

Academic Misconduct Procedure - Student

Date of sign-off:	
Applicable from:	June 2026
Date of next review:	2026/27 academic year
Signed-off by:	Director of Academic Quality and Standards
Related policies:	Academic Misconduct Policy - Student
Alternative formats:	Audio, large font, braille – on request

Contents

1. Introduction	2
2. eVision System Procedure	2
Case Initiator Responsibility:.....	2
Chair of the Assessment Panel or nominee Responsibility:.....	3
3. Leeds Trinity University procedures for investigating suspected cases.	3
a. Poor academic practice and suspected minor instances of academic misconduct	3
b. Investigation of suspected moderate and serious instances of academic misconduct in relation to work submitted for assessment.....	4
c. Procedure for the investigation of other forms of suspected moderate and serious instances of academic misconduct	7
d. Investigation of suspected cheating in an examination.....	7
e. Cases to be heard by the University's Student Academic and Professional Misconduct Panel	8
4. Collaborative Partner procedures for investigating suspected cases.....	11
Minor Misconduct:.....	11
Moderate and Serious:	12
5. Contract Cheating and Use of <i>viva voce</i> inquiries in the investigation of cases.....	12
6. Appeals Procedure	13
7. Penalties.....	14
Minor Offences:	14
Moderate Offences:	15
Serious Offences:	16
8. Glossary.....	18

1. Introduction

- 1.1. The Academic Misconduct Procedure describes the procedures in place to investigate suspected cases of academic misconduct or students who are registered on Leeds Trinity University taught undergraduate and postgraduate programmes, including apprenticeships, recent graduates and students whose registration has been interrupted on a temporary basis. Further details for Students studying at collaborative partners can be found below in Section 4 as well as within the Academic Misconduct Policy.
- 1.2. For students studying at collaborative partners, this procedure will apply with the following modifications
 - a. For institutions with Franchised programmes – They will investigate all cases of misconduct with support from the College Liaison Tutors, with serious cases being referred to Student Casework Office.
 - b. For institutions with validated programmes – the partner will adopt this Policy and Procedure and adapt to their own structures.
- 1.3. This procedure adheres to the University's Academic Misconduct Policy.
- 1.4. This Procedure is designed to be used by:
 - Student Casework Team
 - Assessment Team
 - Student Records Team
 - Schools
 - Partner Institutions
 - Students (excluding Postgraduate Research Students)

The Student Casework Team will keep a record of all cases within e: Vision from March 2026.

Information on Contract Cheating and Vivas is detailed in Section 5.

- 1.5 This Procedure is regularly reviewed by the Student Casework Office and updates will be approved by the Director of Academic Quality and Standards.

2. eVision System Procedure

Case Initiator Responsibility:

- 2.1 When a case of academic misconduct is identified by the marker/module tutor (initiator), they are required to log into e: Vision and initiate a case of misconduct. The marker should firstly click "create case" and complete the first page, which consists of the offence and details of the of the case being reported. This must include a written description of the concerns identified along with the work and supporting evidence. To continue to page 2, they must press 'proceed.'

- 2.2 To add the relevant module information, the marker is to press 'manage assessment', which is found in the 'Offence details' section, where the module can be selected alongside the component and attempt i.e., whether it is the first attempt or resit attempt.
- 2.3 The next screen will show the assessment record for the module chosen. The marker is required to click 'add assessment' under the Action heading to add the component to the student's case.
- 2.4 In the 'Information and Evidence' section the marker will upload a copy of the student's submitted work, notes from a viva or departmental meeting (if the student was invited to one) and any other relevant evidence relating to the case.
- 2.5 In cases of Collusion, information in relation to other students involved in the case must also be added.
- 2.6 Once all the relevant information and documents have been added to the student's case record, select 'submit'.

Chair of the Assessment Panel or nominee Responsibility:

- 2.7 The Chair of the Assessment Panel or nominee will categorise the offence and confirm whether the case is a first or subsequent offence.
- 2.8 Once this is completed, the Chair will click the 'allocate' button, which allows them to allocate the case to either themselves or their nominee. This is not a requirement, however.
- 2.9 The Chair is to then notify the student of their pending misconduct case, by pressing 'notify student.'
- 2.10 If a meeting is required, the Chair will create a meeting by pressing the "create a meeting" button, allowing them to send the student a proposed time, date and location for the meeting. Please note that Teams meeting invites must be set up separately.
- 2.11 Once the Chair has reviewed the case, or a meeting has taken place, the Chair will then click 'record outcome', which allows them to upload notes from the meeting, and to document the outcome.
- 2.12 Once all of the above steps have taken place, the Chair will then close the case.

3. Leeds Trinity University procedures for investigating suspected cases.

a. Poor academic practice and suspected minor instances of academic misconduct

- 3.1 The following procedure applies to poor academic practice and suspected minor instances of academic misconduct where errors of presentation or methodology are likely to be due to inexperience and lack of understanding of the required academic conventions for students in the early stages of their academic career. Instances of this nature are identified and resolved by the marker via the marking and feedback process.
- 3.2 Where a marker discovers **self-plagiarism** verbatim without any reference to the previous body of work and they judge that this would result in the double counting of material credit without proper intellectual development of work, they will log the case into the e:Vision to upload a case. E: Vision will then inform the Chair of the Assessment Panel (or nominee) of the case and this will need to be processed within 5 working days. If it is agreed by the Chair of the Assessment Panel (or nominee) that

it is a case of self-plagiarism, the marker will discount any copied sections and mark the remainder of the work. Markers will give advice and the reason for the mark awarded and guidance on the proper academic conventions in the written assessment feedback.

3.3 Where a marker identifies **poor scholarship**, they will log the case into the e:Vision System to upload a case. E: Vision will then inform the Chair of the Assessment Panel (or nominee) of the case and this will need to be processed within 5 working days. If it is agreed by the Chair of the Assessment Panel (or nominee) that it is a case of poor scholarship, the marker will discount any copied sections and mark the remainder of the work. Direct advice on the reasons for the mark awarded and on the correct academic conventions should be clearly indicated in the written feedback to the student on Moodle.

3.4 Where a marker identifies an occurrence of **minor misconduct**, they will log the case into e:Vision to upload a case. E: Vision will then inform the Chair of the Assessment Panel (or nominee) of the case and this will need to be processed within 5 working days

3.5 If it is agreed by the Chair of the Assessment Panel (or nominee) that it is a case of minor misconduct, the relevant penalty will be applied as detailed in the penalty list. Direct advice regarding referencing and the required academic conventions will be given in the written assessment feedback and the student will be required to undertake an academic integrity tutorial. For students studying at Partner Institutions, they will be required to undertake an Academic Integrity Tutorial facilitated by their institute. The incident should be recorded on the student record by the Assessment Team.

3.6 In all the above cases, the marker may request that the assignment is investigated by the Chair of the Assessment Panel, or nominee, where they have some uncertainty or concerns. This will be done after the case is added to e:Vision.

b. Investigation of suspected moderate and serious instances of academic misconduct in relation to work submitted for assessment

3.7 The following procedure applies to the investigation of all suspected moderate and serious instances of academic misconduct and is conducted by the marker and Chair of the relevant Assessment Panel (or nominee). Where, following investigation, the work is judged to contain moderate levels of academic misconduct, a conclusion may be drawn at the end of the interview with the student. Serious cases may be referred to the University's Student Academic and Professional Misconduct Panel.

3.8 Where a marker suspects academic misconduct to have occurred in an assignment, other than the instances referred to in section 1, they will prepare the case, assemble the evidence, log the case on the Academic Misconduct (AM) e:Vision setting out the case in the notes section of the online system and formally refer it to the relevant Chair of the Assessment Panel (or nominee). This should be done within 5 working days of a marker suspecting a case of misconduct.

- 3.9 The evidence may include, but should not rest solely on, a Turnitin Originality Report as the report simply identifies matched text and is not necessarily an indication that the material has been used improperly. The student submission and all source material should be highlighted and indexed so that the sections of the work in question and corresponding sources are visibly clear to someone who is unfamiliar with the content.
- 3.10 Further evidence to provide to support the case are screenshots of the suspected misconduct, quotes of concern, examples of the references that may not appear genuine and features that raise suspicion that the student was not the author of the work (*such as use of em-dash or language not usually used by the student.*) This is not an exhaustive list. Meta data is not sufficient as a standalone reason to flag a case of AMC.
- 3.11 Upon receipt of a referral, the Chair of the Assessment Panel (or nominee), in consultation with the marker as necessary, will satisfy themselves that there is a clear and convincing case to answer by examining the evidence provided by the marker. Using the penalty list as a guide, they will determine whether the case is that of poor scholarship or whether the case requires further investigation as an occurrence of academic misconduct.
- 3.12 If it is determined that the writing practice amounts to poor scholarship or minor misconduct, the Chair of the Assessment Panel and marker should follow the process as detailed in 3a.
- 3.13 If there is a case to answer, the student will be provided with assessment feedback, advised that their work has been identified as a case of potential misconduct and that they will be invited to a meeting. This invite will be sent via Teams and logged on the e:Vision. Students will be expected to make themselves available for a meeting provided that 5 working days' notice of the meeting has been provided. The student should be given 5 days' notice. At the interview, the Chair of the Assessment Panel (or nominee) will provide the student with details of the allegation and supporting evidence in advance of the meeting. The invite to the meeting should be sent to the student's LTU email address. The marker or another member of academic staff familiar with the requirements of the assessment will attend the meeting and the student may be accompanied by a companion if they choose. This can be a companion, fellow LTU student or an officer of LTSU. If the Chair or nominee is also the marker, then another member of academic staff from the programme team will be asked to attend.
- 3.14 Students are expected to make all reasonable efforts to attend such meetings, and the rearrangement of meetings will normally be limited to one occasion. Should the student not attend the meeting or fail to respond to the correspondence about the meeting, then provided the criteria has been met, the case will be considered in their absence. The meetings can take place in person or online.
- 3.15 The University recognises its duty to make reasonable adjustments to the meeting process for students who may require it. Staff should consider if a student has a disability or a Student Inclusion Plan and if any reasonable adjustments are required. Students are to inform the Chair of the Assessment Panel (or nominee) of any

reasonable adjustments that may need to be considered when conducting the interview.

- 3.16 At the meeting, the Chair of the Assessment Panel (or nominee) and marker will:
- (i) Show the work and sources to the student and explain how the identified passages appear to be in breach of acceptable conduct.
 - (ii) Ask the student for an account of how the work was produced.
 - (iii) Attempt to gain an understanding that the student is aware of the dangers of working in this way and how similar allegations might be avoided in the future.
 - (iv) Ascertain from the student whether there were any mitigating circumstances¹.
 - (v) Make notes of the meeting and upload to e:Vision and the notes may be required for any subsequent appeal.
- 3.17 If it is agreed that there is not a case to be answered or is classified as a minor offence, as defined in the list of penalties, the Chair of the Assessment Panel (or nominee) will inform the student of the penalty to be applied. The student will also be required to undertake an academic integrity tutorial.
- 3.18 If a case of moderate academic misconduct has been substantiated, the Chair of the Assessment Panel (or nominee) and marker will determine the penalty, using the penalty list in Section 7. The Chair of the Assessment Panel (or nominee) will update the case on the e:Vision, normally within 5 working days of the meeting.
- 3.19 In the case of moderate academic misconduct being substantiated, the Chair of the Assessment Panel (or nominee) and marker will:
- (i) Explain to the student that they are being given the relevant penalty, which will be confirmed via the case on e:Vision and that any further allegations may be regarded as a serious offence, for which the consequences will be much more severe and may result in expulsion from the University.
 - (ii) Explain the penalty to the student.
 - (iii) Ask the student to confirm that they understand how they have breached the requisite academic conventions and that they will take all necessary steps to ensure that they do not do so again.
 - (iv) Inform the student that they will be required to undertake an academic integrity tutorial and remind them of the support that is available to them.
 - (v) Advise the student of their right of appeal.
- 3.20 If, at the end of the interview, the Chair of the Assessment Panel (or nominee) and marker decide that the case is of a serious or complex nature, they shall refer the case to the University's Student Academic and Professional Misconduct Panel, using e:Vision. The case will then be considered under the procedure set out in section 3.e.
- 3.21 If the student is studying at a Partner institution, section 4 will be done in consultation with the appropriate member of LTU staff.
- 3.22 For moderate misconduct, if the student has admitted to an offence of academic misconduct and has accepted that a penalty will be invoked, they will be advised that it will be considered the matter to be closed, and it will not be referred to an AMC Panel. Cases of serious misconduct may be referred to an AMC Panel.

¹ If mitigating circumstances are considered when deciding upon an appropriate penalty, they must be supported by independent evidence.

- 3.23 Exceptionally, an alleged offence of Academic Misconduct may come to light after a Progression and Award Board has met and confirmed results have been published.
- 3.24 In such cases, the marker/academic should refer the case directly to the Chair of the Assessment Panel (or nominee), who will consult with the Student Casework Team. The case will then be referred to the Chair of the Progression and Award Board to consider the seriousness of the offence, the time which has elapsed since the alleged offence was committed, the reason as to why it was not discovered earlier and the regulations in relation to PSRBs (if applicable) in determining whether or not to proceed with the case. The Chair of the Progression and Award Board (PAB) must agree to the case being pursued before a student is contacted.
- 3.25 If it is agreed that a case is to be brought forward, the marker and the Chair of the Assessment Panel (or nominee) will follow the above process as detailed in Section 2. If it is determined it is a case of minor or moderate misconduct, the relevant penalty will be applied as detailed in the List of Penalties. If it is determined that it is a case of severe misconduct, it will be referred to an AMC Panel as detailed in section 3.e.

c. Procedure for the investigation of other forms of suspected moderate and serious instances of academic misconduct

The following procedure applies to the investigation of suspected moderate and serious instances of academic misconduct that take place outside of the assessment process and are not covered by the procedure in section 2.

- 3.25 Where a tutor discovers academic misconduct outside of the marking process, such as an attempt of fabrication/falsification of official documentation, they will report it to the Chair of the Assessment Panel (or nominee) via e:Vision by creating a new case. The Chair of the Assessment Panel (or nominee) will investigate the case as required and refer to the Student Casework Office if required. A meeting is to be held as part of the collation of appropriate evidence. The case will be considered under the procedure set out in section 3.e if considered a serious offence.
- 3.26 In some cases, it may be more applicable for a case to be investigated under the Student Code of Conduct. Colleagues should discuss the potential case of non-academic conduct with the Student Casework Team.

d. Investigation of suspected cheating in an examination

- 3.27 The following procedure applies to all forms of offences in breach of the examination procedure and relates to formal examinations and to all laboratory and class tests conducted under exam conditions, including online exams.
- 3.28 Where an invigilator of an examination suspects that a candidate is in breach of the examination procedure or is employing unfair practices to gain an advantage, they will make a note on the candidates answer book at the point at which the suspected cheating occurred and confiscate any unauthorised materials/devices. If the suspected incident involves more than one candidate, notes will be made on both answer books. The answer books will then be removed, and the students will be given new ones.
- 3.29 The student(s) will be informed that the matter will be reported to the Head of Student

Assessment and will be allowed to continue with the examination, unless the offence is one of disruptive behaviour which places other candidates at a disadvantage or is one of impersonation.

- 3.30 Following consultation with the Head of Student Assessment, or nominee or Chair of the Assessment Panel (Partners), the invigilator/Assessment Team /Chair of the Assessment Panel may take any other reasonable steps necessary to secure evidence for the case, for example photographic evidence.
- 3.31 At the end of the examination, the invigilator will write a report of the incident and submit it to the Assessment Team along with the answer book and any materials/devices confiscated from the candidate(s), which may need to be retained until after the investigation has been completed. This should be done within 5 working days of the exam taking place. The case will be referred to the Chair of the Assessment Panel (or nominee) and the Student Casework Team, via the submission of a case on e:Vision.
- 3.32 The Chair of the Assessment panel (or nominee) will write to the student and explain what will happen next within 5 working days.
- 3.33 The Chair of the Assessment Panel (or nominee) shall take any further steps necessary to assemble the case and refer it to the University's AMC Panel if required. The case will be considered under the procedure set out in Section 3.e if it is considered a serious case of misconduct. If it is considered a case of minor or moderate misconduct, the case will be considered under procedures set out in 3.a.
- 3.34 Colleagues should ensure that they include invigilation notes or report and keep a record of staff invigilated the exam. These should be included with the Academic Misconduct Report on the e:Vision.

e. Cases to be heard by the University's Student Academic and Professional Misconduct Panel

- 3.35 The following procedure applies to serious instances of academic misconduct which have been investigated at local level under the procedures described in sections 3.a, 3.b, 3.c, 3.d and referred to the University's Student Academic Misconduct Panel.
- 3.36 Cases of academic misconduct to be considered by the University's Student Academic and Professional Misconduct Panel shall be submitted to the Student Casework Office. Cases shall normally be logged via e:Vision along with supporting evidence and will indicate the outcome of local-level consideration of the case to date.
- 3.37 If the student has admitted to an offence of academic misconduct, they may be offered the option of accepting a penalty, determined by the Chair of the AMC Panel, without need for a full hearing, thus avoiding undue prolongation or escalation on procedural grounds alone. Students must be asked this at meetings. Should the student choose not to accept the penalty, then a meeting of the AMC Panel will be convened.
- 3.38 If it is determined that a meeting of the AMC Panel is to be convened, it will be arranged within 15 working days of the case being referred to Student Casework Officer. It will have the following membership:
 - One Head of School, or nominee, from a subject area independent of the case

- to be heard (Chair)
 - One member of lecturing staff from a subject area independent of the case to be heard
 - The Head of Student Casework or nominee
 - Leeds Trinity Students' Union (LTSU) President or Officer will be invited to sit in attendance
 - Relevant Partner Colleague or nominee/CLT if applicable
- 3.39 Other persons permitted to be present at the meeting are:
- The student
 - If the student chooses, they may be accompanied by a companion, fellow LTU student or a member of LTSU.
 - The departmental representative to present the case, normally the marker or Chair of the Assessment Panel (or nominee)/College Liaison Tutor (as appropriate)
 - A member of the Student Casework Team (secretary)
 - Any other relevant third party as determined by the Chair of the AMC Panel. The student will be notified of any such party who has been invited to attend.
- 3.40 The University recognises its duty to make reasonable adjustments to the panel hearing for students who may require it. Students are to inform the Chair of the AMC Panel Hearing and Student Casework Office of any reasonable adjustments that may need to be considered when conducting the Panel Hearing.
- 3.41 On behalf of the AMC Panel, the Student Casework Team shall:
- (i) Arrange the time and venue for the meeting, in consultation with the panel members and nominated departmental representative. If the meeting cannot be arranged in term-time, a suitable date shall be arranged in consultation with the student². Students are expected to make all reasonable efforts to attend such meetings, and the re-arrangement of meetings will normally be limited to one occasion. However, the student will be encouraged to attend in person and will be advised that it is in their best interest to do so. The AMC Panel can take place in person or online.
 - (ii) Write to the student requiring them to attend the meeting, provide them with details of the allegation and the information to be considered by the AMC Panel. It is the student's responsibility to make any necessary arrangements with the Students' Union. The student will be advised that they can submit a written statement to read out at the Panel.
 - (iii) Take a record of the meeting.
- 3.45 At the hearing, the AMC Panel will hold a private, preliminary meeting and then the hearing will be an open meeting with the student (and companion where applicable) and departmental representative present throughout the inquiry section of the meeting, unless there has been prior arrangement by the Director of Academic Quality and Standards or nominee to operate otherwise. The student (and companion where applicable) and departmental representative will withdraw, and the Panel will draw its conclusions in private. The student (and companion where applicable) will be invited to return to the meeting to receive the panel's decision. The student will formally be informed of the outcome of the panel within 5 working days in writing.

² Where the decision of an AMC Panel has not been resolved within the current academic year, student registration would remain as provisional until the case was resolved. Students should be alerted to this and any consequences in terms of progression to the next level, if appropriate.

- 3.46 Should the student not attend the meeting or fail to respond to the correspondence about the meeting arrangements then, provided that the criteria in 3.41 above have been met, the AMC Panel will hear the case in the student's absence.
- 3.47 During the consideration of the case at the meeting:
- (i) The AMC panel will discuss all relevant documentation submitted as evidence to the Panel in a closed preliminary meeting to establish its lines of enquiry.
 - (ii) The student (and their companion where applicable) and the departmental representative will join the Panel, and the Chair of the AMC Panel will provide an outline of the proceedings.
 - (iii) The Chair will invite the departmental representative to introduce the case and Panel Members will ask questions to obtain a clear understanding of the allegation.
 - (iv) The Chair will invite the student to explain their working methods and/or actions, and Panel Members will ask questions to obtain a clear understanding of the circumstances.
 - (v) Where a third party has been invited to provide advice to the Panel, the Chair will invite comment at appropriate junctures.
 - (vi) The student and departmental representative will each be given the opportunity to ask questions via the Chair at appropriate points in the proceedings.
 - (vii) The departmental representative and student will be invited to make a concluding statement in turn.
 - (viii) The student (and companion where applicable) and departmental representative will withdraw while the Panel draws its conclusions.
 - (ix) The student (and companion where applicable) will be invited to return to the meeting to receive the Panel's decision.
 - (x) The departmental representative and Chair of the Assessment Panel (or nominee) (if different) will normally be informed of the Panel's decision by the Secretary within 10 working days.
- 3.48 The AMC Panel may take any other steps as may be considered necessary to give the case due consideration.
- 3.49 If the case is not upheld or is classified as a minor offence of academic misconduct, the student will be informed via e:Vision, within 10 working days, that the recommended penalty will be applied, as detailed in the penalty list.
- 3.50 If the AMC Panel decides that a case of moderate or serious academic misconduct has been substantiated, it shall consider the student's record, including profile of marks and previously substantiated allegations of academic misconduct when determining a penalty. The penalty will normally be one of the penalties listed in the List of Penalties although the AMC Panel has the authority to impose any other penalty that it deems appropriate to the individual circumstances of the case. If a penalty is agreed where it would result in the cancellation of a student's registration with the University, the Panel will refer this to the Chair of the relevant Progression and Award Board.
- 3.51 The formal record of the meeting will be checked by the Chair of the AMC Panel and will accompany the outcome letter to the student, normally within 10 working days of the meeting. Copies of the records will be held in the Student Casework Team, and the outcome of the hearing will be stored on eVision to facilitate consistency in the application of penalties in future cases.

- 3.52 The student may be accompanied by a companion. A Panel Member will also take notes of the hearing, or the Student Casework Office colleague can attend to act as secretary.
- 3.53 On behalf of the AMC Panel, the Chair shall:
- (i) Arrange the time and venue for the meeting, in consultation with the panel members. If the meeting cannot be arranged in term-time, a suitable date shall be arranged in consultation with the student³. Students are expected to make all reasonable efforts to attend such meetings, and the re-arrangement of meetings will normally be limited to one occasion. However, the student will be encouraged to attend and will be advised that it is in their best interest to do so.
 - (ii) Write to the student requiring them to attend the meeting, provide them with details of the allegation and the information to be considered by the AMC Panel.
- 3.54 If the case is not upheld or is classified as a minor offence of academic misconduct, the Chair will inform the student, in writing, within 10 working days, that the recommended penalty will be applied, as detailed in the penalty list.
- 3.55 If the AMC Panel decides that a case of moderate or serious academic misconduct has been substantiated, it shall consider the student's record, including profile of marks and previously substantiated allegations of academic misconduct when determining a penalty. The penalty will normally be one of the penalties listed in the List of Penalties although the AMC Panel has the authority to impose any other penalty that it deems appropriate to the individual circumstances of the case. If a penalty is agreed where it would result in the cancellation of a student's registration, the Panel will need to refer this to the Chair of the Progression and Award Board.
- 3.56 The formal outcome of the case will be sent to the student via the e:Vision system, normally within 10 working days of the meeting.

4. Collaborative Partner procedures for investigating suspected cases.

- 4.1 Collaborative Partners will undertake their own investigations into Academic Misconduct cases. Cases can be identified by both College Liaison Tutors or Partners.

Minor Misconduct:

- 4.2 In instances of Minor Misconduct, the following procedure is to be followed:
- a. The marker identifies a case of misconduct whilst marking an assignment.
 - b. The marker inputs a mark of 11 in Moodle and in the feedback of the assignment.
 - c. The marker then logs a case on e:Vision (please see the steps required in section 2).
 - d. The Chair of the Assessment Panel (or nominee) will review the student's case in e:Vision and will consider the outcome from the list of penalties.
 - e. The penalty is to be selected in e:Vision and saved.
 - f. At the conclusion of this meeting, on campus staff are to complete the following form with the student, to arrange a tutorial with the Learning Hub: [Learning Hub: Appointment Request Form | Leeds Trinity University](#).

³ Where the decision of an AMC Panel has not been resolved within the current academic year, student registration would remain as provisional until the case was resolved. Students should be alerted to this and any consequences in terms of progression to the next level, if appropriate.

- g. Please note that cases of Contract Cheating at Foundation Year and Level 4 are considered moderate misconduct. Cases of Contract Cheating at L5, 6 and 7 are considered serious misconduct and must be reported to the Student Casework Team.

Moderate and Serious:

4.3 In instances of moderate or serious misconduct, a meeting should be arranged. In these cases, the following will apply:

- a. The panel will consist of Chair of the Assessment Panel (or nominee), marker or module tutor and the College Liaison Tutor if possible. If College Liaison Tutor is unavailable, the Partner is responsible to ensure that sufficient notes are taken at the meeting.
- b. Students must be given at least 5 working days' notice of the meeting, and it should be held no later than 5 working days after the case has been reported to the Chair of the Assessment Panel (or nominee).
- c. A copy of the policy must be sent when inviting a student to the meeting. Students must be given an overview of the case and provided with relevant evidence before the meeting takes place.
- d. At the end of the meeting, the panel will agree if it is a case of misconduct or not and what level (i.e., minor, moderate, or serious).
- e. Once a penalty has been decided, the appropriate section of the eVision will be updated.
- f. At the conclusion of this meeting, on campus staff are to complete the following form with the student, to arrange a tutorial with the Learning Hub: [Learning Hub: Appointment Request Form | Leeds Trinity University](#).

4.4 In some instances, the Student Casework Office may be required to review and approve cases before they are processed to ensure quality and standards.

5. Contract Cheating and Use of *viva voce* inquiries in the investigation of cases.

5.1 In the case of contract cheating/AI, the following will apply when conducting a viva:

- a. Staff must gather evidence before inviting a student to a viva. This replaces the meeting.
- b. Students should be given two different dates and times. They must be given at least 5 working days' notice.
- c. The panel will consist of Chair of the Assessment Panel (or nominee), marker or module tutor and the College Liaison Tutor if a Partner student. If College Liaison Tutor is unavailable, the Partner is responsible to ensure that sufficient notes are taken at the meeting as this forms part of the evidence for the case. For on-campus cases, the Student Casework Office can attend to take notes when required.
- d. Once a penalty has been decided, the appropriate section of eVision will be updated.
- e. Partner colleagues must ensure that they keep a copy of all correspondence sent to the student and provides the Student Casework Team with a copy of this documentation as part of the case of serious misconduct or a misconduct appeal. This should be uploaded to the case on e:Vision.
- f. At the conclusion of this meeting, on campus staff are to complete the following form with the student, to arrange a tutorial with the Learning Hub: [Learning Hub: Appointment Request Form | Leeds Trinity University](#).

- 5.2 If the student does not respond by the permitted deadline or does not provide a valid reason for not attending, they will receive a mark of 0 and they are required to submit a new assignment, if the student has a resit attempt available.
- 5.3 If the student does not attend the viva, the feedback on Moodle will need to be updated stating that a viva was arranged, and the date must be provided and confirmed that the student did not attend and therefore received a mark of 0. The mark of 0 needs to be updated on Moodle
- 5.4 When students receive their outcome of a case, they must be informed that they can submit an academic misconduct appeal. A copy of the academic misconduct appeal form is available on MyLTU.

6. Appeals Procedure

- 6.1 Where a case of academic misconduct is upheld, a student may appeal against the decision of the relevant panel on the following grounds:
 - (i) New evidence of special circumstances which the student could not have presented previously.
 - (ii) A material procedural irregularity in the conduct of the case.
- 6.2 An appeal will only be considered if it is submitted in writing to the Deputy Vice-Chancellor at misconduct@leedstrinity.ac.uk within **10 working days** of the date of the notification to the student of the outcome of the investigation. Any appeal must state the grounds for the appeal and must be supported by appropriate evidence.
- 6.3 On receipt of an appeal, the Deputy Vice-Chancellor or nominee shall determine whether there are grounds for an appeal to proceed. The Deputy Vice-Chancellor or nominee may commission an independent investigation by a Head of School or other senior member of staff not directly associated with either the programme of study on which the student concerned is registered or the student's case to date.
- 6.4 The Deputy Vice-Chancellor or nominee will consider the appeal/investigatory report if applicable and decide as to whether the appeal should be upheld or dismissed.
- 6.5 The Deputy Vice-Chancellor or nominee will communicate the outcome of the appeal to the student, the Chair of the relevant panel as soon as possible after the investigation has been completed.
- 6.6 The decision of the Deputy Vice-Chancellor or nominee shall be final, and a "Completion of Procedures" Letter will be issued with the outcome of the appeal.
- 6.7 If, on exhaustion of the University's internal procedures detailed above, a student wishes to seek an independent external review, then they should submit a complaint to the Office of the Independent Adjudicator (OIA) within 12 months of the date on the "Completion of Procedures" Letter. The Completion of Procedures Letter will contain information on the services provided by the OIA and on how to apply.

7. Penalties

Minor Offences:

7.1 Collusion:

- (i) Making work available to another student either intentionally or as a result of neglect. Collaboration with another student when work is presented as that of a single student. Applicable to Foundation and Level 4.
 - a. First offence: Formal Warning, work is marked on its merits, discounting highlighted sections
 - b. Subsequent offence: Formal Warning, work is marked on its merits, discounting highlighted sections.

7.2 Exams:

- (i) Any form of disruptive behaviour. Not following the instructions given by the examination invigilator. The removal of any material from the examination room other than items which were brought into the room by the candidate or the question paper, where permitted. Applicable to All Levels.
 - a. First offence: Formal Warning, exam is marked.
 - b. Subsequent offence: Formal Warning, exam is marked.

7.3 Plagiarism (any amount):

- (i) Unreferenced and paraphrased OR verbatim. Student has not referenced original source. This can include the use of word spinners/synonyms. Applicable to Foundation and Level 4:
 - a. First offence: Formal Warning, work is marked on its merits, discounting plagiarised sections
 - b. Subsequent offence: Work is marked on its merits, discounting plagiarised sections.

7.4 Poor Scholarship:

- (i) Student has over-relied on sources or has not yet learnt the correct academic conventions. Applicable to all levels.
 - a. First offence: No penalty. Work is marked on its merits, discounting plagiarised sections.
 - b. Subsequent offence: No penalty. Work is marked on its merits, discounting plagiarised sections.

7.5 Self-Plagiarism:

- (i) Student has not referenced their previous assignment or developed those ideas. Applicable to all Levels.
 - a. First offence: No penalty. Work is marked on its merits, discounting plagiarised highlighted sections
 - b. Subsequent offence: No penalty. Work is marked on its merits, discounting plagiarised sections

Moderate Offences:

7.6 Collusion:

- (i) Making work available to another student either intentionally or as a result of neglect outside of group work. Collaboration with another student when work is presented as that of a single student. Applicable to Levels 5, 6 and 7.
 - a. First offence: Awarded a Mark of 0 + required to revise and resubmit the assignment if a resubmission is available.
 - b. Subsequent offence: Awarded a Mark of 0 + required to revise and resubmit the assignment if a resubmission is available.

7.7 Contract Cheating:

- (i) Any case of contract cheating. Applicable to Foundation and Level 4.
 - a. First offence: Mark of 0 + required to submit a new assignment if a resubmission is available.
 - b. Subsequent offence: Mark of 0 + required to submit a new assignment if a resubmission is available.

7.8 Exams:

- (i) Obtaining or seeking to obtain examination papers prior to the examination, unless the paper has been provided as a 'seen' examination. Applicable to All Levels.
 - a. First offence: Formal Warning Exam marked but mark to be capped at pass mark (40 UG/50 PG)
 - b. Subsequent offence: Exam marked but mark be capped at pass mark (40 UG/50 PG)
- (ii) Copying from another candidate or from any unauthorised material, including by use of an electrical device. Communicating or attempting to communicate with other candidates or with any person(s) except the invigilator, including by use of an electrical device.
 - a. First offence: Foundation and Level 4 Mark of 0 + required to resit the exam component if a resubmission is available.
 - b. Subsequent offence: Mark of 0 + required to resit the exam component if a resubmission is available.

7.9 Persistent Poor Scholarship (considered as Plagiarism):

- (i) Student continuously has poor scholarship in their assignments. Clear guidance on academic conventions has been provided previously with direct feedback on techniques to use. Applicable to Level 5, 6 and 7.
 - a. First offence: Awarded a Mark of 0 + required to revise and resubmit the assignment if a resubmission is available.
 - b. Subsequent offence: Awarded a Mark of 0 + required to revise and resubmit the assignment if a resubmission is available.

7.10 Plagiarism (any amount):

- (i) Unreferenced and paraphrased. Student has taken idea from a source and has paraphrased this, without acknowledging the original source or without sufficient attribution of ideas. This can include using synonyms and word spinners. Applicable to Levels 5, 6 and 7.
- a. First offence: Work is marked on its merits, discounting plagiarised sections.
- b. Subsequent offence: Awarded a Mark of 0 + required to revise and resubmit the assignment if a resubmission is available.

7.11 Plagiarism (Up to 50%):

- (i) Unreferenced and verbatim. Student has taken an idea from a source and has not referenced the source and has copied it verbatim. Applicable to Levels 5, 6 and 7.
- a. First offence: Awarded a Mark of 0 + required to revise and resubmit the assignment if a resubmission is available.
- b. Subsequent offence: Awarded a Mark of 0 + required to revise and resubmit the assignment if a resubmission is available.

Serious Offences:

7.12 Contract Cheating:

- (i) Any case of contract cheating. Applicable to Level 5, 6 and 7.
- a. First offence: Mark of 0 + required to submit a new assignment if a resubmission is available.
- b. Subsequent offence: Mark of 0 for module + required to repeat module in the next academic year if a resubmission is available.

7.13 Exams:

- (i) Copying from another candidate or from any unauthorised material, including by use of an electrical device. Communicating or attempting to communicate with other candidates or with any person(s) except the invigilator, including by use of an electrical device. Applicable to Levels 5, 6 and 7.
- a. First offence: Mark of 0 + required to resit the exam component if a resubmission is available.
- b. Subsequent offence: Mark of 0 for module + required to repeat module in the next academic year if a resubmission is available.

7.15 Fabrication or Falsification:

- (i) Content of assessment or records. Documentation associated with academic progress (e.g. entry statements or qualifications) False claims for exemption or mitigation Misrepresentation of a word count. Contribution to a group assessment. Applicable to All Levels.
- a. First offence: Mark of 0 + required to submit a new assignment if a resubmission is available.

- b. Subsequent offence: Mark of 0 for module + required to repeat module in the next academic year if a resubmission is available.

7.16 Impersonation:

- (i) Being party to any arrangement whereby a person, other than a student fraudulently represents or intends to. Applicable to All Levels.
 - a. First offence: Mark of 0 + required to submit a new assignment if a resubmission is available.
 - b. Subsequent offence: Mark of 0 for module + required to repeat module in the next academic year if a resubmission is available.

7.17 Plagiarism (Above 50%):

- (i) Unreferenced and verbatim. Student has taken an idea from a source and has not referenced the source and has copied it verbatim. This can also include secondary research as part of Literature Reviews. Applicable to Levels 5, 6 and 7.
 - a. First offence: Awarded a Mark of 0 + required to revise and resubmit the assignment if a resubmission is available.
 - b. Subsequent offence: Awarded a Mark of 0 + required to submit a new assignment if a resubmission is available.

7.18 Research Misconduct:

- (i) Unethical conduct in data collection presenting risk to participants or the University. Failure to obtain ethical approval prior to commencing primary research. Improper conduct of the research. Improper relationship and dealings with participants. Improper handling of data.
 - a. Foundation, Level 4 and 5 first offence: Awarded a Mark of 0 + required to submit a new assignment if a resubmission is available.
 - b. Foundation, Level 4 and 5 Subsequent offence: Awarded a Mark of 0 + required to submit a new the assignment if a resubmission is available.
 - c. Level 6 and 7 first offence: Awarded a Mark of 0 + required to submit a new the assignment if a resubmission is available.
 - d. Level 6 and 7 Subsequent offence: Mark of 0 for module + required to repeat module in the next academic year if a resubmission is available.

7.19 Notes for penalties:

- (i) This acts as a guide, and each case must be considered on its merits. There will be occasions when particular factors mean that a case falls within either a higher or lower category than indicated in this guide to provide greater consideration and ensure that a fair outcome can be reached. The level of consideration and finding of academic misconduct is ultimately a matter of academic judgement.
- (ii) Once a penalty has been applied, the normal academic regulations will be applied. For example: if a student receives Formal Warning, work is marked on its merits, discounting highlighted sections and it is deemed their work is a fail once it is marked, they will still be entitled to a resit (if a first attempt), which will

be capped at the component level. Any applicable late submission penalties on resit work will be applied to the academic mark before it is capped.

- (iii) For all offences, students are required to undertake an Academic Integrity Tutorial, facilitated by the Learning Hub.
- (iv) The penalties indicated for subsequent offences above refer to what would be typical for a second offence. If a student has had 3 or more cases of misconduct, it is considered that staff will apply a more severe penalty, but this will be considered on a case-by-case basis. Such cases would be regarded as serious. Subsequent offences can occur at any level i.e., if a student has one offence at Level 4, then commits an offence in Level 5, the Level 5 case would be a subsequent offence. Staff can confirm with AQO if a student has had a previous offence.
- (v) If a penalty is applied to a resit assignment, the normal regulations will apply. This means that the mark will always be capped at the resit, regardless of the penalty in line with the normal regulations.
- (vi) If the penalty states "Revise and Resubmit the assignment" or "Submit a new assignment" staff should confirm with the Assessment Team if the student has this option available to them. For example, if a student is already on a second attempt of the component (resit), they would not be able to resubmit an assignment therefore, the penalty would need to be adjusted accordingly. Staff can contact AQO to discuss the penalty further.
- (vii) Mark on Merits: Where a marker/assessor notes that plagiarism has occurred in a student's assignment, they should normally discount any text which has been plagiarised and should award a mark based on academic value of the work that remains. This shall not be regarded as a penalty. The mark awarded is the academic judgement of the marker/assessor. The student should be advised on how to improve their performance.
- (viii) The University's Academic and Professional Misconduct Panel has the authority to impose any other penalty deemed to be appropriate to the individual circumstances of the case, including the below, however, this is not exhaustive:
 - a. Awarding a mark of 0 + required to repeat the year
 - b. Additional Learning Activity or Verification Task (if applicable)
 - c. Limit imposed on final award classification
 - d. Cancellation of registration with the University with no opportunity for reassessment. It will be at the discretion of the APM Panel whether any eligible interim award or credit is awarded.

8. Glossary

- Case Initiator – Marker of the work
- Chair of the Assessment Panel (COAP) or nominee – A member of staff who investigates a case
- CLT – College Liaison Tutor within Academic Partnership Unit who liaise with Collaborative Partners
- Viva voce – An informal meeting to discuss a student's submission in relation to contract cheating/AI.
- Meeting – an investigatory meeting held in moderate or serious academic misconduct (not AI cases) to ascertain whether the student is the author of the work.

- First offence – this is the first time a student has been suspected of AMC across all modules and levels of study.
- Concurrent offence – occurs when in the same period of assessment as another instance of AMC
- Subsequent offence – occurs in a different period of assessment in the same level or has occurred in a previous level of study. NB: If a student has had a substantiated case in their first submission and then is suspected of AMC in their resit this would be a subsequent offence.
- Group Work – Where two or more students can prepare an assignment together and submit a joint assignment for marking. It must be clearly specified to students how the marks will be allocated for the group of students and the individual students.