course. Support on good academic practice is available from CAPOD.

If there is a case to answer, and the AMO does not consider that a written warning is the appropriate sanction, the AMO will refer the case either to a School or University Board. The AMO may use the Guidance for Staff section of this policy, and the range of sanctions available to the different Boards, to determine to which Board it is appropriate to refer the case.

The process from initial identification to a written warning or referral to a board must be completed within five working days unless there is a compelling reason why this is not possible.

A **School Board of Adjudication** will be appointed by the Head of School or Director of Teaching. It will consist of a convener and at least one further member of academic staff. The convener will arrange a hearing of the Board, and will be responsible for all the arrangements relating to the consideration and conduct of the investigation, up to and including presenting a report of the outcome. These duties will involve setting a place and time for the hearing; formally inviting the student to attend; informing the student of his/her right to be accompanied; presiding at the meeting of the Board; communicating with the School(s) and Dean; writing a final report of the result; and informing the student of the outcome and sanction, as well as giving details of the right to appeal.

If, during the course of the hearing, the School Board of Adjudication discovers evidence of additional misconduct over and above that drawn to the attention of the AMO, or the original misconduct is found to be more serious than first thought, the School Board of Adjudication can at this point recommend that a hearing proceed to a University Board of Adjudication. In this event, the convener should contact the Dean within **three** working days, and the Dean will convene a University Board.

If a student with a pending misconduct case has a separate incident of misconduct reported before the outcome of an ongoing case is known, the subsequent case will be put on hold until the outcome of the previous case is known. The outcome of the ongoing case will not be taken into consideration when dealing with the subsequent case. The timeframes for the subsequent case will commence on the day of the communication of the outcome of the previous case to the student.

A **University Board of Adjudication** consists of three or more members nominated by the Dean from experienced staff across the University. Each Board will include at least one male and at least one female staff member, and members drawn from two

or more Faculties. The School in which the academic misconduct was allegedly perpetrated will not be represented on the Board.

One member will be appointed by the Dean to serve as convener and will be responsible for arrangements relating to the consideration and conduct of the investigation, up to and including presenting a report of the outcome. These duties will involve: setting a date and time for the hearing; formally inviting the student to attend using the available template letter; presiding at the meeting of the Board; communicating with the School(s) and the Dean; writing a final report of the result; and informing the student of the outcome and sanction using the available template letter.

The Deans' Office will arrange the venue for the Hearing, provide template letters to the Convenor and provide contact details of the reporting AMO. The Convenor will contact the reporting AMO who will provide the Convenor with the following documentation which should be circulated to the other board members:

- a) names of the student(s) involved;
- b) information about previous proven misconduct held on the academic misconduct register;
- c) copies of plagiarism detection software report (if applicable) and the original piece of work by the student(s) involved (this should also be sent to the student(s));
- d) supporting documentation from the AMO.

The Deans' Office will also contact the AMO to confirm that the AMO will present the case on behalf of the School. If the AMO is unable to attend, they should arrange a deputy.

The following points apply to both School and University Boards:

Boards must meet to consider the case within **fifteen** working days of the convener being appointed, unless there is a compelling reason why this is not possible.

The student(s) concerned must be invited in writing and by email to attend the hearing with at least **five** working days' notice. Students have the right to defer the date of a board until after the examination period if the board is scheduled to occur in the week prior to, or during, the examination period. If a University closure, vacation or examination period begins within the five day period of notification, the convener of the Board will endeavour to convene the Board before the closure, vacation or examination period, unless the student requests that the Board be deferred. They must at that time be informed that the meeting concerns suspected academic misconduct, the type of misconduct suspected, and the piece(s) of work in which it is suspected. The student must also receive a copy of the plagiarism detection software report, and/or any other supporting documentation where relevant.

A student attending a Board of Adjudication has the right to be accompanied and represented by another member of the University. This representative must be a person who is either presently matriculated as a student; or is an employee of the University Court of the University of St Andrews; or who is elected as a sabbatical

officer of or an employee of the Students' Association of the University of St Andrews. The representative cannot have been previously involved in the case eg a) raising the allegation of academic misconduct, b) teaching in the module concerned, c) marking the piece of work. Individuals external to the University cannot attend. If a student fails to attend without good cause, the Board of Adjudication may choose to proceed in the student's absence. Students who are unable to or choose not to attend may send a written statement. They may also be represented *in absentia* by a representative as defined above. The use of remote communication technologies (such as Skype) are not permitted. No audio or electronic recording of a Board of Adjudication will be permitted.

The AMO will normally present the case to the Board. The Board of Adjudication may also ask others concerned to give evidence, and may seek advice from others within and out with the University. The student has the right to challenge any evidence presented and to present her/his own evidence.

The AMO, student(s) and any others who are not members of the Board of Adjudication will withdraw while it considers the evidence and seeks to establish whether or not misconduct has taken place.

If the Board finds there is insufficient evidence of academic misconduct, the case is dismissed and the appropriate Dean informed. The student should also be informed in writing.

If the Board of Adjudication upholds an allegation of misconduct, it must recommend a sanction to the Dean, and provide Minutes of the hearing and the Academic Misconduct Form, using the *pro formas* provided. The student must not be informed of the sanction, nor should the sanction be discussed with the student, until it has been approved by the Dean. The Dean will ordinarily accept the Board's sanction, but may propose an alternative sanction.

Once the Dean has approved a sanction, the student must receive written and emailed notification from the convener informing her/him of the outcome of the Board of Adjudication and its rationale, within **five** working days of the hearing. Thus once the Board of Adjudication has met it has five working days in which to consult the Dean (or her/his delegated authority) about any sanction to be imposed; for the sanction to be agreed; for any other recommendation to be agreed, and for a letter to be received by the student. When a letter informs a student that the case against her/him has been upheld, the same letter will give details of the appropriate appeals process.

The letter will also inform the student of the requirement to retake the Moodle course called *Training in Good Academic Practice*. Successful completion of this training will be noted on the Academic Misconduct Register. Students will also be offered support on good academic practice from CAPOD.

After any case has been upheld, the Dean will place the student's name or students' names on the Academic Misconduct Register.

Where the outcome of a Board of Adjudication affects a student's module grade, it is the School's responsibility to ensure that appropriate action is taken promptly, and

the result correctly reported to the Dean (who will report to Registry as appropriate).

Where academic misconduct is suspected after the award of the degree, the matter should be reported to the Dean of Arts & Divinity or Science. The AMO will consider the evidence and report to the Dean, who may dismiss allegations as trivial or vexatious. If the Dean considers that there is a case to answer then they will appoint a University Board of Adjudication. The University Board will reach a decision subject to approval by the Proctor who acts as an independent third party and ensures that the appropriate actions are taken.

Special procedures to be adopted when dealing with group academic misconduct

The University will endeavour to deal with any cases of alleged group academic misconduct in the same way as it would deal with any other incident of academic misconduct. However, there may be occasions when it is necessary to adopt a special procedure, for example, when large numbers of students are involved in a particular case. These special procedures will be employed at the discretion of the relevant Dean(s) and will involve any or all of the following: extension of the timescales at any stage of the process; group interviews, followed by the option of interviewing individual students (if either the Board or student requests it, and subject to the Dean's approval); submission of written statements by the students (instead of personal hearings); presentation of the evidence to the group collectively; time-limited hearings, with the opportunity for a follow-up interview (as above). In very exceptional circumstances, especially where long delays in the process might otherwise occur, the Dean may authorise the use of more than one University Board to hear the cases. In this event, minutes will be taken at each Board hearing and the Boards will meet to agree outcomes once all of the interviews have been held.

In cases where a subset of students is identified to be entirely responsible for the misconduct (for example by admission of responsibility) then the process continues only for, and penalties are applied only to, the responsible subset of the group.

In all academic misconduct cases involving more than two students, the convener will be guided by the relevant Dean(s) who will advise on the conduct of the hearing and ensure that proceedings are undertaken in a fair and orderly manner.

Sanctions for UG/PGT Students

Issuer	Available Sanctions <i>Marks referred to are on the Common Reporting Scale</i>
Academic Misconduct Officer	<u>Relating to piece of assessment</u> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Written warning issued through MMS
School Board of Adjudication	<u>Relating to piece of assessment</u> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Written warning issued through MMS or <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Piece of assessment capped at 7 or <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Zero for piece of assessment
University Board of Adjudication <i>University Boards are able to award a penalty to both a piece of assessment and the related module</i>	<u>Relating to piece of assessment</u> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Written warning issued through MMS or <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Piece of assessment capped at 7 or <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Zero for piece of assessment <u>Relating to module</u> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Module capped at 7 or <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Zero for module with <ol style="list-style-type: none"> a) the right to retake the module for credit only, or b) the right to take an additional module for credit only, or c) no right to take an additional module <u>Relating to a degree</u> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • In exceptional cases where penalties related to a module are not applicable, University Boards of Adjudication may apply the above sanctions to another module. <u>Relating to continuation of studies</u> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Discontinuation of studies

Postgraduate Research (PGR) Students

Research work that has been submitted for examination or for purposes of progression (progress review, upgrade) may be the subject of an allegation of academic misconduct. Work submitted by research students for other purposes (e.g. draft chapters) cannot be dealt with under the formal procedures described in this document. Students should note that work submitted in the usual course of supervision might not be subject to the same rigorous checks for academic misconduct as work submitted for formal purposes.

If a research student is suspected of academic misconduct in work relating to progression (upgrade or progress review), the person raising the allegation should alert the AMO, and the same procedure as for UG and PGT students followed.

If academic misconduct has been upheld in the case of a research student prior to final submission of the thesis, but the student has been permitted to submit a thesis, then the External Examiner(s) for the thesis should not be informed of the earlier instance/s of misconduct. External Examiners should approach the examination as impartial judges of the quality of the work that has been submitted.

Where academic misconduct is suspected by an Examining Committee in the process of examining a thesis, then the AMO will investigate and decide if there is a case to answer. If the AMO herself/himself raises the allegation, or is involved with the case, then the Director of Postgraduate Studies within the School will fulfil the responsibilities of the AMO. If the AMO judges that there is a case to answer, then the Dean must be consulted. At this point the Dean will, in consultation with the Proctor as necessary, either confirm that the case is to be pursued under the Good Academic Practice policy, or alternatively that it should be pursued as a case of non-academic misconduct. If the case is pursued under the Good Academic Practice policy **it must be considered by a University Board of Adjudication**. In cases where examiners' reports make reference to the alleged misconduct, these will be supplied to the Board.

If misconduct is suspected prior to the viva taking place then the viva is to be put on hold whilst the AMO investigates and decides if there is a case to answer. If academic misconduct is suspected during the viva, the result is to be withheld whilst the AMO investigates and decides if there is a case to answer.

Where academic misconduct is suspected after the award of the degree, the matter should be reported to the Dean, who will appoint an investigating officer. The investigating officer will report to the Dean, who will consider the evidence. If the Dean considers that there is a case to answer then the Dean will appoint a convener who will hold a University Board of Adjudication. The University Board will reach a decision.

After any case has been upheld, the convener will submit to the Dean within **three** working days a report of the case and a recommended sanction. The Dean will convey this information to Registry to take appropriate actions.

Sanctions for PGR Students

The allegation of academic misconduct may be dismissed, in which case no further action is taken and the Dean must be informed.

In the event that the case is upheld, the University Board of Adjudication must apply one of the following sanctions, subject to approval by the Dean:

Issuers	Sanction
1. Penalties available to AMO, School and University boards	Written warning
2. Penalties available to School and University boards	A written warning and resubmission of the work after amendment of the parts affected by the misconduct only (in the case of theses submitted for examination, within a maximum period of one year).
3. Penalties available to University boards	A written warning, re-registration for a lower degree, and resubmission of the work after amendment of the parts affected by the misconduct only (in the case of theses submitted for examination, within a maximum period of one year).
	Discontinuation of studies
	Withdrawal of degree

The Dean will place the student's name on the Academic Misconduct Register.

Any financial or other consequences resulting from the above sanctions are wholly the responsibility of the student.

Appeals

Students have a right of appeal against any decisions made by School or University Boards of Adjudication as outlined in the University's [Policy on Student Academic Appeals](#).

Record keeping and anonymity

The Proctor's Office will keep records of sanctions issued for academic misconduct. The main reasons for record keeping are to allow identification of repeat offenders and to allow the efficiency of the University's procedures to be monitored. Records help the University identify long-term trends, for instance as part of academic monitoring. A record of past decisions helps Board members and Deans to

determine appropriate sanctions and so to ensure that similar offences attract similar sanctions from one School to another. Names will remain on the Register for at least three years after graduation. This information will also be made available on request to those staff asked to provide references for students.

The information recorded will be:-

Date Notified; Matriculation Number; UG/PG; Nature of Academic Misconduct; First/Repeat Offence; Group Case; Type of Board; Date of Hearing; Penalty; Dean's approval; Date Penalty Applied

Only the Vice-Principal (Proctor) and Deans will have access to the full record. However, when a case is presented to a University Board, pertinent information will be made available to the AMO, board and student and circulated to the panel with the paperwork. This information is not used for part of the decision making process but may be used to increase the sanction applied to repeat offenders.

The Deans will produce an annual monitoring report for the Academic Monitoring Group. This report will provide information on how many cases have been dealt with during the year, the Schools involved, a summary of offences and a summary of outcomes. All monitoring will be anonymised and will not identify individual cases.

In cases of students on the Register who remain at or return to the institution to undertake a further programme of study, their records of misconduct will remain on the central Register throughout that further programme.

Procedural steps to be undertaken by the Invigilator in cases where the academic misconduct is SUSPECTED during an examination or class test

If an Invigilator has reason to suspect one or more students of academic misconduct they should call on a second Invigilator (if available) to observe the student(s) before intervening. Where the apparent misconduct is so blatant as to be potentially disruptive to other students (e.g. the open use of notes or other items), the Chief Invigilator should intervene immediately to remove the prohibited items. In cases where intervening would be potentially more disruptive, the Chief Invigilator should wait until the end of the examination before taking action. Regardless of when the first action is taken, at the end of the examination the Chief Invigilator, together with at least one observer, should:

- speak to the student(s) concerned informing him/her of their suspicions and that he/she will be reported to the AMO for suspected academic misconduct;
- remove and retain any prohibited items, if possible, issuing a receipt if necessary (e.g. if equipment is involved), and in the case of a refusal by the student(s) to hand over such items, formally record the refusal and any grounds given;
- in cases where it is believed that relevant materials are written upon or concealed upon parts of a student's body, undertake the following procedure:
 - immediately notify the University Examinations Officer;
 - take the student to a private place to meet with two members of the University academic staff of the same gender as the student,
 - the two members of academic staff should be as specific as possible about what they wish to see, and a refusal by the student should be recorded

- along with a statement of the grounds for refusal;
- note the names and matriculation number of any student involved, the module, time and location of the incident. A brief summary of the incident will be submitted to the University Examinations Officer through an Examination Irregularity Report.

Where time permits, the Chief Invigilator should seek advice on the action to be taken by contacting the University Examinations Officer.

Within 24 hours of the examination the Chief Invigilator must submit a full report, signed and dated, to the University Examinations Officer to be forwarded to the AMO and copied to the appropriate Dean(s).

The report should outline the circumstances of the incident and must:

- (a) where possible, identify all students involved and the degree of alleged involvement of each;
- (b) describe and, if possible, provide all the evidence on which the suspicion is based;
- (c) contain details of the use of any materials brought into the examination (whether inadvertently or deliberately); in contravention of the Good Academic Practice policy or Examination Rules for Candidates;
- (d) provide written statements from the other staff observers of the incident and the names of any students or others who may corroborate the suspicions.

If the suspected misconduct involves a student's exam script, the anonymised script(s) will be sent to the School in the standard way to be internally marked as normal, with no information about the possible academic misconduct - marking should proceed at this point without bias or prejudice. Once a mark has been given, the marker will then be asked to review the mark based on the report submitted by the Chief Invigilator. The marker will report to the AMO on the extent to which any unauthorised material was relevant to the examination and whether it appears to have been used by the student(s).

In cases where a suspicion of academic misconduct arises in the first instance from a marker, rather than an Invigilator, the marker should report in writing without delay to the AMO the following: the nature of the suspicion, the matriculation numbers of all students suspected of being involved, the evidence upon which the suspicion is based, and any corroborating evidence. Once anonymity has been broken after the examination process is complete, cases can be pursued or not, as appropriate. The AMO will receive all such reports and proceed according to the University's Good Academic Practice policy.

Academic misconduct relating to an examination will normally be considered by a School Board of Adjudication.

4. DEALING WITH MISCONDUCT FLOWCHART

