At Griffith University student academic integrity means acting with the values of honesty, trust, fairness, respect and responsibility in learning.  It is important for students to act in an honest way, be responsible for their actions, and show fairness in every part of their work.

The International Centre for Academic Integrity defines academic integrity as "a commitment to five fundamental values: honesty, trust, fairness, respect, and responsibility", and the courage to uphold them "even in the face of adversity" (ICAI, 2014).

The Student Academic Integrity Tutorial is an online tutorial to help you understand more about academic integrity and why it is important, the types of academic misconduct and the University’s policies.

It is important to acknowledge the author or creator of source materials.  Referencing is important to help the reader of your work understand the materials you have used to support your own ideas. More information about [referencing and referencing styles](https://www2.griffith.edu.au/library/study/referencing) is available on the Library website.

**TEXT-MATCHING SOFTWARE**

Griffith University uses text-matching software to educate students about the process of academic writing and how to avoid plagiarism.

* Your course may have a draft submission point so that you can submit and access an originality report to assist with revision prior to final submission.
* The originality report can be used to teach students how to properly acknowledge sources as well as to highlight possible plagiarism issues.
* The originality report and similarity index can also be used to assist academic staff in the detection of breaches of academic integrity.
* Some students think that if the percentage of text-matching in a report is below a certain percentage figure that it is ok – this is not the case as each report is interpreted individually by academic staff.

[TurnItIn](https://intranet.secure.griffith.edu.au/computing/using-learning-at-griffith/students/assessment/turnitin)provides electronic assessment submission, marking and return in conjunction with an online text-matching service.

[Assignment and SafeAssign](https://intranet.secure.griffith.edu.au/computing/using-learning-at-griffith/students/assessment/safeassign) – Blackboard Assignment provides a submission service that will accept most file types, and multiple files. Blackboard Assignment handles individual and group assessment and can be used alongside SafeAssign.
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Concordia University places the principle of academic integrity, that is, honesty, responsibility and fairness in all aspects of academic life, as one of its highest values.

Instructors, students and administrators are expected to be honest and responsible in their academic conduct and fair in their assessment of academic matters.
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We, the members of the student body of Luther College, believe that one of the basic functions of an institution dedicated to the Christian faith and engaged in higher education is the development of academic integrity and responsibility".

—Preamble to the Luther College Honor Code

All academic work is based on the understanding that everyone engaged in academic discourse, in research, and in teaching is truthful, diligent, and respectful of the work of others.

Without this, no academic community can flourish. Academic integrity is the **moral code** that builds trust between scholars.

Academic integrity not only applies to research and the generating of new knowledge, it applies to all aspects of teaching and learning. Class assignments and tests are tools to help students learn; grades show if and how students achieve learning goals. Therefore, all work for which students receive grades should result from the student’s own effort and understanding.

### Why does academic integrity matter?

### Fairness

Academic integrity is a matter of fairness. Every time a violation goes unreported, students who took the easy way out are rewarded for their behavior.

### Changed Expectations

Although not every test is graded on a curve and cheating might not directly affect your grade, a dishonest student indirectly influences the expectations of a teacher for future tests, which might make it more difficult for you and future students to be evaluated fairly.

### Value of Your Degree

Dishonest students might also devalue the grade and degree you earn because they do not have the same skills and knowledge that you have, but can claim the same credentials. Caring for academic integrity, therefore, is caring for the integrity and the value of the grades and the degree you rightfully earn.

### Moral Integrity

Cheating, as well as ignoring the dishonest student’s behavior, creates bad habits and fosters a culture of looking the other way. If cheaters always get away with it and even are rewarded for their fraudulent behavior, they will come to a point where they no longer think about what they are doing. This reaches far beyond your time in college and could be a problem for you if this person is your lawyer, your accountant, or the CEO of the company in which you are invested.

### What are violations of academic integrity?

Violations of academic integrity come in many shapes and forms. Sometimes, academic integrity is violated deliberately, in order to get an unfair advantage. But there are also cases of honest mistakes and misunderstandings. Most people think of plagiarism and cheating when they think of academic dishonesty. But academic integrity goes beyond this and includes all aspects of academic life. Consider the following examples of possible violations:

* Cheating during a test
* Helping others to cheat
* Not reporting someone who cheated
* Signing someone else’s name on an attendance sheet
* Using unauthorized materials for an assignment
* Receiving information about a test from someone who already took it earlier
* Copying something from the Internet without acknowledgement
* Summarizing someone else’s ideas without revealing the source
* Faking an illness or making false claims in order to take a test at a different time
* Intimidating someone to prevent them from reporting (which is also a violation of the Student Code of Conduct)

The Honor Code describes academic dishonesty as "any action or inaction of a student or a group of students which might create an unfair or undeserved academic advantage, which is intended to deceive students or faculty, or which a reasonable person would consider dishonest academic behavior.

# The Honor Code

All academic work is based on the understanding that everyone engaged in academic discourse, in research, and in teaching is truthful, diligent, and respectful of the work of others. Without this, no academic community can flourish. Academic integrity is the moral code that builds trust between scholars.

Because of this, students at Luther College first adopted an honor code in 1962 and have affirmed its importance for the academic life at Luther ever since. It is every student’s responsibility to observe the college’s Honor Code by not violating academic integrity, and to protect the Honor Code by reporting any possible cases of violation

# Preamble

We, the members of the student body of Luther College, believe that one of the basic functions of an institution dedicated to the Christian faith and engaged in higher education is the development of academic integrity and responsibility.

We therefore hereby resolve to uphold individually and collectively the honor of the college by doing all that is within our power to prevent any form of dishonesty in our academic work and our college life.

We manifest our conviction in this Honor Code for all students at Luther College. The Honor Code does not assure honest behavior; rather, it provides for the sharing of responsibility for enforcing honorable conduct between the instructor and the student; the student remains responsible for ensuring the integrity of his or her own behavior and for reporting to the instructor or other appropriate authorities any violation of the Honor Code of which he or she may be aware.

We also recognize that the honor of the individual person should be the concern of any Christian community and that the Honor Code is an attempt to put into practice those values or principles of conduct which are consistent with such a community. As we are part of this community by our own free will, we feel that it is our duty to hold ourselves to this high standard of integrity and responsibility.

* **Preamble**
* [1. Terms and Definitions](https://www.luther.edu/academic-integrity/honorcode/honorcode-1/)
* [2. Honor Council](https://www.luther.edu/academic-integrity/honorcode/honorcode-2/)
* [3. Responsibilities](https://www.luther.edu/academic-integrity/honorcode/honorcode-3/)
* [4. Procedures of the Review Board](https://www.luther.edu/academic-integrity/honorcode/honorcode-4/)
* [5. Procedures of the Educational Committee](https://www.luther.edu/academic-integrity/honorcode/honorcode-5/)
* [6. Sanctions](https://www.luther.edu/academic-integrity/honorcode/honorcode-6/)
* [7. Appeals Process](https://www.luther.edu/academic-integrity/honorcode/honorcode-7/)
* [8. Review, Amendments and Revisions](https://www.luther.edu/academic-integrity/honorcode/honorcode-8/)
* [Appendix I—Plagiarism](https://www.luther.edu/academic-integrity/honorcode/honorcode-app1endix/)

# Terms and Definitions

1.1 The Luther College Honor Code **applies** to all students, all classes, and all academic work at Luther, as well as to all academic work for which students request academic credit from Luther.

1.2 A **Violation of the Honor Code** can be any action or inaction of a student or a group of students which might create an unfair or undeserved academic advantage, which is intended to deceive students or faculty, or which a reasonable person would consider dishonest academic behavior.

     1.2.1 Also considered violations of the Honor Code are all actions that interfere with the work of the Honor Council, including, but not limited to the destruction of evidence, the intimidation of witnesses or complainants, or retaliatory actions against witnesses or complainants.

     1.2.2 Faculty can report suspected violations of academic integrity to the Honor Council Review Board or they may elect to handle the suspected violation according to Faculty Handbook policy.  Should a faculty member choose not to utilize the Honor Council Review Board, he/she shall file a summary of the violation and the outcome to both the Academic Dean’s Office and the Student Life Dean’s Office.  If the faculty member elects to handle a suspected violation according to the Faculty Handbook policy, the student retains the right to an appeal using the Campus Appeals Board (see section 7.0 for information on appeals).

1.3 **Forms of Honor Code violation** are, but are not limited to:

     1.3.1 **Cheating.** Intentionally using or attempting to use unauthorized materials, information, or study aids in any academic exercise. The term includes, but is not limited to:

          1.3.1.1 Use of any unauthorized assistance in taking quizzes, tests, or examinations.

          1.3.1.2 Use of sources beyond those authorized by the instructor in writing papers, preparing reports, solving problems, or carrying out other assignments.

           1.3.1.3 The acquisition, without permission, of tests or other academic material belonging to a member of the Luther College faculty or staff.

          1.3.1.4 Engaging in any behavior specifically prohibited by a faculty member in the course syllabus or class discussion.

     1.3.2 **Fabrication**. Intentional and unauthorized falsification or invention of any information or citation in an academic exercise.

     1.3.3 **Facilitating academic dishonesty**. Knowingly helping or attempting to help another to violate any provision of this Honor Code.

     1.3.4 **Plagiarism**. Using or representing the words or ideas of another as one's own in any academic exercise. The term includes, but is not limited to, the use, by paraphrase or direct quotation, of the published or unpublished work of another person without full and clear acknowledgment. It also includes the unacknowledged use of materials prepared by another person or agency engaged in the selling of term papers or other academic materials.

* [Changed March 2015. See the [Changes](https://www.luther.edu/academic-integrity/changes/) page for details]

1.4 The term “**Complainant**” means any person who submits a charge alleging that a student violated this Honor Code. When a student believes that he/she has been a victim of another student’s misconduct, the student who believes he/she has been a victim will have the same rights under this Honor Code as are provided to the Complainant, even if another member of the Luther College community submitted the charge itself.

1.5 The term “**Respondent**” means any student accused of violating this Honor Code.

1.6 The following groups and officers are responsible for the promotion and enforcement of this Honor Code:

     1.6.1 The **Honor Council** (HC) is the student body that promotes the Honor Code at Luther College.

     1.6.2 The **Honor Code Review Board** (HCRB) is the committee of the Honor Council that conducts a Honor Code Review in cases of alleged violations of the Honor Code and decides about sanctions.

     1.6.3 The **Honor Code Educational Committee** (HCEC) is the committee of the Honor Council that works with faculty and students in the education of academic integrity at Luther College.

      1.6.4 The **Honor Council Chair** (HCC) is the elected chair of the HC, HCRB and HCEC.

      1.6.5 The **Honor Council Vice Chair** is the elected to assist the HCC.

* [Adjusted March 2015. See the [Changes](https://www.luther.edu/academic-integrity/changes/) page for details]

1.7 The **Faculty Advisor to the Honor Council** is the appointed non-voting faculty representative for the HC and HCRB.

1.8 The **Campus Appeals Board** hears any appeals for decisions of the HCRB. 1.9 All definitions in the **Code of Conduct** apply to the Honor Code as they relate to it.

# 2. Honor Council

2.1 The **Honor Council** is elected by the students of Luther College.

     2.1.1 The Honor Council shall be made up of twelve students, normally five members from the Senior Class, four members from the Junior Class, three members from the Sophomore Class.

     2.1.2 The First-year Class, the Sophomore Class, and the Junior Class shall each elect members to the Council (as needed) at their respective class elections held during the spring semester, to take office the following fall.

     2.1.3 Members, once elected, shall continue in office until their graduation, until they leave college, choose to resign their position or are otherwise removed.

     2.1.4 The Honor Council is functional as long as there can be a quorum for the HCRB. Once there is no quorum for the HCRB, the HCC requests from Student Senate to appoint members from the student body to the Honor Council until the vacant positions can be filled by a regular election.

     2.1.5 The Faculty Advisor is a non-voting member of the Honor Council.

2.2 The **Officers of the Honor Council** are the Honor Council Chair and the Honor Council Secretary.

     2.2.1 The Honor Council Chair is elected by and from the Honor Council for one year with no term limit.

* [Changed March 2015. See [Changes](https://www.luther.edu/academic-integrity/changes/) page for details.]

     2.2.2 The Honor Council Vice Chair is elected by and from the Honor Council for one year with no term limit.

* [Changed March 2015. See [Changes](https://www.luther.edu/academic-integrity/changes/) page for details.]

     2.2.3 Both positions will be filled by elections by and from the Honor Council at the beginning of each year and immediately as they become vacant.

* [Adjusted March 2015. See [Changes](https://www.luther.edu/academic-integrity/changes/) page for details.]

2.3 The **Honor Code Review Board** is the standing committee of the Honor Council charged to conduct Honor Code Reviews in cases of alleged violations of the Honor Code.

     2.3.1 The HCRB shall normally be made up of three members from the Senior Class, two members from the Junior Class, one member from the Sophomore Class.

     2.3.2 The HCC always is a member of the HCRB.

     2.3.3 The other members of the HCRB are elected by and from the Honor Council for one academic year with no term limits.

     2.3.4 Any vacant position will be filled through election by and from the Honor Council for the remainder of the term.

     2.3.5 The quorum for any Honor Code Review is five. If a regular member of the HCRB is unable to attend a meeting, another member of the Honor Council can be appointed by the HCC as temporary replacement.

     2.3.6 The faculty advisor is a non-voting member of the HCRB and must be present at all Honor Code Reviews.

2.4 The **Honor Code Education Committee** is the standing committee of the Honor Council charged with educating the student body on the Honor Code.

     2.4.1 The HCEC shall be made up of the remaining HC members not on the Review Board  comprising of two members from the Senior class, two members from the Junior class and two members from the Sophomore class.

     2.4.2 The HCC is always a member of the HCEC and chair of the committee.

     2.4.3 The faculty advisor will also assist the HCEC.

2.5 Any member of the Honor Council who is found incompetent or otherwise objectionable may be removed from the membership of the Honor Council by a majority vote of the Council. Action may be instituted against such a member by a majority vote of the Honor Council or by petition signed by twenty members of the Student Body. All voting shall be by ballot

# Responsibilities

The responsibilities of the **Honor Council** are:

     3.1.1 To promote the Honor Code across campus.

     3.1.2 To create and conduct educational programming designed to promote academic integrity.

     3.1.3 To advise and consult with faculty members and administrative officers on matters pertaining to academic integrity.

     3.1.4 To elect from its members students to serve on the HCRB.

     3.1.5 To issue an annual report to the Student Senate, the Campus Life Committee, and the Dean of the College on academic integrity standards, policies, and procedures, including recommendations for appropriate changes.

     3.1.6 To review the Honor Code for the Student Senate.

     3.1.7 To create necessary bylaws for the Honor Council.

     3.1.8 To assist in the design and teaching of the workshop on academic integrity and moral development (as described in Section 5).

3.2 The responsibilities of the **Honor Council Chair** are:

     3.2.1 To organize and lead meetings of the Honor Council, the HCRB and the HCEC.

     3.2.2 To appoint two recorders for each Honor Code Review.

     3.2.3 To communicate with all parties during a HCRB investigation.

     3.2.4 To oversee work of the HCEC.

     3.2.5 To report to Student Senate about the work of the Honor Council, possible vacancies, and the review process on a regular basis.

3.3 The responsibilities of the **Honor Code Review Board** are:

     3.3.1 To investigate alleged Honor Code violations.

     3.3.2 To issue sanctions for Honor Code violations.

     3.3.3 To provide written statements for the Campus Appeals Board during the appeals process.

3.4 The responsibilities of the **Honor Council Vice Chair** are:

     3.4.1 To keep the minutes of the Honor Council meetings.

     3.4.2 To maintain the website of the Honor Council.

     3.4.3 To supervise and assist the HCEC where and when needed.

* [Changed March 2015. See [Changes](https://www.luther.edu/academic-integrity/changes/) page for details.]

     3.4.4 To lead Review Board meetings when the HCC is not available.

* [Added March 2015. See [Changes](https://www.luther.edu/academic-integrity/changes/) page for details.]

3.5 The responsibilities of the **Honor Code Education Committee** are:

     3.5.1 To educate students about academic integrity and the Luther College Honor Code.

     3.5.2 To assist the HCC in reviews of the Honor Code.

     3.5.3 To become a temporary replacement if a regular member of the HCRB is unable to attend a meeting.

3.6 The **Honor Council Recorders** keep the records of each meeting of the HCRB and create a protocol of the investigations and deliberations.

3.7 The **Faculty Advisor** takes part in the deliberations of the HCRB but has no vote. The opinion of the Faculty Advisor is recorded.

3.8 The responsibilities of the **Campus Appeals Board** are:

     3.8.1 To inform the Honor Council Chair about an appeal.

     3.8.2 To consider the written statement of the Honor Council.

     3.8.3 To inform the Honor Council Chair about the result of the appeals process

# 4. Procedures of the Review Board

1 All aspects of the Honor Code Reviews are confidential and cannot be shared with anyone outside the HCRB unless the investigation or the Honor Code require it.

* [Changed March 2015. See [Changes](https://www.luther.edu/academic-integrity/changes/) page for details.]

4.2 Any member of the Luther College community may file charges against a student for violations of the Honor Code.

     4.2.1 A charge shall be prepared in writing whenever possible and directed to the Honor Council Chair or any other member of the Honor Council.

     4.2.2 Any charge should be submitted as soon as possible after the event takes place, preferably within ten class days.

     4.2.3 If a Complainant cannot or will not submit a written charge, the Honor Council Chair or any other member of the Honor Council will prepare a written summary of the charge presented to him/her by the Complainant.

     4.2.4 A Complainant can choose to stay anonymous to the Respondent.

     4.2.5 Once a charge has been filed with the Honor Council, it cannot be retracted and a full Honor Code Review has to be conducted.

     4.2.6 The Complainant and Respondent of a pending case should not directly or via third parties discuss the charges. Intimidation of the Complainant or of Witnesses by the Respondent or third parties must be reported to the Honor Council immediately.

     4.2.7 Any retaliatory actions against a Complainant or Witnesses by the Respondent or third parties should be reported to the Honor Council.

4.3 Once the Honor Council has been informed of a complaint, a Honor Code Review will be prepared by the Honor Council Chair.

     4.3.1 If necessary, the HCC requests clarifications from the Complainant prior to the Honor Code Review.

     4.3.2 The HCC will select the date, time and place for the Honor Board Review, and notify the Respondent (student alleged to have violated the Honor Code) by personal delivery, certified mail, or by encrypted electronic mail (with receipt confirmed), a minimum of three (3) class days prior to the Honor Board Review.

* [Changed March 2015. See [Changes](https://www.luther.edu/academic-integrity/changes/) page for details.]

     4.3.3 The HCC summons any student witness to the meeting who can help with the investigation. Witnesses have to appear before the HCRB or have to submit a written statement. Not complying with a summoning can be sanctioned as a violation of the Honor Code.

     4.3.4 The Respondent can choose not to appear in person but to submit a written statement.

     4.3.5 If a Respondent, who has received notice as set forth in the Honor Code, does not attend the Honor Code Review and does not submit a written statement, the information in support of the charges shall be presented and considered even if the Respondent is not present.

     4.3.6 If a Complainant decides not to participate in a Honor Code Review, the HCC may or may not elect to present the information in support of the charges.

4.4 For every meeting, the HCC first appoints the two recorders. The records of the HCRB shall be filed in the Student Life Office at the end of every academic year.

4.5 A quorum of five HCRB members (including the Honor Council Chair) is needed.

4.6 The sequence of an Honor Board Review is necessarily controlled by the nature of the incident to be investigated and the character of the information to be examined. It thus lies within the judgment of the HCC to fashion the most reasonable approach.

     4.6.1 All procedural questions are subject to the final decision of the Chairperson of the HCRB.

     4.6.2 Formal rules of process, procedure, and/or technical rules of evidence, such as are applied in criminal or civil court, are not used in Honor Code proceedings.

4.7 The Complainant, the Respondent and the HCRB may arrange for witnesses to present pertinent information to the HCRB.

     4.7.1 Luther College will try to arrange the attendance of possible witnesses who are members of the Luther College community, if reasonably possible, and who are identified by the Complainant and/or Respondent at least two class days prior to the Honor Code Review.

     4.7.2 Witnesses will provide information to and answer questions from the HCRB. Questions may be suggested by the Respondent and/or Complainant to be answered by each other or by other witnesses.

     4.7.3 The HCRB will consider the advisability of such suggested questions and will determine, in its sole discretion, whether such questions will be posed. If so, the Chairperson of the HCRB will direct the question to the witness. Questions of whether potential information will be received shall be resolved at the discretion of the HCRB.

4.8 The Complainant and the Respondent have the right to be assisted by one advisor they choose, at their own expense.

     4.8.1 The advisor serves in a support or advisory role; he/she may not be or function as an attorney.

     4.8.2 The Complainant and/or the Respondent will be responsible for presenting his or her own information, and therefore, the advisor is not permitted to speak or to participate directly in the Honor Code Review. The advisor cannot directly address the HCRB or any participant/witness of the hearing.

     4.8.3 A student should select as an advisor a person whose schedule allows attendance at the scheduled date and time for the Honor Code Review because delays will not normally be allowed due to the scheduling conflicts of an advisor.

4.9 The Complainant, Respondent and their advisors, if any, shall be allowed to attend the entire portion of the hearing at which information is received (excluding deliberations). Admission of any other person to the hearing shall be at the discretion of the HCRB.

4.10 If a member of the HCRB or the Faculty Advisor are directly involved with a case brought to a Honor Code Review, either as Complainants or witnesses, it is recommended that they do not take part and do not vote in the deliberations. However, they do not have to recuse themselves as long as any of the remaining members do not object.

4.11 In the investigative part of the Honor Code Review, the following steps are usually taken:

     4.11.1 The HCC informs the members of the HCRB about the case and the known facts.

     4.11.2 If present, the Respondent is confronted with the complaint. No information concerning the case shall be held back.

     4.11.3 If present, the Respondent shall be requested to make a statement if he or she so desires, or the written statement of the Respondent will be read.

      4.11.4 The Respondent can present his/her witnesses. After these witnesses provide their statements, they will be questioned by the HCRB.

      4.11.5. The Respondent can request to question the Complainant or any witness. This can be done in person or in writing. The Respondent does not have the right to confront the Complainant or any witness directly or to know their identity.

      4.11.6 During the hearing, Respondent, Complainant, and Witnesses can be questioned by all members of the HCRB (including the non-voting Faculty Advisor) at any time before the deliberation.

      4.11.7 The Honor Council Chair closes the investigation if there is a consensus that no further questioning is needed or might be helpful.

4.12 After the investigative portion of the Honor Code Review concludes in which all pertinent information has been received, the HCRB shall determine by majority vote whether the Respondent has violated the Honor Code.

     4.12.1 The HCRB’s determination shall be made on the basis of whether it is more likely than not that the Respondent violated the Honor Code.

      4.12.2 All “hearsay” and “opinion” evidence shall be excluded from the final decision determined by the HCRB.

      4.12.2.1 Testimony from student witnesses will only be considered as evidence if the witnesses agree to allow the accused student to question them, either in person during a meeting or in writing.

     4.12.2.2 If student witnesses do not agree to that condition, their testimony may be used by the Honor Council as a basis for initiating an investigation, but may not be used as evidence of guilt.

     4.12.3 Pertinent records, exhibits, and written statements may be accepted and considered as information for consideration by the HCRB at the discretion of the HCRB.

     4.12.4 If guilt has been established, members can recommend appropriate sanctions, which will be accepted by majority vote.

4.13 If a verdict has been reached, the Honor Council Chair will inform the Complainant, the Respondent, the Dean of Student Life, and the Dean of the College through personal delivery, certified mail, or by encrypted electronic mail, within seven (7) days after the HCRB Hearing

# 5. Procedures of the Educational Committee

5.1 The Honor Council Educational Committee is to help educate students about academic integrity, the Honor Code and the proper way to report Honor Code violations.

5.2 The HCEC shall design and coordinate educational opportunities throughout the academic year.  Strategies may include but are not limited to working with academic advising sessions, Paideia I faculty, open forums, Orientation sessions and Residence Hall floor meetings. Additional suggestions would be posters, SPO letters, announcements, and news articles in Chips addressing the Honor Code procedures, etc.

5.3 One year prior to the three year review of the Honor Code the HCEC will conduct an internal review of the HC.

     5.3.1 The HCEC shall elect three from among its committee to serve on the internal review.  It will consist of one member from the Senior class, one member from the Junior class and one member from the Sophomore class. These three students shall lead the review and present the findings to the HC, the Student Senate and the Campus Life Committee by the end of the academic year.

5.4  Every three years the HCEC will work to inform and educate the Student Body prior to reaffirming or rejecting the Honor Code in a referendum held during regular student government elections. (see section 8.2)

# 6. Sanctions

6.1 If a respondent has been found guilty of an Honor Code violation, the HCRB can impose one or more of the following sanctions:

     6.1.1 Warning.

     6.1.2 Recommendation that student be allowed to do the work again.

     6.1.3 Recommendation for no credit for the work in question.

     6.1.4 Recommendation to lower the grade in the course.

     6.1.5 Recommendation of suspension or dismissal.

* [Changed March 2015. See [Changes](https://www.luther.edu/academic-integrity/changes/) page for details.]

     6.1.6 Barring student from participation in any campus-wide elections for a time.

     6.1.7 Removing student from any campus-wide elected office for a time.

     6.1.8 Requiring student to write a reflection on Academic Honesty, which will be reviewed by the Dean of the College or any other person the Dean determines.

     6.1.8.1 The essay should be of appropriate length and is due ten days after the deadline for an appeal has expired or ten days after an appeal has been denied, whichever comes later.

     6.1.8.2 After the essay has been accepted, the student shall meet with the Dean or any other person the Dean determines in order to discuss the essay.

     6.1.8.3 If the essay is not submitted within the required time frame, the HCRB can recommend further sanctions.

     6.1.9 Requiring student to take part in a workshop on Academic Honesty, conducted by the Honor Council. If the student misses two opportunities to successfully complete the workshop, the HCRB can recommend further sanctions.

6.2 Sanctions can be imposed even if the Respondent at the time of the decision is no longer a student at Luther

# 7. Appeals Process

7.1. A decision reached by the Honor Code Review may be appealed by the Respondent(s) or Complainant(s) to the Campus Appeals Board within 7 days of notification of the decision.

7.2. Except as required to explain the basis of new information, an appeal shall be limited to a review of the record of the Honor Code Review, or a written summary thereof, prepared by the HCRB, and supporting documents for one or more of the following purposes:

     7.2.1 To determine whether the Honor Code Review was conducted fairly in light of the charges and information presented, and in conformity with prescribed procedures giving the Complainant a reasonable opportunity to prepare and to present information that the Honor Code was violated, and giving the Respondent a reasonable opportunity to prepare and to present a response to those allegations. Deviations from designated procedures will not be a basis for sustaining an appeal unless significant prejudice results.

      7.2.2 To determine whether the decision reached regarding the Respondent was based on substantial information; that is, whether there were facts in the case that, if believed by the fact finder, were sufficient to establish that a violation of the Honor Code occurred.

     7.2.3 To determine whether the sanction(s) imposed were appropriate for the violation of the Honor Code which the student was found to have committed.

     7.2.4 To consider new information or other relevant facts not brought out in the original hearing, sufficient to alter a decision, because such information and/or facts were not known to the person appealing at the time of the original Honor Code Review.

7.3. If an appeal is upheld by the Campus Appeals Board, the matter shall be returned to the HCRB for re-opening of the case to allow reconsideration of the original determination and/or sanction(s). If an appeal is not upheld, the matter shall be considered final and binding upon all involved.

7.4. If a student found guilty of violating the Honor Code finds new evidence bearing on his or her case, the Honor Council is obliged to hold a new hearing and may be directed to do so by the Campus Appeals Board.

7.5 A case shall not be reviewed by the HCRB more than two times, unless a majority of the HCRB votes in favor of another review.

### Annotation:

The Student Code of Conduct states in article IV, section D:

"4. The Campus Appeals Board is comprised of three members including one faculty member, typically the Chair of the Faculty Interest Committee; one student, typically the President of the Luther College Student Senate; and the Vice President and Dean for Student Life. Depending upon the circumstances of the case, an alternative designee may review the case if it is determined a conflict of interest may arise based upon the specified representation."

To file an appeal with the Campus Appeals Board, send an email or a letter to the Vice President and Dean for Student Life, **Corey Landstrom** (clandstrom@luther.edu).

# 8. Review, Amendments and Revisions

8.1 All revisions and amendments to this constitution shall be presented in writing to the Luther College Student Senate and its president.

     8.1.1 Proposed amendments shall be posted and published in Chips for two weeks prior to the first reading before the members of the Campus Life Committee session and/or on the website of the Honor Council and the Student Senate.

     8.1.2 Two-thirds of the votes cast at two consecutive meetings of this group shall be required to amend or revise this constitution.

8.2 Every third year the student body shall have an opportunity to reaffirm or reject the Honor Code in a referendum held during regular student government elections.

     8.2.1 A simple majority of the votes cast will decide the referendum. A majority vote reaffirming the Honor Code will continue the Honor Code in operation until the next scheduled referendum.

     8.2.1.1 Should the Honor Code be rejected by the majority of students voting, a second referendum shall be held during student government elections one year later.

      8.2.1.2 If the majority of students voting again reject the Honor Code, the Honor Code shall be abolished, and responsibility for maintaining academic integrity shall immediately revert to the faculty.

     8.2.1.3 If, on the other hand, the majority of students voting reaffirm the Honor Code at the second referendum, the Honor Code shall continue in force until the next regular referendum three years thereafter.

     8.2.2 The referendum shall take the following form:

The Constitution under which the Honor Code functions at Luther College specifies that the Honor Code shall be referred to the student body every third year for reaffirmation or rejection. A vote to reject the Honor Code must be confirmed in a second referendum one year later before becoming effective.

In accordance with the Constitution, therefore, the following alternatives are hereby offered. Check the one which most nearly expresses your opinion. Leave the other one blank.

\_\_\_ The student body of Luther College shall continue to assume responsibility for maintaining academic integrity through the Honor Code.

\_\_\_ The responsibility for maintaining academic integrity shall be returned to the faculty of Luther College.

8.2.3 If a second referendum becomes necessary, it shall take the following form:

One year ago the student body of Luther College voted to reject the Honor Code. The Constitution under which the Honor Code functions at Luther College specifies that a vote to reject the Honor Code must be confirmed in a second referendum one year later before becoming effective.

In accordance with the Constitution, therefore, the following alternatives are hereby offered. Check the one which most nearly expresses your opinion. Leave the other one blank.

\_\_\_ The student body of Luther College shall continue to assume responsibility for maintaining academic integrity through the Honor Code.

\_\_\_ The responsibility for maintaining academic integrity shall be returned to the faculty of Luther College.

# Appendix I—Plagiarism

The Honor Code applies to all aspects of a student’s academic life. This means that all tests, quizzes, examinations, and assigned written or oral work of any kind is expected to be the work of the student alone (unless otherwise assigned or approved) and that failure to observe this requirement shall be considered a violation of the Honor Code. The Honor Code prohibits the giving or receiving of information to or from students who write the test at another time.

To forestall unintentional violations of academic integrity so far as possible, the concept of plagiarism needs some discussion and definition here.

Plagiarism of any sort involves presenting someone else’s intellectual output as one’s own. One kind consists in unauthorized collaboration on an assignment. Discussing and studying together are legitimate and desirable. But joint efforts should not extend to planning and writing something together that is supposed to show one’s individual grasp of the matter at hand (unless the assignment specifically requires such collaboration).

Another kind of plagiarism consists in using someone else’s work (in whole or in part) in a test, a paper, a lab report, or some other context where one is expected to be doing independent work. The most obvious form is to quote someone else’s exact words (or use data, or a diagram, or a musical score, etc.) without showing that the material is borrowed. But it is also plagiarism to rewrite (paraphrase) someone else’s ideas, or follow someone else’s plan of development, or present someone else’s argument, without acknowledging the source; changing the wording does not cancel the debt. Of course, matters of common knowledge need not be credited to a source. To be safe, however, one should not assume anything is common knowledge unless one has seen it mentioned in print more than once without a reference to some other source of information.

The usual form for showing such debts is a footnote, giving at least the name of the author, the title of the work, and the exact page. (Customs governing what should be included in the note vary somewhat from one subject field to another; the departments of instruction can provide information about their particular requirements.) Direct quotations must always be indicated: short quotations should be enclosed in quotation marks, and longer ones should be set off from the writer’s own text by indentation. (Generally, quotation marks are required if one quotes three or more words from a sentence; however, if it is significant, even a single quoted word should be set off in quotation marks.)

# The Honor Council

The following groups and officers are responsible for the promotion and enforcement of the Honor Code.

The **Honor Council** (HC) is the student body that promotes the Honor Code at Luther College. The Honor Council is made up of twelve students, normally five members from the Senior Class, four members from the Junior Class, three members from the Sophomore Class.

The Honor Council is elected by the students of Luther College. The First-Year Class, the Sophomore Class, and the Junior Class each elect members to the Council (as needed) at their respective class elections held during the spring semester, to take office the following fall.

Members, once elected, continue in office until their graduation, until they leave college, choose to resign their position or are otherwise removed.

Some of the responsibilities of the Honor Council are:

* To promote the Honor Code across campus.
* To create and conduct educational programming designed to promote academic integrity.
* To advise and consult with faculty members and administrative officers on matters pertaining to academic integrity.
* To issue an annual report to the [Student Senate](https://www.luther.edu/student-senate/), the Campus Life Committee, and the [Dean of the College](https://www.luther.edu/academics/dean/) on academic integrity standards, policies, and procedures, including recommendations for appropriate changes.
* To review the Honor Code for the Student Senate.
* To assist in the design and teaching of the workshop on academic integrity and moral development.

### Officers of the Honor Council

There are two officers for the Honor Council.

The **Honor Council Chair** (HCC) is the elected chair of the Honor Council, the Honor Code Review Board (HCRB), and the Honor Council Educational Committee (HCEC). The **Honor Council Vice Chair** (HCVC) assists the Honor Council Chair and supervises the work of the Honor Council Educational Committee.

Both the Honor Council Chair and the Honor Council Vice Chair are elected by and from the Honor Council for one year with no term limit. Both positions are filled by elections by and from the Honor Council at the beginning of each year and immediately as they become vacant.

### Committees of the Honor Council

There are two standing committees within the Honor Council.

The **Honor Code Review Board** (HCRB) is the committee of the Honor Council that conducts a Honor Code Review in cases of alleged violations of the Honor Code and decides about sanctions.

The HCRB normally is made up of three members from the Senior Class, two members from the Junior Class, and one member from the Sophomore Class. The Honor Council Chair always is a member of the HCRB. The Faculty Advisor to the Honor Council is a non-voting member of the HCRB and must be present at all Honor Code Reviews.

The responsibilities of the Honor Code Review Board are:

* To investigate alleged Honor Code violations.
* To issue sanctions for Honor Code violations.
* To provide written statements for the Campus Appeals Board during the appeals process.

The **Honor Code Educational Committee** (HCEC) is the committee of the Honor Council that works with faculty and students in the education of academic integrity at Luther College.

The responsibilities of the Honor Code Educational Committee are:

* To educate students about academic integrity and the Luther College Honor Code.
* To assist the HCC in reviews of the Honor Code.
* To become a temporary replacement if a regular member of the HCRB is unable to attend a meeting

# How to Avoid Academic Dishonesty

Many incidents of academic dishonesty occur because students do not know the correct way to do something, for example how to cite sources or how to work with information from a website. In other situations, students simply make a poor decision. Here are some suggestions on how to avoid academic dishonesty:

* Read the syllabus carefully. Seek clarification from your instructors regarding class policies; whenever expectations about an assignment are unclear, do not rely on other students for information.
* Always assume that you are expected to complete assignments independently unless your instructors indicate otherwise. Clarify what is expected of you when you are working on a group project.
* Don’t wait until the night before to begin an assignment. Being rushed for time is not an excuse for cheating or plagiarism. Good time management also allows you to contact your instructor in case you have questions.
* Don’t share your assignments with others. If classmates have a question, try to help them… but copying your assignment won’t teach them anything and you might be accused of academic dishonesty as well.
* Keep track of sources and learn how to cite properly. If you paraphrase or summarize what someone else said, you still have to attribute this information to them.
* Don’t be afraid to ask for an extension for an assignment. If you cannot get an assignment, you're better off taking a zero for it rather than copying/submitting someone else's work and being charged with academic dishonesty which likely will hurt your course grade much more.
* In classroom exams, be cautious where you sit. Cover your answers and distance yourself from others to reduce the temptation to look. Also, to avoid the impression of cheating, don’t look into your bag or use your cell phone during an exam. Remember that in many courses the act of looking at your cell phone during an exam is already considered cheating, whether your actually used the phone for cheating or not.

Luther has many resources in place to help students succeed academically. These resources combined with good common sense prevent academic dishonesty.

# Reporting a Violation

Write down at once exactly what you saw / read / heard, for example:

* What time was it?
* What happen exactly?
* Who else was present? Who might be a witness?
* Where were you (during a test: where were you sitting)?

Contact your professor or contact the Honor Council, either via email at honorcouncil@luther.edu or [campus mail](https://www.luther.edu/doc-mail/mail-center/) (SPO “Honor Council”) or the Faculty Advisor to the Honor Council.

* After you report the case, you should not talk about it with anyone outside the Honor Council. Keep in mind that a report to the Honor Council cannot be retracted.
* The person you accused or his/her friends should not talk about the case with you before or after the case has been discussed by the Honor Council Review Board.

You might be asked to appear in front of the Honor Council Review Board. You do not have to face the person you accuse of breaking the Honor Code. Also, you can choose to stay anonymous to the person you reported.

* All actions that interfere with the work of the Honor Council are also considered violations of the Honor Code, including, but not limited to the destruction of evidence, the intimidation of witnesses or complainants, or retaliatory actions against witnesses or complainants.

# If You Have Been Reported

There are two procedures for dealing with possible violations of academic integrity: The **Individual Review**, conducted by faculty members, and the **Honor Code Review**, conducted by the members of the Honor Council. Both procedures are independent from one another and equal although there are minor differences:

* The Honor Code Review board cannot change grades; it only can make recommendations about grades.
* The Honor Code Review board has some sanctions that professors do not have (e.g. barring a student from participation in any campus-wide elections for a time).
* Verdicts by the Honor Council can be appealed to the Campus Appeals Board; complaints about decisions made by instructors during the course of an Individual Review that lead to a change of a course grade must follow the process of the Final Grade Appeal (as described in the Luther College catalog).
* The Honor Council has to follow the rules of the Honor Code. The procedure for an Individual Review is described in the Faculty Handbook but is less regulated. There is a recommendation for the process, but instructors can deviate from it.

If you are suspected of a violation of academic integrity, there are two situation you can find yourself in:

Situation 1: **A professor can deal with a case “internally”.**

* If the professor does not report the case to the HC, she/he will meet with you, together with another professor who serves as a monitor to the meeting.
* It is recommended that you are allowed to have an advisor with you and that you can request that the case is send to the Honor Council (but you cannot demand this).
* After the meeting, the professor will make her/his decision.
* The professor will send a report about the case to the Dean’s Office.
* If the decision affects your final grade, you can appeal the final grade (i.e. at the end of the semester) within 30 days after it has been posted. This complaint has to be filed with the department head (if the professor is the department head, the complaint is filed with the Dean of the College).

Situation 2: **Students and professors can report a case to the Honor Council.**

* If the case is sent to the HC, you will hear from them about a hearing. You do not have to appear before the Honor Council Review Board (HCRB), but it usually helps your case. You can also just send a written statement. The case will be discussed, with or without you being present at the hearing.
* You can come with an advisor (friend, professor, family) to the HCRB hearing, however, the advisor is not allowed to talk to the HCRB.
* You can suggest questions for the witnesses, but you cannot question witnesses yourself.
* You can ask that witnesses be heard in your support.
* If you know who filed the complaint (peer or professor), you should NOT contact them, nor should you ask anyone (friends, family) to speak to them. Remember that once a complaint has been filed, it cannot be retracted.
* Once the HCRB has reached a decision, you can appeal the decision within 6 class days but at least after one full day has passed. You can send a mail to the “Campus Appeals Board” or you can deliver your written appeal to the Dean’s Office or the Student Life Office.
* Remember, the HCRB can only issue recommendations concerning grades. It does not change grades. Grades are changed by the instructor

# Information for Faculty

# for Faculty

The Luther College faculty handbook states that all “faculty members need to assist in maintaining an environment at Luther that is thoughtful about and supportive of academic integrity and the Honor Code” (509.2.2). Students and faculty members are partners in this endeavor.

Questions concerning academic integrity and the Luther College Honor Code you can direct to the [Dean's Office](https://www.luther.edu/academics/dean/) or to the **Faculty Advisor to the Honor Council**. Currently, this is Sören Steding (stedso01@luther.edu / Main 403A / Phone 1489) .

* [How must I handle violations of academic integrity?](https://www.luther.edu/academic-integrity/facultyinformation/#FAQ_1)
* [Can I conduct an Individual Review and send the case to the Honor Council?](https://www.luther.edu/academic-integrity/facultyinformation/#FAQ_2)
* [How do I conduct an individual review?](https://www.luther.edu/academic-integrity/facultyinformation/#FAQ_3)
* [What should I do while a case is pending before the Honor Council?](https://www.luther.edu/academic-integrity/facultyinformation/#FAQ_4)
* [What happens if students appeal the verdict of the Honor Council to the Campus Appeals Board?](https://www.luther.edu/academic-integrity/facultyinformation/#FAQ_5)
* [What should I do with a grade if the Honor Council cannot meet before the end of the semester?](https://www.luther.edu/academic-integrity/facultyinformation/#FAQ_6)
* [How can I submit a case to the Honor Council?](https://www.luther.edu/academic-integrity/facultyinformation/#FAQ_7)
* [What needs to be included if I submit a case to the Honor Council?](https://www.luther.edu/academic-integrity/facultyinformation/#FAQ_8)
* [What should I do if a violation was reported to me by another student?](https://www.luther.edu/academic-integrity/facultyinformation/#FAQ_9)
* [What are the sanctions issued by the Honor Code Review Board?](https://www.luther.edu/academic-integrity/facultyinformation/#FAQ_10)
* [What happens if a student is unhappy with a changed grade?](https://www.luther.edu/academic-integrity/facultyinformation/#FAQ_11)

**How must I handle violations of academic integrity?**

There are two different procedures for dealing with possible violations of academic integrity: the **Individual Review**, conducted by faculty members, and the **Honor Code Review**, conducted by the Honor Code Review Board of the Honor Council.

Both procedures have their advantages and disadvantages. The Individual Review, for example, usually is faster than the Honor Code Review because there have to be three class days between the summoning of a student to the Honor Code Review and the actual hearing. However, the Honor Code Review makes better provisions for due process because the procedure is regulated in more detail in the Honor Code. Also, the Honor Code Review provides an independent and uninvolved party to look at the case and the evidence.

If an instructor discovers a possible case of academic dishonesty, the instructor is free to decide if an individual review should be conducted or if the case should be handled by the Honor Council. However, if the only evidence is the statement of a student-witness, the Faculty Handbook recommends that the case be sent to the Honor Council.

In any case, if it is likely that a violation of academic integrity has occurred, faculty members **must** either conduct an individual review and submit the required form to the Dean’s office or send the case to the Honor Council.

**Can I conduct an Individual Review and send the case to the Honor Council?**

This is not recommended. It is preferable that instructors send cases of possible violations to the Honor Council instead of conducting an individual review, however, in some situation, an individual review might be the better option. If in doubt, instructors should consult with other faculty members or with the Advisor to the Honor Council.

**How do I conduct an individual review?**

Read [detailed information](https://www.luther.edu/academic-integrity/facultyinformation/individualreview/) about the individual review.

**What should I do while a case is pending before the Honor Council?**

Once a case is referred to the Honor Council, the instructor should stop any communication with the accused student (or any other person involved) until the Honor Code Review Board has come to a decision. You also should not change any grades at this time or make any statements about any action you might take after the Honor Council has come to a verdict. Once you receive the verdict, you can either follow the recommendations or issue your own sanction.

**What happens if students appeal the verdict of the Honor Council to the Campus Appeals Board?**

The Campus Appeals Board only determines if an accused student got a fair hearing, if the information on which the decision of the Honor Code Review Board is based was substantial, if the sanctions were appropriate for the violation, or if new information has to be considered. The Campus Appeals Board cannot change a verdict and it cannot change grades. If an appeal is upheld, the case will be re-opened by the Honor Code Review Board. Instructors are usually only informed if there is a different verdict after the case has been re-opened.

**What should I do with a grade if the Honor Council cannot meet before the end of the semester?**

If a case arises at the end of the semester (e.g. during the final exam) and it is not very likely that the Honor Code Review Board can hear the case before the next semester, instructors can either assign the grade of “Incomplete” while the case is pending, or they can assign a regular grade and inform the student and the registrar (and perhaps the department head) that a grade change might be necessary after the Honor Code Review Board has reached a verdict.

Of course, you could also conduct an Individual Review instead.

**How can I submit a case to the Honor Council?**

You can contact the Honor Council via email, via SPO to “Honor Council”, by contacting the Honor Council Chair or the Advisor to the Honor Council. The Advisor of the Honor Council also is available to help you prepare your case for the Honor Council.

**What needs to be included if I submit a case to the Honor Council?**

A report to the Honor Council should include (if available or applicable):

* a detailed description of the case (type of assignment, description of the assignment, how the violation was detected, etc.),
* a detailed description of the possible violation (always assuming that the members of the Honor Code Review Board are not experts in the subject matter),
* names of all students involved (accused students and witnesses),
* a course syllabus,
* emails related to the case (if there already has been email communication with students involved).

**What should I do if a violation was reported to me by another student?**

If there is no evidence other than the statement of a witness, the Faculty Handbook recommends that the case be sent to the Honor Council. If the witness is not willing to identify themselves to the Honor Council, the case cannot go forward. Witnesses and students reporting violations to the Honor Council can choose to stay anonymous to the students they accuse, but they must be known to the Honor Council.

In the individual review, the names of witnesses can be withheld from accused students; however, they should have a chance to review the evidence and statements against them.

**What are the sanctions issued by the Honor Code Review Board?**

There are three types of sanctions that are available to the Honor Code Review Board:

* recommendations to the instructor concerning grades;
* recommendations to the Dean concerning suspension or dismissal of a student;
* sanctions under the sole authority of the Honor Council (e.g. barring the student from participation in any campus-wide elections for a time or requiring the student to take part in a workshop on academic integrity). You can find a detailed list [here](https://www.luther.edu/academic-integrity/honorcode/honorcode-6/).

Instructors are not required to follow the recommendations of the Honor Council, but they also cannot change the verdict (e.g. if the Honor Code Review Board requires a student to take part in a workshop on academic integrity, the instructor cannot free the student from this obligation).

Usually, if a student was found guilty of a first Honor Code violation, the sanction is a recommendation to the instructor to grade the assignment in question with “0” and to reduce the final course grade by one full step (e.g. from B to C) after the “0” of the assignment has been taken into consideration.

**What happens if a student is unhappy with a changed grade?**

The only possibility for a student to appeal a grade is the Final Grade Appeal. Therefore, a student must wait until the final course grade has been released. Student can only register a complaint about a final course grade. The catalog states:

“If a student feels that his or her grade in a course is inconsistent with explicit standards, then he or she should first make an effort to resolve the matter by registering a complaint with the instructor. In the event that this fails to produce a resolution, the student may submit a formal petition to the department in question. This petition should express the grievance and give just cause for the department to intervene. Should the department support the actions of the instructor, then the matter is closed with no further institutional recourse to the student. A department may wish to refer the issue to the dean of the college for final resolution.

When a student feels that his/her academic evaluation has not been fairly rendered, he/she has 30 days after the release of the final grades by the [Registrar's Office](https://www.luther.edu/registrar/) to file an appeal.”

The Honor Code exists at Luther College because we believe that as a community of learning rooted in the Christian faith, it is incumbent on all of us – faculty, staff, and students – to mutually support and uphold academic and personal integrity, within and across these groups.  Like any group of professionals, the faculty, staff, and students at Luther College recognize the integrity of our calling in living, working, and learning here.  Therefore, we assume responsibility for the maintenance of academic integrity ourselves, especially since we are part of this community by our own free will, and since violations of the Honor Code, if left unaddressed, can be considered as debasing not only that code and our community’s systems of value but also the academic worth of students’ grades, degrees, and other outward measures of academic performance at Luther College.  Faculty, staff, and students are encouraged to recognize the fact that violations of the Honor Code, therefore, may affect everyone on campus, directly or indirectly, in this way.

Therefore, although it does not and cannot guarantee honest behavior in academic work, the Honor Code transfers the responsibility for enforcing honorable conduct from the instructor to the student, who becomes responsible for ensuring the integrity of his or her own behavior and for reporting to the instructor or other appropriate authorities any violation of the Honor Code of which he or she may be aware.  The faculty will support the student body and one another in maintaining and encouraging academic integrity, and it will address violations of academic integrity with diligence and fairness.

**509.1 Student Responsibilities**

The Luther Student Body shall assume responsibility for maintaining academic integrity though the Honor Code. For Honor Code specifics see the Student Handbook.

**509.2 Faculty Roles in Maintaining Academic Integrity**

509.2.1  In the Classroom: The spirit of the Luther College Honor Code is based on every individual student assuming responsibility for his or her own work – including, but not limited to, exams, homework, assignments, papers, group projects, presentations – while neither receiving nor giving assistance in violation of the parameters set forth by the faculty member.  Therefore, the primary role of faculty in promoting academic integrity in courses is to define violations and parameters for students to understand, and to create an environment that is supportive of an honor system.  To this end, faculty members should have at least one discussion in each course about academic integrity and how it applies to the course.  Many additional actions can be taken to further this goal—for suggestions, please see “Methods of Encouraging and Maintaining Academic Integrity in Courses” available at: (URL to be inserted here).

509.2.2  In the Luther Community: All faculty members need to assist in maintaining an environment at Luther that is thoughtful about and supportive of academic integrity and the Honor Code.  The following is a list of ways for maintaining this environment:

·       New faculty members need to be introduced to the Honor Code during their orientation.  They should be informed on the purpose of the Honor Code, its relevance to the values of Luther College, all of the content in this section (509) of the Faculty Handbook, and additional resources available through the Academic Dean’s Office website.

·       When serving as a first-year advisor, faculty share responsibility with representatives from Student Life and the Honor Council for informing new students of the Honor Code and generating discussion on academic integrity. First-year advisors should address these issues during at least one of their Fall semester meetings.

·       Every Department should have at least one discussion each academic year during a department meeting on academic integrity and the Honor Code. Suggested topics for this meeting include: the purpose and presence the Honor Code at Luther College, the meaning of academic integrity among students and faculty, how to address suspected violations of the Honor Code and how violations have been addressed in the past in this discipline, and how to seek additional assistance with academic integrity concerns.

·       One-on-one discussion can also be initiated between individual faculty members, without violating confidentiality, to seek clarity about whether a violation has occurred and what the next steps should be.

·       Faculty members are encouraged to attend and be active in open forums, talks by leaders in the field of ethics, and other events hosted by Student Senate, the Honor Council, and the Center for Ethics and Public Engagement on the topics of academic integrity and the Honor Code.

·       Additionally, faculty members can initiate discussions by inviting professionals from their disciplines to talk to students on integrity and ethics in their professional lives.

**509.3  Faculty Roles in Cases of Suspected Honor Code Violations**

509.3.1  All faculty are expected to take action against violations of academic integrity. It is recognized that faculty may elect to submit reports of academic integrity violations to the Honor Code Review Board (HCRB), or faculty may opt to initiate their own individual reviews.

·       Faculty are strongly encouraged to consider submitting cases to the HCRB since that process is most consistent with the spirit of the Luther College Honor Code.  As a student-run, peer-reviewed and juried process, the HCRB embodies the responsibility for upholding academic integrity that students place on themselves through the creation and renewal of an Honor Code.

·       It is not recommended that faculty perform individual reviews when the only evidence of an academic integrity violation is the testimony of a witnessing student.  If a student approaches a faculty member with a concern about a suspected violation, the faculty member should encourage the student to report their concern to the HCRB (and offer to assist the student in the process if the student seems reticent to do so).

**509.3.2 Reporting to the Honor Code Review Board**

Faculty can initiate this process by contacting the Honor Council chair (who is also the HCRB chair) by email or regular mail.  The SPO mail address and the email address of the Honor Council chair are available at: (URL to be inserted here). The HCRB procedures are outlined in the Student Handbook (URL to be inserted here).

·       It is requested that faculty do not enact their own sanctions while cases are pending before the HCRB. The decisions reached by the HCRB, and the suggested sanctions, are presented to the reporting faculty at the conclusion of the process. Such sanctions provided by the HCRB are to be viewed as recommendations, providing the faculty with options for action.

·       Faculty may choose to refrain from discussions about the suspected violation with the student(s) involved while the case is pending before the HCRB.  If a faculty member chooses to engage in discussion, it is suggested that a third party be included, preferably his or her department chair, a senior member of his or her department, or the Faculty Advisor to the Honor Council.  This third party is present to assist in the discussion and to discourage harassment of the faculty member by the student(s).

**509.3.3  Individual Review by Faculty of Suspected Academic Integrity Violations**

Faculty retain the freedom to deal with academic integrity violations in their courses according to their own discretion and to what they deem the best interests of Luther College.  If a faculty member determines that it is in the best interests of the College not to refer a suspected violation to the Honor Council Review Board, the faculty member must follow the principles of due process when addressing suspected violations.  To assist in this process, a form has been created that includes all necessary steps with instructions to follow.  This form must be used each time a faculty member conducts an individual review for the following reasons: a) it ensures that due process is upheld, b) it standardizes the individual review procedure so that there is consistency across the College, and c) it standardizes the reports that must be submitted to the Academic Dean’s Office and the Student Life Dean’s Office any time a faculty member determines that a violation has occurred and a sanction has been applied, and d) having a record of all violations allows the Academic Dean to determine if a student has committed multiple violations and is therefore eligible for further sanctions.  The Individual Review by Faculty of Suspected Academic Integrity Violations Form can be found on the Academic Dean’s Office website at: (URL to be inserted here).  For recommendations on how to conduct an individual review, see the “Suggested Procedures for Individual Review by Faculty of Suspected Academic Integrity Violations by Faculty” document available at: (URL to be inserted here).

**509.4  Faculty Advisor to the Honor Council**

A faculty member serves as an advisor to the Honor Council and the Honor Council Review Board.  This faculty person is appointed by the Academic Dean of the College, and maintains the position as long as he or she is willing to serve and the Dean supports the appointment.  The faculty advisor is a non-voting member of the Honor Council Review Board.  The faculty advisor can also serve as a source of information and advice to faculty who are addressing academic integrity issues

# Encouraging and Maintaining Academic Integrity

**Suggested Procedures for Exams**

The following is a list of best practices for maintaining academic integrity with exams:

* Have students leave all books, notes, backpacks, cellular devices, and other aids in an inaccessible spot (exception : open-note/open-book tests)
* Inform students that they may not leave the testing room and return without permission of the faculty member/proctor
* Inform students that they may not talk to each other
* Create a designated seating arrangement and put space between students, if possible. If no seating arrangement is specified, the students shall ensure that their line of sight does not create cause for suspicion of cheating.
* Include a printed statement about academic integrity and the Honor Code on the exam document.  (Note: This statement could be one that appears at the end of the exam.  The student then signs the statement if he/she has no suspicion of dishonest work.  If the statement is left unsigned, he/she will be contacted by the faculty member responsible for the exam. If the statement was purposefully left unsigned, the student in question is asked to indicate the nature of his/her suspicions.  An investigation of the suspicions can be pursued, if appropriate, by the faculty member or the Honor Code Review Board [see 509.3].)
* Verbally remind students of the honor system before the exam
* Inform the students on the proctoring protocol for the test  (Note: While the spirit of the Honor Code would make proctoring unwarranted, the proctoring of exams will be at the discretion of the faculty member.)
* Instruct the students of the specific procedure for turning in the exam when the students’ work is complete
* Specify if students are allowed use of any legal “crib sheet” (specified size) during the exam.  (Note: doing so may encourage students to think about, synthesize, and organize materials prior to the exam).
* Faculty members are encouraged to make him/herself available at the exam site, at some point in time or at intervals throughout the exam period, to answer questions related to the exam.

**Suggested Procedures for Homework Assignments**

The following is a list of best practices for maintaining academic integrity with homework assignments:

* Clearly define expectations for the homework assignment.
* Be explicit about the amount or degree of outside assistance that is acceptable, including if students may collaborate on the assignment.
* Suggest various forms of acceptable assistance that is available to them, i.e. SASC, scheduling a meeting with the faculty member, tutors, etc. if they should run into a problem with the assignment.
* State what sources the students are expected to use or not use for the assignment.

**Suggested Procedures for Papers**

The following is a list of best practices for maintaining academic integrity with papers:

* Explain what plagiarism is and the repercussions for plagiarism at the beginning of the course, through a statement in the syllabus or a handout that they can refer to thereafter. Give students practical guidance on how plagiarism is defined and can be avoided with each paper asssignment.1
* Assign drafts of papers so that concerns about plagiarism can be addressed early on.
* Assign focused topics likely to be engaging to students.1
* Use shorter and more frequent papers, including in-class writing exercises. 1
* Learn student writing styles. 1
* Have students submit components of major papers in stages (e.g., start with a proposal and outline). 1
* Review and comment on how students use citations. 1
* Ask students to "present" their papers and respond to questions in class. 1

**Suggested Procedures for Group Projects**

The following is a list of best practices for maintaining academic integrity with group projects:

* Develop a clear rubric that explains the expectations of each student in the group.
* Require notes or other evidence of process from each student.
* Include a public presentation from the group that requires each student to present.
* Ask each student to write an evaluation of his/her participation in the project.

**Suggestions for Syllabi Statements and First Day of Semester Discussions**

The following is a list of best practices for highlighting and discussing academic integrity at the beginning of a course:

* Include in syllabi or course policy statements a statement affirming the presence and nature of the Honor Code and its applicability to the work students will undertake in this course (see Appendix A for an example syllabus statement).
* Discuss openly during the first week of classes the presence and nature of the Honor Code, and its importance in preserving academic integrity (see 509.0 of the faculty handbook for language that may assist in this discussion).
* Remind students, in statements and discussion, that under the provisions of the Honor Code, faculty may and students are expected to report to the Honor Council a student suspected of an Honor Code violation.
* Include in syllabi and course policy statements, or otherwise make students aware, of a definition of plagiarism and of correct citation techniques as they will apply to that student’s work in that course (see Appendix B for a description of plagiarism).
* Remind students of the basic policy for reporting Honor Code violations (refer them to the Honor Code section of the Student Handbook [URL to be inserted here]).  Also discuss how allowing Honor Code violations to go unreported degrades the value of every student’s Luther College grades and degree, is contrary to Luther’s values, and undermines Luther’s academic prestige.

# Individual Review

# al Review

As part of the individual review, [this form](https://www.luther.edu/academics/dean/assets/Form_for_Individual_Review_by_Faculty_of_Suspected_Academic_Integrity_Violations.docx) has to be submitted to the Dean's office, even if no sanctions are issued.

There are six phases in the recommended procedure for the individual review of possible violation of academic integrity:

1. Investigating
2. Consulting
3. Meeting
4. Discussing / Deliberating
5. Sanctioning
6. Reporting

**1. Investigate** the case and keep records of all evidence of the suspected violation, including copies of the assignments or exams, statements by students or other witnesses, potential sources of plagiarism, and references to policies in the course syllabus or assignments that define violations of academic integrity.

**2. Consult** with another faculty member, preferably the department chair, a senior member of the department, or the Faculty Advisor to the Honor Council, and discuss the evidence and your reasons for believing that a violation has occurred.

If you, at this point, decide to send the case to the Honor Council, inform the student about this. All communication with the student or third parties concerning the case should stop until you received a verdict from the Honor Council. Keep in mind that a case, once submitted to the Honor Council, cannot be retracted.

**3.** You and the additional faculty member (who is present as an observer, to take notes on the meeting, and to discourage harassment of the faculty member by the student, but who otherwise should not participate) should **meet** face to face with the student (if there is more than one student involved in the violation, they should meet with each separately).

* It is recommended that students are allowed to be accompanied by an advisor as well (who cannot take an active role during the meeting).
* It is recommended that the student should be asked if she/he would prefer that the case be sent to the Honor Council. However, students cannot demand that the case is send to Honor Council. If you follow the student's request for sending the case to the Honor Council, the meeting automatically ends and you should wait until you hear back from the Honor Council.

You should explain what violation is being discussed, how exactly this behavior is a violation of the Honor Code and/or the course policies, and the evidence that exists.
The student has an opportunity to respond to the evidence and the allegation, ask and answer questions, and present any evidence to refute the allegation. If you need time to review evidence presented by the student, a follow-up meeting may be held.

**4.** At the conclusion of the meeting, the two faculty members should **discuss**all the evidence for and against the allegation. The additional faculty member can provide advice and an alternative perspective, but the decision of whether a violation has occurred and if a sanction is imposed is in the hands of the faculty member in charge of the course.

**5.** If a faculty member, considering all evidence, determines that a violation has occurred, he or she can impose a **sanction** that is commensurate with the violation. His or her additional faculty member and/or the Faculty Advisor to the Honor Council can provide guidance on appropriate sanctions, as well as examples of past violations of a similar nature. Sanctions can include:

* Issuing a warning to the student.
* Allowing the student to do the work over again.
* Refusing credit for the work in question.
* Lowering the student’s grade in the course.

**6.** If a faculty member determines that a violation has occurred, he/she must **report** the case by submitting the Individual Review of Suspected Academic Integrity Violations by Faculty Form (which explains the violation, the student’s response, the decision, and the sanction, along with any evidence used) to the Academic Dean’s Office so that a record of all academic integrity violations on campus is maintained. The Academic Dean will review all reports of academic integrity violations to determine if a student has committed multiple violations, and what additional sanctions might be appropriate.

# Practical Tips

 » [Academic Integrity](https://www.luther.edu/academic-integrity/) » [Information for Faculty](https://www.luther.edu/academic-integrity/facultyinformation/) » Practical Tips

# Practical Tips

The following information is **not** provided by the Honor Council and is **not**part of the Luther College policy on Academic Integrity, but rather is a collection of some practical tips. You may use, adapt and share all information without permission or attribution.

**1. Papers and homework as original work**

In the past, the Honor Code Review Board did not automatically consider a paper that had been submitted in two different classes a violation of the Honor Code. In order to make clear to student that they have to write a new paper or essay, please include in your syllabus or your assignment description that **original** work is required (e.g. Assignment #2 is an original paper on…).

**2. Test materials from publishers / test and assignment collections**

If you are using test material that is provided by a publisher, be aware that all of those materials are available online, either for free or for purchase, even if you use the latest edition. There is a worldwide market for these materials and it cannot be assumed that students do not have access to Instructors Manuals or test banks. Also, if you are handing back tests to students, please be aware that those are collected and exchanged by students. While the Honor Council **does** consider the use of an Instructor’s Manual or previous tests a violation of the Honor Code, this is usually very difficult to prove.

**3. Cheating during tests**

While in the past the Faculty Handbook suggested that instructors should not be in the classroom during tests as a sign of trust in the honesty of the students, this is no longer part of the handbook language. Each instructor may decide whether to leave the room or remain there during tests.

Cheating during tests is very difficult for the Honor Council to investigate. When students report a possible case of cheating, it often comes down to “s/he said – s/he said”. Therefore, it is better to create a testing environment that makes cheating more unlikely.

This is also beneficial and important for all students who do not cheat, because they have not to worry about what to do when they see something suspicious (which can be very distracting for them), and they do not have to be afraid that someone might use their answers.

Here are some ways to create a testing environment that is more conducive to academic integrity:

* There should be room between students while taking the test.
* Students should leave all backpacks and articles of clothing (jackets, etc.) in the front of the room. They should not have books, papers, or backpacks next to or under the table. They should not put articles of clothing over their chairs, on their laps, or on the table. They should not have anything but writing utensils on the table (also excluding any pencil cases).
* Some colleagues make a new seating arrangement for each major test. Sometimes, they seat students of similar academic level next to each other.
* Students should not be allowed to leave the room with the test or a cellphone. They should switch off and put their cellphones in their backpacks or put them on the table in the front of the room. It could be part of the course policy that the use of a cellphone at any time during a test can automatically exclude a student from a test.
* Tests should be deposited into a closed or locked box once students are done (if the instructor is not present).
* It is recommended to have different tests if students cannot spread out in your test location, or to use more open answer questions. If instructors do not want to write two completely different tests, it may be enough to have two tests with the questions (and in multiple-choice test: the answers) in a different sequence.
* When using multiple-choice questions, it is recommended to have questions that allow for more than one right answer and to have questions for which no correct answer is provided. Most test banks do not have these options, thus, changing a test from an Instructor’s Manual in this way will help avoid violations of academic integrity.

**4. Collaboration on homework and other assignments**

There have been several cases where students claimed that they were unclear about what was allowed and what not when it comes to group work and homework. There are good reasons for this confusion, mainly because the rules are very different from one class to the next.

However, there is also conceptual confusion: It is not always clear to student what the pedagogical purposes of group work and homework assignments are. The more they see them as “busy work” and not really contributing to learning, the more they feel it is permissible to “cut corners”.

Also, there is a strong feeling within the student body that collaboration and sharing are important skills, that solving problems together is more necessary in the 21st century than working on assignments on your own, that it is a “waste of time” to answer questions that have been answered a million times before. While this could be dismissed as a cheap excuse, research suggests that the overall attitude of students towards grades and assignments is changing. Therefore, it might be helpful to explain the purpose and goals of an assignment.

In the **attached documents**, you can find terminology that might help clarify the level of collaboration that is allowed for assignments.

**5. Paraphrasing and referencing**

Students up to their senior year demonstrate misperceptions about what it means to paraphrase and what sort of information must be referenced. While many instructors feel that students should have learned these things in school or at least in the first-year Paideia courses, this does not always seem to be the case.

As the Faculty Handbook suggests that “faculty members should have at least one discussion in each course about academic integrity and how it applies to the course” (509.2.1), it might be helpful to remind students again about these issues. Here is additional information you can use:

 ------------

# 1. Definition of Academic Integrity and Academic Misconduct

Academic integrity reflects a shared set of principles which include honesty, trust, diligence, fairness and respect and is about maintaining the integrity of a student’s work and their award. Academic integrity is based on the ethos that how you learn is as important as what you learn.

Academic integrity is based upon a number of core principles. For students, this means:

* Taking responsibility for their own work and studies;
* Respecting the opinions of others, even if they do not agree with them;
* Respecting the rights of others to work and study within the ‘learning community’;
* Acknowledging the work of others, where it has contributed to their own studies, research or publications;
* Ensuring that the individual’s contribution to group work is represented honestly;
* Supporting others to behave with academic integrity;
* Following the ethical requirements and where appropriate professional standards appropriate to the discipline;
* Avoiding actions which would give an unfair advantage over others;
* Ensuring that the results of research or experimental data are represented honestly;
* Complying with the assessment requirements.

Academic integrity is the guiding principle for all student assessment; from taking exams, making oral presentations, or writing assignments; dissertations or theses for assessment.

Academic misconduct includes: plagiarism; collusion; breach of examination regulations; fabrication of data; impersonation of others or the commissioning of work for assessment (this list is not exhaustive.)

**1.1**

**It is academic misconduct to commit any act whereby a person may attempt to obtain for himself/herself, or for another person, an unpermitted advantage. This shall apply whether candidates act alone or in conjunction with another/others. An action or actions shall be deemed to fall within this definition whether occurring during, or in relation to, a formal examination, a piece of coursework, or any other form of assessment undertaken in pursuit of an academic or professional qualification at Swansea University.**

The University has a range of procedures and methods for detecting academic misconduct:

* in examination conditions (see 2.0).
* in non-examination conditions (see 3.0).
* in research degrees (see 6.0).
* after an Award has been bestowed (see 8.0).

The University may employ appropriate means of detecting and investigating cases of academic misconduct, for instance, through the use of plagiarism detection software or by means of an academic integrity/viva (see 3.1 below.)  Colleges may also choose to implement a system of random vivas in subject areas.

A Director of Academic Integrity is appointed by the University to promote academic integrity and to deal with all University level cases. The Director of Academic Integrity is supported in their role by the Deputy Director of Academic Integrity who may assist them or deal with cases of academic misconduct on their behalf, in accordance with this Procedure.   Accordingly, all references within these procedures to the Director of Academic Integrity shall include the Deputy Director of Academic Integrity.

In investigating allegations of academic misconduct, the Director of Academic Integrity, on behalf of the University, reserves the right to consult with other universities or organisations, where appropriate and to share relevant information.

Without prejudice to the generality of the foregoing, examples of academic misconduct are shown in sections 2.0 to 2.4 and 3.0 below

# 2. Examination Conditions

#### Academic Misconduct in examination conditions (this list is not exhaustive).

It is academic misconduct to:

* introduce into an examination room any unauthorised form of material such as a book, manuscript, data or loose papers, information obtained via an electronic device or any source of unauthorised information;
* copy from, or communicate with, any other person in the examination room, except as authorised by an invigilator;
* communicate electronically with any other person during an examination;
* be in possession of any electronic device capable of communicating with other devices or other people during an examination;
* impersonate an examination candidate, or allow oneself to be impersonated;
* present evidence of special circumstances to examination boards which is false, or falsified, or which in any way misleads or could mislead examination boards;
* present an examination script as one’s own work when the script includes material produced by unauthorised means.

**2.1**

##### Academic Misconduct in the Examination Room

An invigilator who considers, or suspects, that a candidate is engaging in academic misconduct shall inform such a candidate, preferably in the presence of a witness, that the circumstances will be reported. The candidate will, however, be allowed to continue the examination and any subsequent examination(s) without prejudice to any decision which may be taken. Failure to inform the candidate that the circumstances will be reported shall not, however, prejudice subsequent proceedings.

Where appropriate, the invigilator shall confiscate and retain evidence relating to any alleged unfair examination practice, so that it is available to any subsequent investigation. The invigilator shall as soon as possible report the circumstances, verbally in the first instance and thereafter in writing, to the Examinations Officer who shall in turn notify the College's Academic Integrity Officer and the Director of Academic Integrity.

In cases where a student has written on their person, the invigilator may contact the Examinations Office and request that a member of staff from the College attend the examination and confirm whether the writing is relevant to the subject/examination. Where possible a photograph of the evidence may also be taken.

**2.2**

##### Academic Misconduct in In-class Tests

In the case of an unseen written test which contributes to the final module result, which is conducted under the aegis of the College, the invigilator should report the case to the College's Academic Integrity Officer in the first instance, who in turn shall report the case to the Director of Academic Integrity.

**2.3**

##### Unauthorised Electronic Devices in the Examination venue

In the case of a student being found in possession of any electronic device capable of storing or displaying data, including mobile phones, smart watches or any other portable technology, which is not permitted in the rubric of the examination paper and which has **not** been used or where there is **no evidence** that it has been used, the offence shall be considered as a breach of examination regulations only. The invigilator shall as soon as possible report the circumstances, verbally in the first instance and thereafter in writing, to the Examinations Officer who shall in turn notify the Director of Academic Integrity.

The Director of Academic Integrity shall interview the student and draw their attention to examination regulations. The Director of Academic Integrity shall then decide whether to issue a penalty (see below).

In order to ensure consistency in the application of penalties the University provides guidance on penalties in the Code of Practice on Academic Misconduct.

The penalty for a **first breach of examination regulations** shall be:

* the issue of a written reprimand to the candidate, a record of the reprimand should be kept.

In cases of a **second breach** the penalty shall normally be:

* the cancellation of the candidate's marks for the whole examination paper.

Such students will have the rightto request a final review of the outcome in accordance with the University’s Final Review procedures. The Director of Academic Integrity may also decide not to issue a penalty but to refer the case to a Committee of Enquiry in accordance with regulation 2.6.

Where there is suspicion/evidence that the electronic device may have been used, e.g. witnessed by the invigilator, such cases should be referred to the Director of Academic Integrity who will determine whether a prima facie case of academic misconduct has been established (see 2.5).

**2.4**

##### Suspected Academic Misconduct Detected During or Subsequent to the Marking Period (Examination cases)

An internal or external examiner who, whether in the course of the marking period or subsequently, considers or suspects that a candidate has engaged in academic misconduct, shall report the matter in writing to the College's Academic Integrity Officer as soon as possible. He/she shall retain any relevant evidence and shall forthwith report the matter in writing to the Director of Academic Integrity who will determine whether a prima facie case of academic misconduct has been established (see 2.5).

**2.5**

##### Further actions to be taken by the Director of Academic Integrity

On receipt of a report concerning an allegation of academic misconduct, the Director of Academic Integrity shall determine whether, in the light of all the circumstances, a prima faciecase of academic misconduct has been established.

The Director of Academic Integrity may deal with the allegation in accordance with 2.3 above, where he/she considers that there has been a breach of examination regulations.

If it is decided that no further action against the candidate shall be taken, the College's Academic Integrity Officer or the Examination Officer shall, where appropriate, inform the candidate in writing that the matter is closed.

If satisfied that a prima facie case of academic misconduct exists, the Director of Academic Integrity shall report the case in writing to the Director of Academic Services and shall send to the Director of Academic Services copies of any relevant supporting evidence. The procedure shown shall then operate as described.

Where an allegation concerns a joint case involving a student from ICWS on a non-integrated programme together with a Swansea University student and/or an ICWS student on an integrated programme e.g. communicating in an examination etc, the case shall be dealt with by the Director of Academic Integrity who shall determine whether, in light of all the circumstances, a prima facie case exists.  Cases concerning ICWS students on non-integrated programmes only, shall be dealt with by ICWS.

**2.6**

The candidate shall be informed, in writing, by Academic Services of the allegation and that a Committee of Enquiry will be constituted to consider the case

# 3. Non-Examination Conditions

**Academic misconduct in non-examination conditions.**

**Plagiarism** is defined as using, without acknowledgment, another person's work and submitting it for assessment as though it were one's own work; for instance, through copying or unacknowledged paraphrasing. This constitutes plagiarism whether it is intentional or unintentional.

Examples include:

* The use of any quotation(s) from the published or unpublished work of other persons which have not been clearly identified as such by being placed in quotation marks and acknowledged;
* Summarising another person's ideas, judgments, figures, software or diagrams without appropriately attributing that person in the text and the source in the reference list;
* The use of the services (paid or un-paid) of 'ghost writing' agencies in the preparation of assessed work;
* The use of unacknowledged material downloaded from the Internet;
* The submission of another student's work as though it was one’s own.

This list of examples is not exhaustive.

**Self-Plagiarism** is not recognised in Swansea University regulations. Colleges are expected to take steps to ensure that the design of programmes/modules/assessments does not allow students the opportunity to submit the same work twice. In addition, Colleges should take steps to inform students that they cannot submit work or sections of their work on more than one occasion. A statement to this effect should be included on the coursework submission form. Where a student has self-plagiarised work, the College will mark the work in accordance with the normal marking criteria.

**Collusion** is defined as two or more students or other persons working together without prior authorisation in order to gain unfair advantage and to produce the same or similar piece of work and then attempting to present this work entirely as their own.

Examples include:

* Two or more students working together to develop data or other materials without prior authorisation. Such materials would then be presented for assessment without acknowledging the originator(s) of the work.
* Sharing data, materials or other coursework with another student(s) which is then presented for assessment without the knowledge or permission of the originator(s).

**Commissioning** of work, which is the act of paying for, or arranging for another to produce, a piece of work whether or not this is then submitted for assessment as though it were the student’s own work.

Examples include:

• Commissioning an essay to be written by another.
• Downloading materials from essay exchange sites
• Paying another for the collection, manipulation or interpretation of data, where this is a requirement of the student’s studies

Commissioning of work may also include the submission for assessment of the commissioned work as though it were the student’s own work.

Examples include;

• Purchasing material from internet sites or another and then presenting that material for assessment as though it were one’s own work.
• Paying for another to write coursework which is then submitted as though it were the student’s own work.
• Paying for another to write draft coursework which is then presented to a supervisor for scrutiny and feedback.

This list is not exhaustive.

**Falsification** of the results of laboratory, field-work or other forms of data collection and analysis also constitutes academic misconduct.

**3.1**

##### ***Academic Integrity Vivas as a means of Detecting Academic Misconduct in non-examination conditions at College level***

In cases where College academic staff, the College/School Academic Integrity Officer and/or the Director of Academic Integrity has concerns about whether a piece of coursework, or any work completed under non-examination conditions, submitted by a student is his/her own work, the College/School may invite the student to attend an academic integrity viva. The purpose of the academic integrity viva is to test the student’s knowledge of the work which he/she has submitted

The student should be given no less than two days notification of the academic integrity viva in writing. Where the student fails to attend the academic integrity viva without good reason, inferences may be drawn in relation to the student’s failure to attend by the College/School Academic Integrity Officer and/or Academic Misconduct Committee of Enquiry.

The viva process would normally involve a Panel of at least 2 members of Academic Staff (excluding the College Academic Integrity Officers).  A record of the viva must be kept.  At the discretion of the School/College a third member of staff may be nominated to record/transcribe the viva. Following the academic integrity viva, one of the academic staff present during the viva will prepare a report setting out their opinion as to the student’s knowledge of the work which he/she has submitted and the reasons for their opinion.

If the member of staff considers, or suspects, that academic misconduct has occurred in relation to work submitted by the student, then they will provide to the College/School Academic Integrity Officer or to the Director of Academic Integrity (as appropriate) a copy of their report and the recording / transcription of the viva, in addition to the normal supporting paperwork relating to the case - normally within five working days of the date of the student’s academic integrity viva (in accordance with 3.4 below.)

**3.2**

##### Investigating Academic Misconduct in non-examination conditions at College level (excludes Taught Master's Directed Independent Learning and Research Degree Theses)

Each College shall appoint a minimum of two Academic Integrity Officers to deal with College level (first offence) cases.  In each case one Academic Integrity Officer will carry out the investigation and make a recommendation on the case.  A second Academic Integrity Officer will be responsible for determining whether an offence has been committed and for determining a penalty.  The allocation of responsibilities shall be left to the discretion of the College; however, it is the responsibility of the College Academic Integrity Officers to ensure that all staff are aware of the reporting procedure.

In cases of suspected academic misconduct, in work completed under non- examinable conditions (excluding Taught Master's Directed Independent Learning and Research Degree Theses), Colleges will be expected to carry out the stages listed below. The burden of proof (duty of proving the allegation) shall rest on the College and the standard of proof should be on the balance of probabilities: a fact will be established if it is more likely than not to have happened. Cases involving Taught Master's directed independent learning modules and research degree theses should be dealt with as directed in section 6.0.

**3.3**

***Procedure for Investigating and Determining Academic Misconduct in non-examination conditions at College level***

**3.4**

***Stage One - report to First College Academic Integrity Officer***

If a member of staff considers, or suspects, that academic misconduct has occurred in relation to work submitted as a piece of coursework, or any work completed under non-examination conditions (excluding the directed independent learning element of postgraduate taught programmes and research degree thesis) he/she shall report the matter in writing or by email and provide any relevant evidence to the First College Academic Integrity Officer, normally within five working days of his/her consideration of the student’s work or the student’s academic integrity viva.

The member of staff (or his/her colleague) may require the student to attend an academic integrity viva to test the student’s knowledge of the work submitted before reporting the matter to the First College Academic Integrity Officer, in accordance with 3.1 above.

**3.5**

***Stage Two - establishing a Prima Facie case***

The College's First Academic Integrity Officer or nominee shall first determine whether a prima facie case of academic misconduct exists by referring to the documentation/evidence and where required through discussion with the student.

The First Academic Integrity Officer may request that an academic member of staff conducts an academic integrity viva to test the student’s knowledge of the work submitted, in accordance with 3.1 above.

Cases involving ICWS students on integrated programmes shall be dealt with by the College in accordance with regulations 3.3 to 3.12.  In joint cases involving an ICWS student(s) on a non-integrated programme and a Swansea University student and/or an ICWS student(s) on an integrated programme, the College Academic Integrity Officer may involve a member of staff from ICWS in stages Two to Six, normally the Director of Academic and Support Services or his/her nominee.

In cases involving an ICWS student(s) on a non-integrated programme  only (i.e. not also involving a Swansea University student or an ICWS student on an integrated programme) the case should be referred to ICWS, for it to deal with in accordance with ICWS’ procedures.

If no prima facie case of academic misconduct exists the student should be informed and no further formal action shall be taken. However, where the Academic Integrity Officer decides that poor referencing has occurred, the student should be referred for advice and guidance on correct referencing (this may include a referral to the personal tutor, the subject librarian or the Centre for Academic Success).  Once they have met with their tutor or subject librarian, students shall be required to sign a statement confirming that they have received advice and that they understand referencing conventions.

**3.6**

***Stage Three – Determining whether the case is dealt with by the College or by the Director of Academic Integrity / Committee of Enquiry***

If the College's First Academic Integrity Officer determines there to be a prima facie case of academic misconduct, he/she shall then determine whether the case can be heard at the College level or referred to the Director of Academic Integrity.

The College Academic Integrity Officer shall contact Academic Services to clarify whether the student has any previous offences of academic misconduct. Only first allegations of a less serious nature can be determined at the College level.  Any allegation subsequent to a substantiated offence must be referred to the Director of Academic Integrity.

Colleges should also examine any other work, previously submitted by the student, (including work submitted in other Colleges/subject areas where the student has pursued modules for other possible instances of academic misconduct).

Where additional evidence of academic misconduct is found or the College considers that the case is of a serious nature (e.g. a significant part of the assignment has been plagiarised) the First College Academic Integrity Officer should take into account the following in determining whether it would be more appropriate to deal with the case at the College level (in accordance with Stages Four to Six below), or refer the case to the Director of Academic Integrity :

•        the weighting of the coursework within the module;

•        the number of pieces of work affected;

•        the seriousness of the offence;

•        the total number of credits affected;

•        the level of study.

The Academic Integrity Officer should refer initially to the guidance in the University's Code of Practice on Academic Misconduct, but may also approach Academic Services or the Director of Academic Integrity for additional advice in determining whether a case should be dealt with by the College or the University's Committee of Enquiry.

In cases of a **second allegation/offence** (where a student has previously been found guilty of an academic misconduct offence) and in other cases referred by the College Academic Integrity Officer, the College's Academic Integrity Officer should notify the Director of Academic Integrity who will refer the case to Academic Services and request that a University Committee of Enquiry be established to consider the case (see regulation 9).

Academic Misconduct involving material purchased from a web site/essay bank/other agency

Cases of this nature are not dealt with at College level and should be forwarded to the Director of Academic Integrity (see regulation 5.0).

**3.7**

**Stage Four - student response to allegation**

If a prima facie case of academic misconduct exists and the First Academic Integrity Officer determines that the case should be dealt with at College level, he/she (or nominee) should inform the student concerned, in writing, of the suspected case of academic misconduct. Within the letter (a template of which will be available from Academic Services) the College Academic Integrity Officer will either: invite the student to comment in writing or; invite the student to attend for interview.

Where the student is invited to an interview, the student shall be entitled to be accompanied to the interview by a friend or colleague (who is a member of the University) or a Students' Union representative. The role of any person accompanying the student will be to support the student, and he/she will not normally be allowed to answer questions on behalf of the student.

The Second Academic Integrity Officer may also attend the interview.

Students should be provided with copies of evidence, normally this will be a copy of the marked-up essay and/or the Turnitin report, sources etc.

In cases of collusion students should be sent copies of all the work under investigation, or extracts as appropriate.

The College Academic Integrity Officer does not have to take intent into consideration and in relation to an allegation of academic misconduct - there can be no defence that the offence was committed unintentionally or accidentally.  Such circumstances can, however, be submitted by the student as mitigation in relation to the penalty to be imposed.

After having considered the evidence and any response provided by the student, the First Academic Integrity Officer shall refer the case, all relevant evidence, any written response received from the student and any notes of any meeting held with the student to the Second Academic Integrity Officer together with his/her recommendation as to the outcome of the case and any penalty to be applied (unless the Second Academic Integrity Officer was also present at such meeting).

**3.8**

***Stage Five - substantiating the case***

The College’s Second Academic Integrity Officer shall consider the documentation and recommendation received from the First Academic Integrity Officer, and shall then determine whether on the evidence received the allegation of academic misconduct has been substantiated. The burden of proof (duty of proving the allegation) shall rest on the College and the standard of proof should be on the balance of probabilities: a fact will be established if it is more likely than not to have happened.

The Second Academic Integrity Officer does not have to take intent into consideration and in relation to an allegation of academic misconduct there can be no defence that the offence was committed unintentionally or accidentally.  Such circumstances can however be submitted by the student as mitigation in relation to the penalty to be imposed.

If there is sufficient doubt about the evidence then the case should be dismissed and the student informed of this decision in writing.

If the Second Academic Integrity Officer finds that the allegation of academic misconduct has been substantiated, he/she shall then determine the penalty to be imposed in accordance with Stage Six below.

**3.9**

**Stage Six - College Level Cases – determining penalties**

In order to ensure consistency in the application of penalties the University provides guidance on penalties in the Code of Practice on Academic Misconduct. The Second Academic Integrity Officer should consult the University’s Code of Practice on Academic Misconduct and may consult with colleagues in arriving at a penalty.

The Second Academic Integrity Officer shall consider the seriousness of the offence and any mitigating circumstances brought to his/her attention in determining the penalty. The Second Academic Integrity Officer should be convinced that any mitigating circumstances have a direct bearing on the case and, in particular, had influenced the action of the student(s) concerned.

The College Academic Integrity Officer may impose one of the following penalties:

**3.9.1**

the issue of a written reprimand to the candidate and the text to be ignored when marking, resulting in a reduced mark;

**3.9.2**

the cancellation of the candidate's marks for the assignment;

**3.9.3**

cancellation of the candidate’s mark(s) for the module component(s);

**3.9.4**

the cancellation of the candidate's mark for the module concerned.

The decision whether to allow a student to retake work/assessment(s) shall be taken by the relevant Examination Board, in accordance with the assessment regulations for the programme.

**3.10**

***Case Report***

The College Academic Integrity Officer(s) shall draft a report on each case noting whether the allegation has been found substantiated, any penalty imposed and the reasons for the decisions reached (a template shall be available from Academic Services).  The report, along with a copy of the letter shall be sent to Academic Services where a permanent record will be kept.  The report may be considered in final review cases. A copy of the report will also be sent by the College to the student (see 3.11 below).

**3.11**

***Informing the student***

The College should inform the student in writing of the decision as to whether the allegation has been found substantiated and any penalty imposed (a template is available from Academic Services).  A copy of the Case Report should also be provided to the student.

The student will also be notified of the University's [**Final Review procedure**](https://www.swan.ac.uk/academic-services/academic-guide/conduct-and-complaints/final-review-procedure/).  However, students should note a final review of the outcome could result in a more severe penalty being imposed (e.g. if the current outcome is cancelled and the case is referred for a new investigation and determination).  A copy of the letter shall be sent to Academic Services.

Where an allegation has been substantiated, and the College is concerned that this may affect the student’s fitness to practise, the case may also be referred to the Head of College (or nominee) in accordance with the University’s [**Fitness to Practise Regulations**](https://www.swan.ac.uk/academic-services/academic-guide/conduct-and-complaints/fitness-to-practise/).

**3.12**

##### Survey of penalties

In order to ensure consistency, the University's Academic Regulations and Cases Committee may carry out a survey of penalties

# 4. Final Review of a case at College level

**4.1**

Students who wish to appeal against the penalty above shall be informed that they may appeal in accordance with the University's [**Final Review Procedures**](http://www.swansea.ac.uk/academic-services/academic-guide/conduct-and-complaints/final-review-procedure/).

# Final Review Procedure

**1.1**

Where a student has been given a formal decision/outcome under relevant regulations/procedures, the student may request a final review of the decision/outcome in accordance with this Final Review Procedure. By way of example, students may request a final review of the formal decisions made/outcomes imposed at the conclusion of the University’s:

* [**Academic Misconduct Procedure**](http://www.swansea.ac.uk/academic-services/academic-guide/assessment-and-progress/academic-misconduct-procedure/);
* [**Appeals Regulations**](http://www.swansea.ac.uk/academic-services/academic-guide/assessment-and-progress/academic-appeals/);
* [**Complaints Procedure**](http://www.swansea.ac.uk/academic-services/academic-guide/conduct-and-complaints/complaints-procedure/);
* [**Fitness to Practise Procedure**](http://www.swansea.ac.uk/academic-services/academic-guide/conduct-and-complaints/fitness-to-practise/);
* [**Disciplinary Procedures**](http://www.swansea.ac.uk/academic-services/academic-guide/conduct-and-complaints/disciplinary-procedures/).

The above list is not exhaustive and students should refer to the relevant regulations regarding the stage when they may request a final review (if applicable).

**1.2**

Any requests for a final review must be made in writing to the Director of Academic Services [hereinafter referred to as the 'Director'] **within 14 working days** of the original decision of the Committee, Board or University Officer by submitting the form which can be downloaded via the [**University's MyStudies (Blackboard) website**](https://blackboard.swan.ac.uk/webapps/portal/frameset.jsp) or obtained from [**Academic Services**](http://www.swansea.ac.uk/academic-services/).

To request a final review of a decision taken in relation to attendance through the [**Attendance Monitoring Policy for Taught Students**](http://www.swansea.ac.uk/academic-services/academic-guide/assessment-and-progress/attendance-monitoring-taught-students/) or the [**Attendance Monitoring Policy for Research Students (to include Masters by Research)**](http://www.swansea.ac.uk/academic-services/academic-guide/assessment-and-progress/attendance-monitoring-research-students/) or the [**Tier 4 Attendance Monitoring Policy**](http://www.swansea.ac.uk/academic-services/academic-guide/assessment-and-progress/tier-4-attendance-monitoring-policy/) students must submit their final review application form to the Director within**5 working days** of the date of the letter/email confirming the withdrawal decision.

**1.3**

If a final review application form is not received within the time limits stipulated, the final review will normally be treated as **not eligible** for consideration on the basis it is ‘out of time’, unless the student shows there to be a compelling reason for not having submitted the application within the time limits. Where it is decided that a final review application is not eligible for consideration, the student will be advised of this outcome by letter.

**1.4**

Academic Services shall acknowledge, in writing, receipt of a request for a Final Review within 5 working days.

**1.5**

The Director may nominate a person within Academic Services to assist them or to deal with the Final Review in accordance with this Procedure on their behalf as their ‘nominee’.   Accordingly, all references within these procedures to Director shall include the Director's nominee.

**1.6**

Where the Director has been directly involved in making decisions on the case previously (such as having provided a Stage 2 Complaint response on the same case) he/she shall immediately, following receipt of the student’s Final Review Form, refer the complaint to a Pro-Vice-Chancellor who shall deal with the matter in accordance with these **Final Review Procedures**in place of the Director.

**1.7**

The Director shall notify the complainant in writing of his/her decision (made in accordance with Section 4.2) normally within 1 calendar month of receipt of the final review application. If it should prove impracticable to respond fully within this timescale, the student shall be informed in writing of the timescale for receipt of a full response.

**1.8**

Students can seek free and independent advice and support, in confidence, in relation to final reviews from the [**Students’ Union Advice Centre**](https://www.swansea-union.co.uk/support/advicesupportcentre/).

**1.9**

The University expects all parties to act reasonably and fairly towards each other, and with respect. If a final review is not upheld, the reasons for the decision will be communicated to the student.

**2.**

##### Requests for final reviews must be based upon one or more of the following grounds:

**2.1**

Irregularities in the conduct of the relevant procedures, which are of such a nature as to cause reasonable doubt whether the party/parties concerned would have reached the same decision had they not occurred.

**2.2**

New evidence which was not made available to the party/ parties concerned when the candidate's case was considered and which can be shown to be relevant to the case.  The student must show a compelling reason why such evidence was not made known prior to the decision being made. Where the student could have made the new evidence available prior to the decision being made, such evidence cannot subsequently be cited as grounds for review.

**2.3**

That the decision reached was unreasonable on the information which had been available to the party/parties when the case was considered. To apply this ground the student must explain why no reasonable person could have reached the decision that was made.

**3.**

The Director or a nominated alternate will review the case based on the written evidence provided and will decide whether to:

**3.1**

Seek to resolve the final review through mediation / alternative dispute resolution, with the aim of achieving an outcome that is satisfactory to all (where all parties agree to this and the process involved).

**3.2**

Refer the request for a final review to the appropriate authority of the relevant procedure where it appears that the student has not completed all stages of that procedure. The student will be copied into this referral. If the student remains dissatisfied with the outcome, the student can then activate the Final Review procedure.

**3.3**

Investigate / determine the final review in accordance with Section 4 below.

**4.**

##### Investigation / Determination of the final review

**4.1**

Where the Director carries out an investigation of the final review and issues raised, in the interests of transparency and fairness, the investigation will be conducted through a process of open correspondence, unless there are compelling reasons for any information or communications to remain confidential.

**4.2**

The Director may gather further evidence from either or both parties, or from other persons, and when satisfied that sufficient evidence has been gathered will review the case and may, at his, her discretion:

1. dismiss the request for a final review. This decision shall be final, as detailed at Section 4.3 below;
2. permit the request for a final review to proceed; and
* refer the case back to: the Chair of the relevant Committee Board; the relevant Board; or the relevant Officer to reconsider the case in light of the new evidence. The decision of the Chair/Board/Officer shall be final, as detailed at Section 4.3 below;
* refer the case to an Appeal Board to consider the case (in the case of a review against a filtered academic appeal). The Appeal Board shall be arranged in accordance with the Academic Appeal procedures. However, the decision of the Chair/Board/Officer shall be final, as detailed at Section 4.3 below;
* refer the case to an entirely new Committee of Enquiry (consisting of a new Panel) under the relevant Regulations to hear the case. The Committee of Enquiry shall be arranged in accordance with the relevant Regulations. However, the decision of the Committee of Enquiry shall be final, as detailed at Section 4.3 below;
* refer the case to a Pro-Vice-Chancellor for his/her guidance or for his/her independent assessment and determination of the final review. The decision of the Pro-Vice-Chancellor shall be final, as detailed at Section 4.3 below;
* establish a Final Review Committee before which the student could present his/her case [in accordance with Sections 5, 6 and 7 below];
* in consultation with the relevant Chair/Board/Officer modify the severity of the penalty. This decision shall be final, as detailed in Section 4.3 below;
* uphold the request for a final review, in full or in part, and confirm any action to be taken accordingly. This decision shall be final, as detailed at Section 4.3 below.

**4.3**

The decision made under Sections 4.2(1) and (2) above, shall constitute the final decision of the request for Final Review, and the matter shall, therefore, be regarded as closed. There shall be no discussion of the decision with the student or any other person. The Director will issue the student with a Completion of Procedures letter.

**5.**

##### Final Review Committee

**5.1**

If it is decided by the Director that a request for a final review should be referred to a Final Review Committee, a member of Academic Services shall be appointed to act as Secretary to the Committee.

The Committee Secretary shall convene such a Committee, consisting of three Panel members (selected by the Committee Secretary); all from Senate but one of whom shall be a Pro-Vice-Chancellor or a former Pro-Vice-Chancellor of the University.

The (former) Pro-Vice-Chancellor has the discretion to substitute a member of Senate with a member of Council.

One member of the Final Review Committee Panel shall be appointed by the Board’s Secretary to act as Chair.

**5.2**

The Final Review Committee Panel shall not contain members of staff from a College in which the student is studying, or anyone who has had prior involvement in the case. Normally, the Committee will meet in private.

**5.3**

As soon as is reasonably practicable after the appointment of the Final Review Committee Panel, the Secretary shall:

* invite the student and where relevant, the student’s College, to provide, by a prescribed deadline, any evidence, written statements, statements of witnesses or other documents in support of their case which shall also be presented to the Final Review Committee. At a meeting of the Final Review Committee, the Chair has discretion to declare inadmissible any evidence received after the prescribed deadline;
* send to the student and where relevant, to the student’s College, copies of all evidence, statements of witnesses and other documents to be placed before the Final Review Committee;
* invite the student to notify the Committee Secretary of any special requirements;
* arrange the date, place and time when the Final Review Committee shall meet and inform the student and all relevant parties of the same.

**5.4**

The student shall be informed that he/she shall have the right to attend the meeting of the Final Review Committee. The student shall be required to inform the Secretary whether or not he/she intends to attend the meeting. If the student indicates that he/she does not wish to attend the meeting, the Committee shall proceed in his/her absence. Normally a student may not send any other person to the meeting in his/her place unless there are shown to be exceptional reasons why this is necessary and this is authorised by the Chair prior to the meeting.

Should the student not attend the meeting of the Final Review Committee, having previously indicated to the Committee Secretary that he/she would attend, and provided that all reasonable steps have been taken to contact the student, the meeting shall proceed in his/her absence. The Committee may also proceed in the absence of any other party/witness, at the discretion of the Chair.

**5.5**

Students are reminded that it is in their best interest to keep in contact with the University.  If the student does not respond to his/her correspondence or asks for a Final Review Committee to be postponed on more than one occasion, the University will proceed with the hearing in the absence of the student provided that all reasonable effort has been made to contact and/or accommodate the student.

**6.**

##### Procedure During the Committee Meeting

**6.1**

The student/respondent may be represented or accompanied at the meeting of the Final Review Committee by a colleague/friend (who is a member of Swansea University) or a Students' Union representative. The student shall have the right to hear all the evidence, to have a representative speak on his/her behalf, to call and question witnesses, and to draw to the Panel’s attention other evidence which has been submitted by the prescribed deadline.

**6.2**

A student/respondent who intends to be accompanied and/or represented shall inform the Secretary of the name of the person accompanying him/her in writing in advance of the meeting and shall state whether or not the person has legal qualifications. Such persons cannot normally attend in a legal capacity, unless this is approved by the Chair in advance of the meeting and this would be at the Chair’s discretion, based on the particular circumstances of the case.

**6.3**

The student shall have the right to be accompanied by a language translator if his/her first language is not English or Welsh. It is the student’s responsibility to arrange such translator if required and to be responsible for their fees. The student shall notify the Secretary of the name of the translator in advance of the meeting.

**6.4**

The student may choose to have the Committee of Enquiry hearing conducted in either English or Welsh. Students wishing to have the hearing in Welsh shall notify the Secretary, upon receiving notification of the hearing date, in order for translation services to be arranged by the University’s Welsh Language Office. Such services shall be provided free of charge to the student.

**6.5**

The Final Review Committee shall base its decision on the evidence of the student's submission, the testimony of any witnesses and (where relevant to the case) the testimony of the Chair of the Committee of Enquiry or the Academic Appeal Board concerned, together with any further evidence, which it considers relevant.

**6.6**

Witnesses can only be concerned with evidence relating directly to the case and shall normally withdraw after questioning.  They shall normally be interviewed individually.  A witness cannot therefore attend both in the capacity of witness and representative. The Chair of the Panel might wish to consider allowing witnesses to remain in the hearing throughout the proceedings provided that both parties agree to this in advance or the Chair considers it pertinent to the case for a witness to remain.

**6.7**

At a meeting of the Final Review Committee, the Chair has discretion to declare inadmissible any matter introduced by the student, or by any person accompanying the student, if he/she deems it not directly related to the contents of the request for review previously lodged in writing by the student.

**6.8**

The decision of the Final Review Committee shall be conveyed by the Director, or his/her nominee, as soon as possible to the student and the relevant respondent or Committee/Board Chair.

**6.9**

The Final Review Committee is obliged to hear the case on the basis of the facts presented before it at the meeting of the Final Review Committee and not in the light of anything that the Panel members may have heard or discovered outside of the Committee meeting.

**7.**

##### Outcomes Available to the Final Review Committee

**7.1**

The options available to the Final Review Committee shall be to:

1. dismiss the request for review and uphold the original decision of the Committee of Enquiry, University Officer or Academic Appeal Board;
2. uphold the request for review and confirm appropriate action to be taken based on the circumstances of the case.

**7.2**

The decision of the Final Review Committee shall be final, and the matter shall, therefore, be regarded as closed.  There shall be no discussion of the decision of the Final Review Committee with the student or any other person. The Director will issue the student with a Completion of Procedures letter.

**8.**

##### Office of the Independent Adjudicator (OIA)

**8.1**

[**The Office of the Independent Adjudicator for Higher Education (OIA)**](http://www.oiahe.org.uk/) operates an independent student complaints programme pursuant to the Higher Education Act 2004. All higher education institutions in England and Wales are required to comply with the Rules of the programme. The OIA is not a regulator; it handles individual complaints against higher education institutions and is a free service to students.

**8.2**

Students who are dissatisfied with the outcome of their appeal may be able to complain to the OIA providing that their complaint is eligible under its Rules (these are on the [**OIA website**](http://www.oiahe.org.uk/)).

**8.3**

Students will need to send to the OIA a Scheme Application Form within twelve months of the date of the Completion of Procedures letter. (See 6.3 above.)  A Scheme Application Form can be obtained from the Director's Office and/or the Students' Union and may also be [**downloaded from the OIA website**](http://www.oiahe.org.uk/students/download-saf.aspx). Students should send a copy of their Completion of Procedures letter to the OIA with their Scheme Application Form.

**9.**

##### Reporting, Monitoring, Evaluation and Review

**9.1**

Academic Services shall report to the Academic Regulations and Cases Board statistical information relating to Final Reviews on an annual basis. It shall be the responsibility of the Academic Regulations and Cases Board to monitor the data and make recommendations to the Academic Standards and Quality Committee as appropriate.

**9.2**

It shall also be the responsibility of the Academic Regulations and Cases Board to review the Final Review Procedures and their effectiveness and make recommendations for changes to the Academic Standards and Quality Committee, where appropriate, to be considered by Senate

# 5. Cases to be referred to the University's Committee of Enquiry

##### Cases to be Referred to the University's Committee of Enquiry

**5.1**

##### Informing the Director of Academic Integrity

The College's Academic Integrity Officer should inform the Director of Academic Integrity in writing, who shall confirm either that:

1. a case exists and inform the College (or nominee) and the Director of Academic Services that a Committee of Enquiry should be convened; or
2. that no case exists and that no further action should be taken.

In some cases the Director of Academic Integrity may decide that poor referencing has occurred. In such instances the student should be referred to their Tutor for advice and guidance on referencing. Once they have met with their Tutor students should then be asked to sign a statement confirming that they have received advice and understand referencing conventions.

**5.2**

If a case exists the candidate shall be informed in writing by Academic Services of the allegation and that a Committee of Enquiry will be constituted to consider the case

# 6. Taught Master's Directed Independent Learning and Research Theses - Initial Stages

#### Academic Misconduct in Work Completed in Taught Master's Directed Independent Learning and Research Degree Theses - Initial Stages

**6.1**

If after formal submission, a Supervisor/Examiner considers, or suspects, that academic misconduct has occurred in relation to the directed independent learning for a taught master's programme or a research degree thesis he/she shall report the matter in writing to the College's Academic Integrity Officer as soon as possible.  In cases where academic misconduct is identified during the Viva, the Examination Board should be suspended and the College informed.

The member of staff (or his/her colleague) may require the student to attend an academic integrity viva to test the student’s knowledge of the work submitted before reporting the matter to the First College Academic Integrity Officer, in accordance with 3.1 above.

**6.2**

The College's Academic Integrity Officer shall first decide whether there is a prima facie case for treating the matter as a case of academic misconduct by referring to documentation/evidence. The College's Academic Integrity Officer should inform the student concerned of the suspected case of academic misconduct and shall inform the Director of Academic Integrity, in writing, who shall confirm whether a prima facie case exists. The Director of Academic Integrity should confirm either that;

1. a case exists and inform the College Academic Integrity Officer and the Director of Academic Services that a Committee of Enquiry should be convened; or
2. that no case exists and that no further action should be taken.

In some cases the Director of Academic Integrity may decide that poor referencing has occurred. In such instances the student should be referred to their Tutor and/or Subject Librarian for advice and guidance on referencing. Once they have met with their Tutor and/or Subject Librarian, students should be asked to sign a statement confirming that they have received advice and understand referencing conventions.

**6.3**

If a case exists, the candidate shall be informed in writing by the Director of Academic Services of the allegation and that a Committee of Enquiry will be constituted to consider the case

# 7. Joint cases - ICWS (non-integrated) and Swansea/ICWS (integrated)

#### Joint Academic Misconduct cases involving ICWS students on non-integrated programmes and Swansea students and/or ICWS students on integrated programmes – Initial stages

**7.1**

Joint cases (first offences) involving ICWS students on non-integrated programmes and Swansea students and/or ICWS students on integrated programmes shall be dealt with in accordance with the Swansea University procedures.

**7.2**

Cases involving ICWS students on non-integrated programmes only shall be dealt with by ICWS.

**7.3**

In joint cases dealt with by the University (7.1 above), a representative from ICWS may be involved in stages two to six (see 3.5-3.9).

**7.4**

In cases dealt with by a University Committee of Enquiry a representative from ICWS maybe invited to sit on the Committee in accordance with regulation 9.0

# 8. Academic Misconduct after an Award has been bestowed – Initial Stages

##### Academic Misconduct After an Award has been Bestowed – Initial Stages

**8.1**

Where an allegation of academic misconduct arises after an Award has been bestowed the University shall consider the case in accordance with the regulations governing revocation of Award.

**8.2**

The Director of Academic Integrity shall initially consider the evidence and shall either dismiss the case, or confirm that a prima facie case of academic misconduct exists. The Director of Academic Integrity will then refer the case to the Vice Chancellor or nominee (normally a Pro Vice Chancellor) who will consider the request to establish a Committee of Enquiry. In arriving at a decision, the Vice Chancellor or nominee will consider the evidence available to substantiate the case; the time elapsed since the alleged offence and the broader interests of the University. If a prima facie case exists he/she shall request that a Committee of Enquiry is established to hear the case.

**8.3**

The Committee of Enquiry shall be conducted in accordance with the regulations below. Where a case is substantiated the Committee shall make a recommendation to Senate on the outcome and any penalty to be applied

# 9. Establishment of the University's Committee of Enquiry to deal with cases of Academic Misconduct

#### Establishment of the University's Committee of Enquiry to deal with cases of Academic Misconduct

**9.1**

On receipt of an allegation of academic misconduct, submitted by the Director of Academic Integrity, Academic Services shall arrange for an appropriate Committee of Enquiry to be convened as soon as reasonably possible, normally within a month of the allegation being made. A member of staff from Academic Services will normally act as Secretary to the Committee. The Director of Academic Integrity (or nominated deputy) shall present the case against the student and shall not act as Chair or Secretary to the Committee.

**9.2**

Each Committee of Enquiry Panel shall consist of 3 members (selected by the Committee Secretary), namely an experienced Chair (selected from a list of approved Chairs), a member of academic staff of the University and a Students’ Union Full-time Officer. Where it is not practicable for the Secretary to arrange for a Students’ Union Officer to sit as a member of the Panel without this resulting in a significant delay to the scheduling of the Committee, the Secretary may select a third member of academic staff in place of the Students’ Union Officer.

In the case of an allegation concerning an ICWS student, the Committee of Enquiry may include a fourth Panel member who is a member of staff from ICWS, normally the Director of Academic and Support Services or his/her nominee.

The Committee of Enquiry Panel shall not contain members of staff from the College in which the student is studying nor members who have had any prior involvement in the case concerned.  A decision of the Committee Panel will be reached by a majority vote of the Panel members. The votes of the individual members will be treated as confidential. In the event of a tie decision, the Chair shall have an additional casting vote.

**9.3**

As soon as reasonably practicable after the appointment of the Committee of Enquiry, and bearing in mind the University's expectation that such cases should normally be heard within a month of the allegation being made, the Secretary shall:

1. send to the candidate copies of statements of witnesses and any other evidence to be placed before the Committee of Enquiry, and offer the candidate an opportunity to indicate any statement or documents which may be in dispute;
2. notify the Director of Academic Integrity (or nominated deputy) and members of the Committee of Enquiry of the date, place and time of the meeting and supply them with copies of the allegation and of any statements or documents.

The Secretary shall, at the same time, inform the candidate of the date, place and time when the Committee of Enquiry intends to meet and that he/she shall have the right to be accompanied. A student may bring an interpreter if it is felt that they will not be able to understand the proceedings fully. It is the student's responsibility to arrange such a translator and to be responsible for their fees (except for Welsh translation; see 9.7 below).  The student shall notify the Secretary of the name of the translator in advance of the meeting.

**9.4**

Any documentary evidence to be presented in the student's defence should be sent to Academic Services prior to the date of the meeting and circulated to members of the Committee. The candidate shall be required to inform the Secretary whether or not he/she intends to attend the meeting of the Committee of Enquiry. If the candidate indicates that he/she does not wish to attend the meeting, the Committee of Enquiry shall proceed in his/her absence. Normally a student may not send any other person to the meeting in his/her absence unless this is authorised by the Chair prior to the meeting. Where no response is received from a student and after all reasonable means have been taken to contact the candidate, the meeting shall proceed in his/her absence. In exceptional circumstances, provision may be made for one postponement.

Any further evidence made available on the date of the meeting may be presented to the Committee but only with the express permission of the Chair.

**9.5**

The Committee does not have to take intent into consideration and in relation to an allegation of academic misconduct there can be no defence that the offence was committed unintentionally or accidentally. Such circumstances can however be submitted by the student as mitigation in relation to the penalty to be imposed.

**9.6**

Committee hearings should be held at Swansea University unless alternative regulations have been agreed upon e.g. Collaborative Partner's campus.

**9.7**

Committee hearings shall be held in English or, at the request of a student, in Welsh. Students wishing to have the hearing in Welsh shall notify the Secretary, upon receiving notification of the hearing date, in order for translation services to be arranged by the University's Welsh Language office. Such services shall be provided free of charge to the student.

**9.8**

A candidate who intends to be accompanied shall inform the Secretary of the name of the person accompanying him/her in writing in advance and shall state whether or not the person representing or accompanying him/her has legal qualifications. Such persons cannot attend the Committee hearing in a legal capacity.

**9.9**

Should a candidate not attend the meeting of the Committee of Enquiry, having previously indicated to the Secretary that he/she would attend, and provided that all reasonable means have been taken to contact the candidate, the meeting shall proceed in his/her absence

# 10. Functions of the Committee

**10.1**

The functions of the Committee of Enquiry shall be:

* to consider the evidence submitted to it with regard to the allegation of academic misconduct;
* to determine whether the allegation has been substantiated;
* to determine, in appropriate cases, the penalty which should be imposed.

# 11. Procedure during the Meeting

**11.1**

In cases where two or more candidates are accused of related offences, such as in the case of collusion, the Chair may decide to deal with the cases together. However, each candidate must be given the opportunity to request that the cases be heard separately.  The decision will be made by the Chair.

**11.2**

The Director of Academic Integrity (or nominated deputy) shall present the case, on behalf of the University, against the candidate(s), calling such witnesses and presenting such evidence as he/she thinks fit.

The Director of Academic Integrity (or nominated deputy) may question both the candidate and witnesses. The candidate may question the witnesses called by the Director of Academic Integrity.

**11.3**

The candidate shall have the right to be represented or accompanied, to hear all the evidence brought against him/her, to call and question witnesses, and to submit other evidence. The Chair may invite contributions from the person accompanying the student.

**11.4**

Witnesses can only be concerned with evidence relating directly to the allegation and shall normally withdraw after questioning.  The Chair may wish to consider allowing witnesses to remain in the hearing throughout the procedures provided that both parties agree to this in advance or the Chair considers it pertinent to the case for a witness to remain.

**11.5**

Additional documentary evidence may only be presented to the Committee on the day of the hearing with the express permission of the Chair.

**11.6**

When the submission of evidence and the questioning of witnesses are completed, all persons, other than the members of the Committee, the secretary and other Academic Services staff, if present, shall withdraw.

**11.7**

The Chair of the Committee may approve an adjournment of the hearing following a reasonable request from either party or from the Committee itself. For example, to gain further evidence, such as to obtain documentary evidence in support of an oral statement made or to test a student's knowledge of the work in question if there remains uncertainty that the work is the student's own work.

**11.8**

The Committee of Enquiry shall then consider whether on the basis of the evidence presented the allegation has been substantiated. The burden of proof (duty of proving the allegation) shall rest on the University and the standard of proof should be on the balance of probabilities: a fact will be established if it is more likely than not to have happened.

**11.9**

The Committee of Enquiry shall not normally be informed, before reaching its verdict on the allegation under consideration, of any evidence of previously substantiated allegations of academic misconduct; the Committee should be so informed before determining the penalty in appropriate cases.

However, in exceptional cases, evidence of previous substantiated acts of academic misconduct may be disclosed prior to the verdict of the Committee where such evidence:

* rebuts a claim of previous good character made by the candidate/representative;
* is relevant to the allegation under consideration (other than merely showing that the candidate had a disposition to commit the facts alleged) and its prejudicial effect does not outweigh its probative value.

**11.10**

The Committee does not have to take intent into consideration. However, mitigation may be considered in relation to the penalty.

**11.11**

If the Committee finds that the case has been substantiated, it shall then consider the penalty to be imposed. Penalties are divided into:

* Penalties available for academic misconduct in examination conditions (see 12).
* Penalties available for academic misconduct under non-examination conditions (see 13).
* Penalties available for academic misconduct in Research degrees (see 14)

**11.12**

If the Committee finds that the case has not been substantiated the candidate shall be informed of the outcome in writing. All record of the case shall be removed from the student's file

# 12. Penalties - Examination Conditions

#### Penalties Available to the Committee for Academic Misconduct in Examination Conditions

**12.1**

The Committee shall consult the Code of Practice for Academic Misconduct, case history and the candidate's academic record before imposing any penalty. In order to ensure consistency in the application of penalties the University provides guidance on penalties in the Code of Practice on Academic Misconduct. However, the Committee may also wish to take into consideration any mitigating circumstances. The Committee should be convinced that the mitigating circumstances have a direct bearing on the case and, in particular, had influenced the action of the student(s) concerned. The full list of penalties available to the Committee of Enquiry shall be:

**12.1.1**

the issue of a formal reprimand to the candidate;

**12.1.2**

the cancellation of the candidate's marks for the examination paper;

**12.1.3**

the cancellation of the candidate's marks for the module concerned;

**12.1.4**

the cancellation of the candidate's mark in the module concerned and the preclusion of redeeming the failure until the next academic session;

**12.1.5**

the cancellation of the candidate's marks in all of the modules for the particular level of study;

**12.1.6**

the cancellation of the candidate's marks in all of the modules for the particular level of study and the disqualification of the candidate from any future University examination;

**12.1.7**

In the event of a Committee deciding that the above penalties are inappropriate, the Committee may use its discretion to decide upon an appropriate penalty.

Where an allegation has been substantiated, and this may affect the candidate's ability to practise in a particular profession, the case may also be referred to the Head of College or nominee who will decide whether to inform the professional body. In some instances the Head of College will be obliged to inform the Professional Body.

##### Retrieval and Capping

The decision whether to allow a student to retake work/assessment(s) shall be taken by the relevant Examination Board, in accordance with the assessment regulations for the programme.

Where 12.1.4 or 12.1.5 is applied prior to the end of the session a candidate may be required to suspend their studies.

The penalty shall be recorded on the student's central record

# 13. Penalties - Non-Examination Conditions

#### Penalties Available to the Committee of Enquiry in Cases of Academic Misconduct in Non-examination Conditions

**13.1**

The Committee shall consult the Code of Practice for Academic Misconduct, the case history and the candidate's academic record before imposing a penalty. In order to ensure consistency in the application of penalties, the University provides guidance on penalties in the Code of Practice on Academic Misconduct. However, the Committee may also wish to take into account any mitigating circumstances. The Committee should be convinced that the mitigating circumstances have a direct bearing on the case and, in particular, had influenced the action of the student(s) concerned. The full list of penalties available to the Committee of Enquiry shall be:

**13.1.1**

the issue of a written reprimand to the candidate and the text to be ignored when marking, resulting in a reduced mark;

**13.1.2**

the cancellation of the marks for the module component;

**13.1.3**

the cancellation of the candidate's marks for the assignment;

**13.1.4**

the cancellation of the candidate's mark in the module concerned;

**13.1.5**

the cancellation of the candidate's mark in the module concerned and the preclusion of redeeming the failure until the next academic session;

**13.1.6**

the cancellation of the candidate's marks in all of the modules for the particular level of study;

**13.1.7**

the cancellation of the candidate's mark in all of the modules for the particular level of study and the disqualification of the candidate from any future University examination;

**13.1.8**

In the event of a Committee deciding that the above penalties are inappropriate, the Committee may use its discretion to decide upon an appropriate penalty.

Where an allegation has been substantiated, and this may affect the candidate's fitness to practise, the case may also be referred to the Head of College or nominee in accordance with the University’s [**Fitness to Practise Regulations**](https://www.swan.ac.uk/academic-services/academic-guide/conduct-and-complaints/fitness-to-practise/).

##### Retrieval and Capping

Where 13.1.2, 13.1.3 or 13.1.4 are applied, the decision whether to allow a student to retake work/assessment(s) shall be taken by the relevant Examination Board, in accordance with the assessment regulations for the programme.

Where 13.1.5 or 13.1.6 are applied prior to the end of the session a candidate may be required to suspend their studies.

The penalty shall be recorded on the student's central record.

# 14. Penalties - Taught Master's Directed Independent Learning and Research Degrees

#### Penalties available to the Committee in cases of Academic Misconduct in Research degrees (including the Directed Independent Learning for Taught Masters degrees)

**14.1**

The Committee shall consult the Code of Practice on Academic Misconduct, the case history and the candidate's academic record before imposing a penalty. In order to ensure consistency in the application of penalties the University provides guidance on penalties in the Code of Practice on Academic Misconduct. However, the Committee may also wish to take into consideration any mitigating circumstances. The Committee should be convinced that the mitigating circumstances have a direct bearing on the case, and, in particular, had influenced the action of the student(s) concerned. The full list of penalties available to the Committee of Enquiry shall be:

**14.1.1**

the issue of a formal reprimand to the candidate;

**14.1.2**

the candidate be awarded a decision of Fail, with a right of resubmission;

**14.1.3**

the candidate be awarded a decision of Fail, with no right of resubmission;

**14.1.4**

In the event of a Committee deciding that the above penalties are inappropriate, the Committee may use its discretion to decide upon an appropriate penalty.

Where an allegation has been substantiated and this may affect the candidate's fitness to practise in a particular profession, the case may also be referred to the Head of College or nominee in accordance with the University’s [**Fitness to Practise Regulations**](https://www.swan.ac.uk/academic-services/academic-guide/conduct-and-complaints/fitness-to-practise/).

##### Retrieval and Capping

The decision whether to allow a student to retake work/assessment(s) shall be taken by the relevant Examination Board, in accordance with the assessment regulations for the programme.

The penalty shall be recorded on the student's central record

# 15. Penalties - After an Award has been bestowed

#### Penalties available to the Committee in cases of Academic Misconduct after an Award has been bestowed

**15.1**

The Committee shall make a recommendation to Senate regarding an appropriate penalty. The Committee should consult the Code of Practice on Academic Misconduct, case history and the candidate’s academic record before imposing a penalty. In order to ensure consistency in the application of penalties the University provides guidance on penalties in the Code of Practice on Academic Misconduct. The Committee may wish to take into consideration mitigating circumstances. The Committee should be convinced that the mitigating circumstances have a direct bearing on the case and in particular had influenced the action of the student concerned. The full list of penalties available to the Committee of Enquiry shall be:

**15.1.1**

the cancellation of the candidate’s marks for the whole or part of a module;

**15.1.2**

the cancellation of the candidate’s marks in all of the modules for the particular level of study;

**15.1.3**

reduction of a degree result by one class or the deprivation of a distinction\*, as appropriate.

\*Distinction refers to any classification of the Award including distinction/merit/commendation etc

**15.1.4**

the disqualification of the candidate from any future examination.

**15.1.5**

In the event of a Committee deciding that the above penalties are inappropriate, the Committee may use its discretion to decide upon an appropriate penalty.

**15.1.6**

Where an allegation has been substantiated, and this may affect the candidate’s fitness to practise, the case may also be referred to the Head of College or nominee in accordance with the University’s Fitness to Practise Regulations.

##### Retrieval and Capping

Where the Committee chooses to implement 15.1.1 and 15.1.2, the committee shall also consider whether the candidate shall be permitted to redeem the work in question for a capped mark, in accordance with the assessment regulations for the programme of study.

# 16. Action after an Award has been Bestowed

#### Action to be taken following the Committee of Enquiry in cases occurring after an Award has been bestowed

**16.1**

When the Committee of Enquiry has investigated the facts of the alleged academic misconduct the Secretary shall in his/her report state whether or not the allegation has been substantiated and shall state any penalty to be imposed. The report shall be submitted to Senate as soon as possible after the Enquiry has been completed.

**16.2**

The student shall be informed of the outcome of the hearing.

**16.3**

The candidate shall be informed that there is no right of appeal/final review against the decision, however, where a candidate feels that there have been irregularities in the conduct of the procedures they shall have 14 working days in which to inform Academic Services. If it is found that irregularities have occurred; the case shall be referred to a new Committee of Enquiry.

**16.4**

Normally, the University would not make any public pronouncements of decisions of Committees of Enquiry. However, the University will maintain a record of all cases, which will be available to the public on request.

In investigating allegations of academic misconduct, the Director of Academic Integrity, on behalf of the University, reserves the right to consult with other Universities or organisations, where appropriate.

**16.5**

The final outcome of the case shall be reported to Senate, together with any recommendation for further action, such as deprivation or revocation of a qualification, if warranted as well as details of any subsequent action e.g. investigations into irregularities in the conduct of the procedures. Senate shall make a determination in the case including a decision to deprive a person of a qualification or to revoke a qualification if warranted.

# 17. Action following the Committee of Enquiry

#### Action to be taken following the Committee of Enquiry - all other cases

**17.1**

When the Committee of Enquiry has investigated the facts of the alleged academic misconduct the Secretary shall in his/her report state whether or not the allegation has been substantiated and shall state any penalty to be imposed.

**17.2**

If the finding of the Committee of Enquiry is that a case has not been substantiated, the Chair of the Committee of Enquiry may inform the candidate verbally of this. Irrespective of whether or not the candidate is informed verbally, Academic Services shall notify the candidate, formally in writing, of the Committee of Enquiry's findings and that the matter is therefore closed.

**17.3**

If the finding of the Committee of Enquiry is that the allegation has been substantiated, the Chair of the Committee of Enquiry may inform the candidate verbally, but there shall be no discussion of the Committee's decision with the candidate. Irrespective of whether or not the candidate is informed verbally, the Director of Academic Services shall inform the candidate of the findings, in writing, and the penalty imposed.

**17.4**

A candidate shall be informed of his/her right to request a final review of the outcome determined by the Committee of Enquiry.  Any such request must be submitted to the Director of Academic Services within 14 working days of the date of the letter/email to the student confirming the outcome of the Committee of Enquiry, in accordance with the University’s Final Review Procedure.  Students should note that a final review of the outcome could result in a more severe penalty being imposed (e.g. if the current outcome is cancelled and the case is referred for a new determination).

**17.5**

Where the allegation has been substantiated, the relevant Examining Board will determine the candidate's overall progression/award decision, in light of the penalty imposed by the Committee of Enquiry.

**17.6**

If the Committee of Enquiry has decided that the mark obtained for the unit of assessment, in which academic misconduct has occurred, shall be cancelled, the Examining Board shall award a mark of zero for the unit and shall then determine the candidate's overall result.

**17.7**

Normally, the University would not make any public pronouncements of decisions of Committees of Enquiry. However, the University will maintain a record of all cases, which will be available to the public on request.

**17.8**

The Academic Regulations and Cases Board shall receive an annual report on issues relating to academic misconduct.

# 18. Final Reviews

**18.1**

To request a final review of the outcome of the academic misconduct case, please see Swansea University's [**Final Review procedures**](http://www.swansea.ac.uk/academic-services/academic-guide/conduct-and-complaints/final-review-procedure/).  Students should note that any request for a final review must be submitted to the Director of Academic Services within 14 working days of the date of the letter/email to the student confirming the outcome of the academic misconduct case, in accordance with the Final Review Procedure.

# Final Review Procedure

**1.1**

Where a student has been given a formal decision/outcome under relevant regulations/procedures, the student may request a final review of the decision/outcome in accordance with this Final Review Procedure. By way of example, students may request a final review of the formal decisions made/outcomes imposed at the conclusion of the University’s:

* [**Academic Misconduct Procedure**](http://www.swansea.ac.uk/academic-services/academic-guide/assessment-and-progress/academic-misconduct-procedure/);
* [**Appeals Regulations**](http://www.swansea.ac.uk/academic-services/academic-guide/assessment-and-progress/academic-appeals/);
* [**Complaints Procedure**](http://www.swansea.ac.uk/academic-services/academic-guide/conduct-and-complaints/complaints-procedure/);
* [**Fitness to Practise Procedure**](http://www.swansea.ac.uk/academic-services/academic-guide/conduct-and-complaints/fitness-to-practise/);
* [**Disciplinary Procedures**](http://www.swansea.ac.uk/academic-services/academic-guide/conduct-and-complaints/disciplinary-procedures/).

The above list is not exhaustive and students should refer to the relevant regulations regarding the stage when they may request a final review (if applicable).

**1.2**

Any requests for a final review must be made in writing to the Director of Academic Services [hereinafter referred to as the 'Director'] **within 14 working days** of the original decision of the Committee, Board or University Officer by submitting the form which can be downloaded via the [**University's MyStudies (Blackboard) website**](https://blackboard.swan.ac.uk/webapps/portal/frameset.jsp) or obtained from [**Academic Services**](http://www.swansea.ac.uk/academic-services/).

To request a final review of a decision taken in relation to attendance through the [**Attendance Monitoring Policy for Taught Students**](http://www.swansea.ac.uk/academic-services/academic-guide/assessment-and-progress/attendance-monitoring-taught-students/) or the [**Attendance Monitoring Policy for Research Students (to include Masters by Research)**](http://www.swansea.ac.uk/academic-services/academic-guide/assessment-and-progress/attendance-monitoring-research-students/) or the [**Tier 4 Attendance Monitoring Policy**](http://www.swansea.ac.uk/academic-services/academic-guide/assessment-and-progress/tier-4-attendance-monitoring-policy/) students must submit their final review application form to the Director within**5 working days** of the date of the letter/email confirming the withdrawal decision.

**1.3**

If a final review application form is not received within the time limits stipulated, the final review will normally be treated as **not eligible** for consideration on the basis it is ‘out of time’, unless the student shows there to be a compelling reason for not having submitted the application within the time limits. Where it is decided that a final review application is not eligible for consideration, the student will be advised of this outcome by letter.

**1.4**

Academic Services shall acknowledge, in writing, receipt of a request for a Final Review within 5 working days.

**1.5**

The Director may nominate a person within Academic Services to assist them or to deal with the Final Review in accordance with this Procedure on their behalf as their ‘nominee’.   Accordingly, all references within these procedures to Director shall include the Director's nominee.

**1.6**

Where the Director has been directly involved in making decisions on the case previously (such as having provided a Stage 2 Complaint response on the same case) he/she shall immediately, following receipt of the student’s Final Review Form, refer the complaint to a Pro-Vice-Chancellor who shall deal with the matter in accordance with these **Final Review Procedures**in place of the Director.

**1.7**

The Director shall notify the complainant in writing of his/her decision (made in accordance with Section 4.2) normally within 1 calendar month of receipt of the final review application. If it should prove impracticable to respond fully within this timescale, the student shall be informed in writing of the timescale for receipt of a full response.

**1.8**

Students can seek free and independent advice and support, in confidence, in relation to final reviews from the [**Students’ Union Advice Centre**](https://www.swansea-union.co.uk/support/advicesupportcentre/).

**1.9**

The University expects all parties to act reasonably and fairly towards each other, and with respect. If a final review is not upheld, the reasons for the decision will be communicated to the student.

**2.**

##### Requests for final reviews must be based upon one or more of the following grounds:

**2.1**

Irregularities in the conduct of the relevant procedures, which are of such a nature as to cause reasonable doubt whether the party/parties concerned would have reached the same decision had they not occurred.

**2.2**

New evidence which was not made available to the party/ parties concerned when the candidate's case was considered and which can be shown to be relevant to the case.  The student must show a compelling reason why such evidence was not made known prior to the decision being made. Where the student could have made the new evidence available prior to the decision being made, such evidence cannot subsequently be cited as grounds for review.

**2.3**

That the decision reached was unreasonable on the information which had been available to the party/parties when the case was considered. To apply this ground the student must explain why no reasonable person could have reached the decision that was made.

**3.**

The Director or a nominated alternate will review the case based on the written evidence provided and will decide whether to:

**3.1**

Seek to resolve the final review through mediation / alternative dispute resolution, with the aim of achieving an outcome that is satisfactory to all (where all parties agree to this and the process involved).

**3.2**

Refer the request for a final review to the appropriate authority of the relevant procedure where it appears that the student has not completed all stages of that procedure. The student will be copied into this referral. If the student remains dissatisfied with the outcome, the student can then activate the Final Review procedure.

**3.3**

Investigate / determine the final review in accordance with Section 4 below.

**4.**

##### Investigation / Determination of the final review

**4.1**

Where the Director carries out an investigation of the final review and issues raised, in the interests of transparency and fairness, the investigation will be conducted through a process of open correspondence, unless there are compelling reasons for any information or communications to remain confidential.

**4.2**

The Director may gather further evidence from either or both parties, or from other persons, and when satisfied that sufficient evidence has been gathered will review the case and may, at his, her discretion:

1. dismiss the request for a final review. This decision shall be final, as detailed at Section 4.3 below;
2. permit the request for a final review to proceed; and
* refer the case back to: the Chair of the relevant Committee Board; the relevant Board; or the relevant Officer to reconsider the case in light of the new evidence. The decision of the Chair/Board/Officer shall be final, as detailed at Section 4.3 below;
* refer the case to an Appeal Board to consider the case (in the case of a review against a filtered academic appeal). The Appeal Board shall be arranged in accordance with the Academic Appeal procedures. However, the decision of the Chair/Board/Officer shall be final, as detailed at Section 4.3 below;
* refer the case to an entirely new Committee of Enquiry (consisting of a new Panel) under the relevant Regulations to hear the case. The Committee of Enquiry shall be arranged in accordance with the relevant Regulations. However, the decision of the Committee of Enquiry shall be final, as detailed at Section 4.3 below;
* refer the case to a Pro-Vice-Chancellor for his/her guidance or for his/her independent assessment and determination of the final review. The decision of the Pro-Vice-Chancellor shall be final, as detailed at Section 4.3 below;
* establish a Final Review Committee before which the student could present his/her case [in accordance with Sections 5, 6 and 7 below];
* in consultation with the relevant Chair/Board/Officer modify the severity of the penalty. This decision shall be final, as detailed in Section 4.3 below;
* uphold the request for a final review, in full or in part, and confirm any action to be taken accordingly. This decision shall be final, as detailed at Section 4.3 below.

**4.3**

The decision made under Sections 4.2(1) and (2) above, shall constitute the final decision of the request for Final Review, and the matter shall, therefore, be regarded as closed. There shall be no discussion of the decision with the student or any other person. The Director will issue the student with a Completion of Procedures letter.

**5.**

##### Final Review Committee

**5.1**

If it is decided by the Director that a request for a final review should be referred to a Final Review Committee, a member of Academic Services shall be appointed to act as Secretary to the Committee.

The Committee Secretary shall convene such a Committee, consisting of three Panel members (selected by the Committee Secretary); all from Senate but one of whom shall be a Pro-Vice-Chancellor or a former Pro-Vice-Chancellor of the University.

The (former) Pro-Vice-Chancellor has the discretion to substitute a member of Senate with a member of Council.

One member of the Final Review Committee Panel shall be appointed by the Board’s Secretary to act as Chair.

**5.2**

The Final Review Committee Panel shall not contain members of staff from a College in which the student is studying, or anyone who has had prior involvement in the case. Normally, the Committee will meet in private.

**5.3**

As soon as is reasonably practicable after the appointment of the Final Review Committee Panel, the Secretary shall:

* invite the student and where relevant, the student’s College, to provide, by a prescribed deadline, any evidence, written statements, statements of witnesses or other documents in support of their case which shall also be presented to the Final Review Committee. At a meeting of the Final Review Committee, the Chair has discretion to declare inadmissible any evidence received after the prescribed deadline;
* send to the student and where relevant, to the student’s College, copies of all evidence, statements of witnesses and other documents to be placed before the Final Review Committee;
* invite the student to notify the Committee Secretary of any special requirements;
* arrange the date, place and time when the Final Review Committee shall meet and inform the student and all relevant parties of the same.

**5.4**

The student shall be informed that he/she shall have the right to attend the meeting of the Final Review Committee. The student shall be required to inform the Secretary whether or not he/she intends to attend the meeting. If the student indicates that he/she does not wish to attend the meeting, the Committee shall proceed in his/her absence. Normally a student may not send any other person to the meeting in his/her place unless there are shown to be exceptional reasons why this is necessary and this is authorised by the Chair prior to the meeting.

Should the student not attend the meeting of the Final Review Committee, having previously indicated to the Committee Secretary that he/she would attend, and provided that all reasonable steps have been taken to contact the student, the meeting shall proceed in his/her absence. The Committee may also proceed in the absence of any other party/witness, at the discretion of the Chair.

**5.5**

Students are reminded that it is in their best interest to keep in contact with the University.  If the student does not respond to his/her correspondence or asks for a Final Review Committee to be postponed on more than one occasion, the University will proceed with the hearing in the absence of the student provided that all reasonable effort has been made to contact and/or accommodate the student.

**6.**

##### Procedure During the Committee Meeting

**6.1**

The student/respondent may be represented or accompanied at the meeting of the Final Review Committee by a colleague/friend (who is a member of Swansea University) or a Students' Union representative. The student shall have the right to hear all the evidence, to have a representative speak on his/her behalf, to call and question witnesses, and to draw to the Panel’s attention other evidence which has been submitted by the prescribed deadline.

**6.2**

A student/respondent who intends to be accompanied and/or represented shall inform the Secretary of the name of the person accompanying him/her in writing in advance of the meeting and shall state whether or not the person has legal qualifications. Such persons cannot normally attend in a legal capacity, unless this is approved by the Chair in advance of the meeting and this would be at the Chair’s discretion, based on the particular circumstances of the case.

**6.3**

The student shall have the right to be accompanied by a language translator if his/her first language is not English or Welsh. It is the student’s responsibility to arrange such translator if required and to be responsible for their fees. The student shall notify the Secretary of the name of the translator in advance of the meeting.

**6.4**

The student may choose to have the Committee of Enquiry hearing conducted in either English or Welsh. Students wishing to have the hearing in Welsh shall notify the Secretary, upon receiving notification of the hearing date, in order for translation services to be arranged by the University’s Welsh Language Office. Such services shall be provided free of charge to the student.

**6.5**

The Final Review Committee shall base its decision on the evidence of the student's submission, the testimony of any witnesses and (where relevant to the case) the testimony of the Chair of the Committee of Enquiry or the Academic Appeal Board concerned, together with any further evidence, which it considers relevant.

**6.6**

Witnesses can only be concerned with evidence relating directly to the case and shall normally withdraw after questioning.  They shall normally be interviewed individually.  A witness cannot therefore attend both in the capacity of witness and representative. The Chair of the Panel might wish to consider allowing witnesses to remain in the hearing throughout the proceedings provided that both parties agree to this in advance or the Chair considers it pertinent to the case for a witness to remain.

**6.7**

At a meeting of the Final Review Committee, the Chair has discretion to declare inadmissible any matter introduced by the student, or by any person accompanying the student, if he/she deems it not directly related to the contents of the request for review previously lodged in writing by the student.

**6.8**

The decision of the Final Review Committee shall be conveyed by the Director, or his/her nominee, as soon as possible to the student and the relevant respondent or Committee/Board Chair.

**6.9**

The Final Review Committee is obliged to hear the case on the basis of the facts presented before it at the meeting of the Final Review Committee and not in the light of anything that the Panel members may have heard or discovered outside of the Committee meeting.

**7.**

##### Outcomes Available to the Final Review Committee

**7.1**

The options available to the Final Review Committee shall be to:

1. dismiss the request for review and uphold the original decision of the Committee of Enquiry, University Officer or Academic Appeal Board;
2. uphold the request for review and confirm appropriate action to be taken based on the circumstances of the case.

**7.2**

The decision of the Final Review Committee shall be final, and the matter shall, therefore, be regarded as closed.  There shall be no discussion of the decision of the Final Review Committee with the student or any other person. The Director will issue the student with a Completion of Procedures letter.

**8.**

##### Office of the Independent Adjudicator (OIA)

**8.1**

[**The Office of the Independent Adjudicator for Higher Education (OIA)**](http://www.oiahe.org.uk/) operates an independent student complaints programme pursuant to the Higher Education Act 2004. All higher education institutions in England and Wales are required to comply with the Rules of the programme. The OIA is not a regulator; it handles individual complaints against higher education institutions and is a free service to students.

**8.2**

Students who are dissatisfied with the outcome of their appeal may be able to complain to the OIA providing that their complaint is eligible under its Rules (these are on the [**OIA website**](http://www.oiahe.org.uk/)).

**8.3**

Students will need to send to the OIA a Scheme Application Form within twelve months of the date of the Completion of Procedures letter. (See 6.3 above.)  A Scheme Application Form can be obtained from the Director's Office and/or the Students' Union and may also be [**downloaded from the OIA website**](http://www.oiahe.org.uk/students/download-saf.aspx). Students should send a copy of their Completion of Procedures letter to the OIA with their Scheme Application Form.

**9.**

##### Reporting, Monitoring, Evaluation and Review

**9.1**

Academic Services shall report to the Academic Regulations and Cases Board statistical information relating to Final Reviews on an annual basis. It shall be the responsibility of the Academic Regulations and Cases Board to monitor the data and make recommendations to the Academic Standards and Quality Committee as appropriate.

**9.2**

It shall also be the responsibility of the Academic Regulations and Cases Board to review the Final Review Procedures and their effectiveness and make recommendations for changes to the Academic Standards and Quality Committee, where appropriate, to be considered by Senate

# Academic integrity

Sir John Monash, after whom Monash University is named, said "...equip yourself for life, not solely for your own benefit but for the benefit of the whole community". This is the principle behind academic integrity; the pursuit of quality scholarship and education in alignment with the policies and expectations of the University.

This set of modules will teach you:

* The definition and ethical principles of academic integrity
* Practical and cognitive skills to ensure integrity in your academic work
* Types of plagiarism, how it occurs and how it can be avoided
* The definition of collusion and how it relates to academic integrity
* Consequences of academic misconduct and where to find help if needed

Academic dishonesty is prohibited in The City University of New York. Penalties for academic dishonesty include academic sanctions, such as failing or otherwise reduced grades, and/or disciplinary sanctions, including suspension or expulsion.

1. Definitions and Examples of Academic Dishonesty.

1.1 **Cheating** is the unauthorized use or attempted use of material, information, notes, study aids, devices or communication during an academic exercise. Example of cheating include:

* Copying from another student during an examination or allowing another to copy your work.
* Unauthorized collaboration on a take home assignment or examination.
* Using notes during a closed book examination.
* Taking an examination for another student, or asking or allowing another student to take an examination for you.
* Changing a graded exam and returning it for more credit.
* Submitting substantial portions of the same paper to more than one course without consulting with each instructor.
* Preparing answers or writing notes in a blue book (exam booklet) before an examination.
* Allowing others to research and write assigned papers or do assigned projects, including using commercial term paper services.
* Giving assistance to acts of academic misconduct/ dishonesty.
* Fabricating data (in whole or in part).
* Falsifying data (in whole or in part).
* Submitting someone else’s work as your own.
* Unauthorized use during an examination of any electronic devises such as cell phones, computers or other technologies to retrieve or send information.

1.2. **Plagiarism** is the act of presenting another person’s ideas, research or writing as your own. Examples of plagiarism include:

* Copying another person’s actual words or images without the use of quotation marks and footnotes attributing the words to their source.
* Presenting another person’s ideas or theories in your own words without acknowledging the source.
* Failing to acknowledge collaborators on homework and laboratory assignments.
* Internet plagiarism, including submitting downloaded term papers or parts of term papers, paraphrasing or copying information from the internet without citing the source, or “cutting & pasting” from various sources without proper attribution.

1.3. **Obtaining Unfair Advantage** is any action taken by a student that gives that student an unfair advantage in his/her academic work over another student, or an action taken by a student through which a student attempts to gain an unfair advantage in his or her academic work over another student. Examples of obtaining unfair advantage include:

* Stealing, reproducing, circulating or otherwise gaining advance access to examination materials.
* Depriving other students of access to library materials by stealing, destroying, defacing, or concealing them.
* Retaining, using or circulating examination materials which clearly indicate that they should be returned at the end of the exam.

Intentionally obstructing or interfering with another student’s work

1.4. **Falsification of Records and Official Documents**

Examples of falsification include:

* Forging signatures of authorization.
* Falsifying information on an official academic record.
* Falsifying information on an official document such as a grade report, letter of permission, drop/add form, ID card or other college document

**2. Methods for Promoting Academic Integrity**

2.1. Packets containing a copy of the CUNY Policy on Academic Integrity and, if applicable, the college’s procedures implementing the Policy, and information explaining the Policy and procedures shall be distributed to all current faculty and, on an annual basis to all new faculty (full and part time). These packets also shall be posted on each college’s website. Orientation sessions for all new faculty (full and part time) and students shall incorporate a discussion of academic integrity.

2.2. All college catalogs, student handbooks, faculty handbooks, and college websites shall include the CUNY Policy on Academic Integrity and, if applicable, college procedures implementing the policy and the consequences of not adhering to the Policy.

2.3. Each college shall subscribe to an electronic plagiarism detection service and shall notify students of the fact that such a service is available for use by the faculty.  Colleges shall encourage faculty members to use such services and to inform students of their use of such services.

3. Reporting

3.1. Each college’s president shall appoint an Academic Integrity Officer in consultation with the elected faculty governance leader. The Academic Integrity Officer shall serve as the initial contact person with faculty members when they report incidents of suspected academic dishonesty. The Academic Integrity Officer may be the college’s Student Conduct Officer, another student affairs official, an academic affairs official, or a tenured faculty member. Additional duties of the Academic Integrity Officer are described in Sections 4.1., 4.2.1., 4.2.2., 4.3 and 4.4.

3.2. A faculty member who suspects that a student has committed a violation of the CUNY Academic Integrity Policy shall review with the student the facts and circumstances of the suspected violation whenever  feasible. Thereafter, a faculty member who concludes that there has been an incident of academic dishonesty sufficient to affect the student’s final course grade shall report such incident on a Faculty Report Form in substantially the same format as the sample annexed to this Policy and shall submit the Form to the college’s Academic Integrity Officer.  Each college shall use a uniform form throughout the college, which shall contain, at a minimum, the name of the instructor, the name of the student, the course name and number, the date of the incident, an explanation of the incident and the instructor’s contact information.

3.3.The Academic Integrity Officer shall update the Faculty Report Form after a suspected incident has been resolved to reflect that resolution. Unless the resolution exonerates the student, as described in Section 4.4,  the Academic Integrity Officer of each college shall place the Form in a confidential academic integrity file created for each student alleged to have violated the Academic Integrity Policy and shall retain each Form for the purposes of identifying repeat offenders, gathering data, and assessing and reviewing policies.  Unless they exonerate the student, written decisions on academic integrity matters after adjudication also shall be placed in the student’s academic integrity file. The Academic Integrity Officer shall be responsible for maintaining students’ academic integrity files.

4. Procedures for Imposition of Sanctions

4.1. Determination on academic vs. disciplinary sanction.

The Academic Integrity Officer shall determine whether to seek a disciplinary sanction in addition to an academic sanction.  In making this determination, the Academic Integrity Officer shall consult with the faculty member who initiated the case and may consult with student affairs and/or academic affairs administrators as needed. Before determining which sanction(s) to seek, the Academic Integrity Officer also shall consult the student’s confidential academic integrity file, if any, to determine whether the student has been found to have previously committed a violation of the Academic Integrity Policy, the nature of the infraction, and the sanction imposed or action taken.  Prior violations include both violations at the student’s current college and violations that occurred at any other CUNY college.  In making the determination on prior violations, the Academic Integrity Officer shall determine whether the student previously attended any other CUNY college and, if so, shall request and be given access to the academic integrity file, if any, at such other CUNY college.

The Academic Integrity Officer should seek disciplinary sanctions only if (i) there is a substantial violation; (ii) the student has previously violated the Policy; or (iii) academic sanctions may not be imposed because the student has timely withdrawn from the applicable course.  Examples of substantial violations include but are not limited to forging a grade form or a transcript; stealing an  an examination from a professor or a university office; having a substitute take an examination or taking an examination for someone else; having someone else write a paper for the student or writing a paper for another student; sabotaging another student’s work through actions that prevent or impede the other student from successfully completing an assignment; and violations committed by a graduate or professional student or a student who will seek professional licensure.  The college also should consider any mitigating circumstances in making this determination.

4.2. Procedures in Cases Involving Only Academic Sanctions.

4.2.1. Student Admits to the Academic Dishonesty and Does Not Contest the Academic Sanction.

If a faculty member wishes to seek only an academic sanction (i.e., a reduced grade) and the student does not contest either his/her guilt or the particular reduced grade the faculty member has chosen, then the student shall be given the reduced grade, unless the Academic Integrity Officer decides to seek a disciplinary sanction. The reduced grade may apply to the particular assignment as to which the violation occurred or to the course grade, at the faculty member’s discretion. A reduced grade may be an “F” or another grade that is lower than the grade that the student would have earned but for the violation. The faculty member shall inform the Academic Integrity Officer of the resolution via email and the Officer shall update the applicable Faculty Report Form to reflect that resolution.

4.2.2 Student Admits to the Academic Dishonesty but Contests the Academic Sanction.

In a case where a student admits to the alleged academic dishonesty but contests the particular academic sanction imposed, the student may appeal the academic sanction through the college’s grade appeal process.  The student shall be allowed, at a minimum, an opportunity to present a written position with supporting evidence. The committee reviewing the appeal shall issue a written decision explaining the justification for the academic sanction imposed.

4.2.3. Student Denies the Academic Dishonesty

In a case where a student denies the academic dishonesty, a fact-finding determination shall be made, at each college’s option, by an Academic Integrity Committee established by the College’s governance body or by the Student-Faculty Disciplinary Committee established under Article XV of the CUNY Bylaws. Each college’s Academic Integrity Committee shall adopt procedures for hearing cases. (If a college opts to use its Student-Faculty Disciplinary Committee for this purpose, that Committee shall use Article IX procedures.) These procedures, at a minimum, shall provide a student with (i) written notice of the charges against him or her; (ii) the right to appear before the Committee; and (iii) the right to present witness statements and/or to call witnesses. Those procedures also shall provide the faculty member with the right to make an appearance before the Committee. The Committee may request the testimony of any witness and may permit any such witness to be questioned by the student and by the administrator presenting the case. Academic Integrity Committees and Student-Faculty Disciplinary Committees, as applicable, shall issue written decisions and send copies of their decisions to the college’s Academic Integrity Officer. The Academic Integrity Officer may not serve on a college’s Academic Integrity Committee.

4.3.  Procedures in Cases Involving Disciplinary Sanctions.

If the college decides to seek a disciplinary sanction, the case shall be processed under Article XV of the CUNY Bylaws.  If the case is not resolved through mediation under Article XV, it shall be heard by the college’s Faculty-Student Disciplinary Committee.

If the college seeks to have both a disciplinary and an academic sanction imposed, the college shall proceed first with the disciplinary proceeding and await its outcome before addressing the academic sanction. The student’s grade shall be held in abeyance by using the PEN grade established for this purpose, pending the Committee’s action.  If the Faculty-Student Disciplinary Committee finds that the alleged violation occurred, then the faculty member may reflect that finding in the student’s grade.  The student may appeal the finding in accordance with Article XV procedures and/or may appeal the grade imposed by the faculty member in accordance with section 4.2.2. If the Faculty-Student Disciplinary Committee finds that the alleged violation did not occur, then no sanction of any kind may be imposed.

Where a matter proceeds to the Faculty-Student Disciplinary Committee, the Academic Integrity Officer shall promptly report its resolution to the faculty member and file a record of the resolution in the student’s confidential academic integrity file, unless, as explained below, the suspected violation was held to be unfounded.

4.4. Required Action in Cases of No Violation

If either the Academic Integrity Committee or the Faculty- Student Disciplinary Committee finds that no violation occurred, the Academic Integrity Officer shall remove all material relating to that incident from the student’s confidential academic integrity file and destroy the material.

5. Implementation

Each college shall implement this Policy and may adopt its own more specific procedures to implement the Policy.  Colleges’ procedures must be consistent with the policy and procedures described in the Policy

# Academic integrity and misconduct

Academic integrity means honesty in your studies, acknowledging the work of others and giving credit where you have used other people's ideas as part of presenting your arguments. Plagiarism means presenting someone else's work as your own, even with their consent.

Plagiarism is wholly unacceptable and is treated by the University of Nottingham as an act of Academic Misconduct, comparable to cheating in exams or fabricating data.

If plagiarism is discovered, it not only makes the student concerned liable to serious penalties, but raises questions about personal integrity. However, sometimes what appears to be intentional plagiarism can be poor academic practice arising from a lack of understanding of standard methods of acknowledging the source of words, ideas and diagrams in your work.

You may be asked to sign your submitted work to show you have read and understood the University's Regulations on Academic Misconduct. Your School handbooks will offer some guidance on what this means in the context of your particular subject of study and you should ask your lecturer or tutor to clarify if you're not sure.

## Types of cheating behaviour

Cheating is seeking to gain unfair advantage, usually violating regulations, of which plagiarism is one type. At the University of Nottingham it is academic misconduct to present someone else's work as being one's own. Note that plagiarism has to do with work, and copyright violation has to do with words. These are often confused.

Cheating behaviours include:

* False citation
* Plagiarism
* Using unauthorised sources or notes in examinations or tests.
* Dishonestly obtaining materials or information prior to examinations.
* Copying from other students.
* Permitting other students to copy your work.
* Soliciting work from others (e.g. individuals, 'editors' or essay banks etc).
* Unauthorised Collaboration, or collusion occurs where:
	+ Collaboration became collusion
	+ The work submitted has resulted from collaboration with others whose contribution has not been acknowledged.
	+ Fabrication may take various forms but is essentially concerned with manufacturing aspects of the work produced. For example, the insertion of made-up information, data, sources, quotes, anecdotes or analysis would all amount to fabrication.

Recycling - The multiple submission of your own work/ material is not, in itself, considered as academic misconduct. Submission of material that has been submitted on a previous occasion for a different summative assessment is, however, unlikely to be academically appropriate. The merit of such material will therefore be a matter of academic judgement and it may attract fewer (or no) marks than would have been the case if it had not been assessed previously.

# Avoiding plagiarism

Plagiarism means to pass off someone else’s work, intentionally or unintentionally, as your own.

This might be by copying or paraphrasing someone's published or unpublished work without proper acknowledgment, or representing someone's artistic or technical work or creation as your own.

## The University's policy on plagiarism

An act of Academic Misconduct is, generally speaking, any action in which may give a student an unpermitted academic advantage; as such, it is not acceptable in a scholarly community The most common examples of acts of Academic Misconduct are plagiarism, cheating in exams, collusion, and fabricating results or data. It can be, however, anything that gives you an unfair advantage in an assessment.

Incidences of placgiarism will first be addressed within the School, and they may apply penalties such as giving you a mark of zero for the piece of work concerned. The University's Academic Misconduct Committee has the power to apply a range of penalties for serious or repeated cases, including terminating your course.

## Tips for avoiding plagiarism

### Don't just copy

In your writing, describe other people's ideas or results (using references) and their importance to your argument, rather than simply copying what you've read.  Avoid using cut and paste options in electronic material as this encourages you to simply copy what you've read word for word.

### Use a range of sources

Don't just limit yourself to using one source when writing your assignments.  Discussing ideas from a range of sources shows that you have read widely and that you are able to formulate your own views based on your reading.  Remember, important sources can be available in print and electronic format.

### Develop your own style

You should develop your own style of writing during your time at University.  Try to be concise and clear.  Using the words of another author will stand out from the rest of your work and may alert lecturers to possible plagiarism.

### Keep good quality notes

If you are making notes from your sources, remember to put direct quotations in quotation marks and always keep a note of your sources. This will help to ensure that you do not accidentally plagiarise.  It also makes collating your references much easier when writing your assignments.  You can keep track of your references using a tool such as Endnote Web.

### Use quotation marks

If you do want to quote a short extract from another author's words exactly, make sure you enclose these words in quotation marks to indicate that it is a direct quote.  Direct quotes should be used sparingly and shouldn't include large amounts of text. They should be used where you are identifying an key idea or highlighting the place where you found the particular idea you are using. Don't forget if you are using someone else's ideas in your work you need to show this by referencing it.

# Referencing and citing

## What is referencing?

You will refer to a range of different types of material including books, journal articles, images and web resources in your academic work.

When you use the information that you have read in another source, you must create a citation to the source in the text of your document.  This citation refers the reader to the full reference in a reference list or bibliography at the end of your document.

The reference provides a description of the details of the source presented in an accurate and consistent way.

## Why we reference

* Referencing enables anyone who reads your work to identify and locate sources quickly and efficiently
* Referencing acknowledges the work of others and protects you from accusations of [plagiarism](https://www.nottingham.ac.uk/studyingeffectively/writing/plagiarism/index.aspx)
* Referencing can verify quotations
* Referencing can demonstrate the depth of your research.

## Creating a reference list

A reference list is created at the end of your document which outlines all the sources that you have referenced in your document.

Sometimes, you may also create a bibliography which is a full list of all sources consulted when researching your assignment, whether referenced in the work or not.

A bibliography may also be a separate work, listing sources published on a particular topic