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The following policy and procedures relate solely to the handling of allegations of academic misconduct at the University of Bradford. Guidance for staff and students at Collaborative Partner Institutions is available [here](http://www.bradford.ac.uk/student-academic-services/breaches-appeals-complaints/guidance-for-collaborative-partners/).

Allegations of racial, sexual and other forms of harassment are covered by the [University Harassment and Bullying Policy](http://www.brad.ac.uk/admin/equalopp/policies/HarassmentandBullyingPolicy07.pdf).

Disciplinary issues are covered by the [Regulations Governing Disciplinary Procedures for Students](http://www.bradford.ac.uk/governance/ordinances-regulations/regulations/university-regulations/regulation-28/), and issues involving staff by the [Staff Disciplinary Procedures.](file:///C%3A%5CUsers%5Cwhudson%5CDownloads%5CDisciplinary-Policy-and-Procedure.pdf)

Students wishing to make a complaint to the University should consult the [Student Complaints Procedure.](http://www.bradford.ac.uk/student-academic-services/breaches-appeals-complaints/complaints/)

 **Defining Academic Misconduct**

* 1. It is in the best interests of all students that the University of Bradford’s awards are deemed to be of the highest academic quality and standards and that they are not undermined by instances of academic misconduct. All instances of academic misconduct will be investigated and dealt with according to principles which are fair, equitable and proportional to the offence concerned. The University and its partner organisations reserve the right to use any fair and reasonable means of identifying instances of academic misconduct.
	2. When investigating such cases, academics must make a fair and reasonable judgement, on the basis of evidence, about whether the student intended to deceive. An Investigating Officer or members of an Investigating Committee may consider similar fact evidence in order to reach such a judgement. This evidence will normally comprise information about previously proven cases of academic misconduct by the student. It may also comprise emails and other evidence relating to access by the student to unauthorised web sites or essay writing companies. This evidence will be made available to the Officer/Committee via the Student Casework Team.
	3. The evidence will be considered carefully in order to decide whether an incident constitutes academic misconduct or whether it is a case of poor academic practice and should more judiciously be addressed within the marking scheme for the assignment. Advice can be sought from the Associate Dean, Learning and Teaching in the Faculty concerned at the University of Bradford
	4. When investigating a case of academic misconduct the University will consider whether the evidence presented establishes that, on the balance of probabilities, academic misconduct has taken place. The balance of probabilities is decided on the preponderance of the evidence under consideration. The standard is met if the proposition is more likely to be true than not true. Effectively, the standard is satisfied if there is greater than 50% chance that the proposition is true. Lord Denning, in Miller v Minister of Pensions, described it simply as "more probable than not".
	5. Staff should be aware that all communications that contain information about such cases will be accessible to the student concerned. Staff involved in bringing forward or investigating such allegations must act professionally and without bias.
	6. The following is a list of examples of academic misconduct. This list is not exhaustive; however it aims to describe the most common academic misconduct.

## Plagiarism

The University of Bradford has defined plagiarism as the inclusion within a student’s own work of a substantial, unacknowledged section of material which has been derived from the published or unpublished work of another person or the student themselves. This includes:

* The inclusion within a student’s work of substantial extracts of another person’s work without the use of quotation marks and/or specific acknowledgement of the source of the material in the references to this work. This includes text, diagrams and equations, programming results or code, test results or any other kind of evidence assembled by another person.
* The inclusion, without acknowledgement and referencing (use of quotation marks etc.), of material downloaded from the Internet.
* This also includes copying into a piece of work a section of unacknowledged material that contains references to other publications, thereby inferring that the references to these publications are the student’s own.
* The summarising or close paraphrasing of another person’s work without acknowledgement.
* The submission of work obtained from others. This includes the submission of assignments in their entirety or sections of assignments:
* Work bought from commercial Internet assignment writing sites, organisations or private individuals, whether pre-written or prepared specifically for the student concerned.
* The submission of an assignment written, in whole or in part, by another person, whether obtained with or without permission from that person.
* The use of the unacknowledged and / or unauthorised ideas of another person.
* Collusion, defined by the University as two or more students collaborating to submit work which is not entirely their own, except in such cases where the assignment requires the submission of a group effort. As well as action against the user of this material, this may result in action being taken against the originator of the work if it can be shown, within the balance of probabilities, that they allowed their work to be used
* **Note**: If cheating is suspected in respect of a piece of group work, and it cannot be established which individual(s) are responsible, the entire group will be deemed responsible, providing that there is sufficient evidence to substantiate the allegations on the balance of probability.
* Self-plagiarism or duplication: this is defined as re-using work that was originally completed and submitted to gain credit in respect of another module or assignment.

## Formal Examinations: the following will constitute Academic Misconduct

* Disruptive behaviour during an examination.
* Failure to comply with written Assessment Regulations, Examination Procedures the oral or written instructions provided by internal Examiners or invigilators.
* Gaining access to any unauthorised material, either prior to or during the examination in order to gain an unfair advantage over others.
* Gaining access to a copy of an examination paper, either written or in electronic form, prior to its authorised release date in order to gain an unfair advantage over others.
* Communicating with another student during an examination.
* Copying from another student during an examination, with or without their permission or knowledge. This includes taking data from data sticks, taking another student’s printout.
* Introducing into the examination room, or being in possession of, any written, electronic or printed materials, unless specified in the rubric for the examination.
* Leaving the examination room, for instance during a comfort break, and whilst away from the room consulting any written, printed or electronic materials in order to gain an unfair advantage over others when resuming the examination.
* Substituting examination scripts or pages within scripts during the examination.
* Making use of any electronically stored or communicated material within an examination room unless specified in the rubric for the examination.
* Use of a mobile phone, ipad and Apple watch (or other electronic device) during an examination.

## Other Forms of Academic Misconduct

* The fabrication or falsification of results or evidence: this is where a student presents data which is based on experimental or experiential work which the student claims to have carried out, but which they have invented or obtained by other means in order to gain an unfair advantage.
* Misrepresentation of identity, which the University defines as a student asking another person to take the examination/assignment in their place. In such cases, where the other person is a student of the University, they will also incur penalties appropriate to the misconduct.
* The theft of another student’s work.
* Allowing another student to copy an assignment, or sections of an assignment, in order that they may submit this material as their own.
* Any other deliberate attempt to deceive or to gain unfair advantage over other students.
* Each case and the circumstances around any instance of academic misconduct will be considered on a case by case basis; however there are no extenuating circumstances which can excuse plagiarism. The University provides clear guidance to all students about what plagiarism is and how to avoid it; the University will therefore not accept a plea of ignorance if a student is subsequently found answerable for a case of plagiarism.

## Investigating Academic Misconduct

In the event that the University receives information to the effect, anonymously or otherwise, that a student has committed academic misconduct, either plagiarised an assignment, or has purchased or is seeking to purchase an assignment from an on-line essay writing company, or from any other organisation or individual, or via any other means, or any other form of academic misconduct, the University will fully investigate the allegation.

The investigation may involve seeking access to a student’s email account to investigate alleged communications with on-line sites or with any other individual or organisation in relation to the allegation. Students may be asked to provide, at short notice, essay notes, drafts of the assignment and/or proof of the development of the assignment.

**Please Note**: The University reserves the right to share information about a student’s assessment with other academic institutions in instances involving an allegation of collaboration between students and/or cases in which a student is alleged to have purchased, or attempted to purchase, an assignment from an external source for the purpose of submission to the University as an assessment for a module on which they are registered.

## Retrospective Investigations and Rescinding Awards:

An allegation of academic misconduct may be investigated at any point during a student’s period of registration whether or not a final mark has been assigned to the work in question.

Allegations of academic misconduct in relation to graduates of the University will result in retrospective investigation where evidence which is deemed to be significant is provided.

The decision about whether or not to instigate an investigation will be taken by the Deputy Vice- Chancellor (Academic) in consultation with the Academic Registrar and the Student Casework Team.  An Investigating Officer will be nominated by the Deputy Vice-Chancellor (Academic) to consider whether a prima facie case exists prior to this decision being made.

Cases involving graduates of the University will be heard by an Investigating Committee (see section 15 below). An allegation which is found may result in a recommendation being made to the Senate to revoke the award previously made by the University of Bradford under Ordinance 3, section 7(1).

Where the Investigating Committee recommends that an award be revoked, a Completion of Procedures letter will not be issued until approval from the Senate is received.

# Procedures at Collaborative Partner Organisations:

* 1. Further information about procedures to be followed by students and staff working or studying at Collaborative Partner Organisations are available on [our website.](http://www.bradford.ac.uk/student-academic-services/breaches-appeals-complaints/guidance-for-collaborative-partners/)
	2. In order that students studying at partner organisations may be afforded equity of treatment in terms of representation, Collaborative Partners are required to manage all suspected academic misconduct in line with University of Bradford regulations and procedures. Permission must be sought from the Deputy Vice-Chancellor if a Collaborative Partner wishes the University of Bradford to manage cases of academic misconduct on their behalf.
	3. In line with University of Bradford Regulations, senior academics at collaborative partner institutions will be required to consider and establish prima facie cases in respect of final year undergraduate and postgraduate dissertations, projects and thesis, and arrange for their subsequent consideration by Investigating Committees.
	4. Collaborative Partner organisations will apply academic penalties in accordance with the [University Penalty Tariff.](http://www.bradford.ac.uk/legal-and-governance/media/legalandgovernance/allfiles/documents/breaches/Award-Penalties-Based-on-Points-V2.pdf)
	5. Collaborative Partner organisations will be required to issue a detailed outcome letter to the student when the investigation has been concluded. The outcome letter should include information about the appeals process.
	6. Where a student wishes to appeal against a decision made by a Collaborative Partner their case should be referred, by the Partner organisation, to the Student Casework Team at the University of Bradford.
	7. Such cases will be considered by an Independent Investigating Dean following the procedures documented under section 8.4 below.
	8. Where a student wishes to appeal against the decision of an Investigating Committee which has taken place at a Collaborative Partner organisation, their case should be referred by the Partner organisation, to the Student Casework Team at the University of Bradford.
	9. Such cases will be considered by the Deputy Vice-Chancellor (Academic) of the University of Bradford.
	10. Each case, and the outcome, should be reported by the Partner organisation to a named administrative/academic member of the home Faculty at Bradford. The details of case will be recorded in SITS by the home Faculty.
	11. The outcome of appeals against Collaborative Partner decisions will be managed by the Student Casework Team at the University of Bradford who will be responsible for issuing a Completion of Procedures letter and for recording the details of the case in SITS.

# Procedures for dealing with allegations of Academic Misconduct in relation to Undergraduate First and Foundation Year Students

* 1. Where an allegation is made in respect of a module delivered to a student within the Faculty in which they are registered for an award, the appropriate Chair of the Board of Examiners will have authority to consider and adjudicate in respect of all alleged breaches of assessment regulations relating to First Year and Foundation Year students where these matters relate to a first offence by the student. This process will take place separately from the Boards of Examiners meetings (see section 3.11 below).
	2. Where an allegation is made in respect of a module delivered to a student who is not registered on an award in the Faculty of module delivery:
* The allegation will be communicated in writing to the student by the Faculty which delivers the module. The home Faculty will be copied into the correspondence.
* The investigation and interviews will be carried out by the Faculty which delivers the module.
* The Faculty of delivery will copy the home Faculty into the correspondence detailing the outcome of the investigation and the penalty applied.
	1. In cases where the Chair of the Board of Examiners might experience a conflict of Interest, the Dean of Faculty will be empowered to nominate another senior academic to undertake this role.
	2. Where an examiner suspects that a case of academic misconduct has occurred they should cease to consider the student’s work and should not assign a mark to the assessment.
	3. In relation to a formal examination or a laboratory or class test conducted under examination conditions, it is the responsibility of the Invigilator to provide evidence of a suspected breach of Regulation 7: Assessment Regulations to the Examinations Office who will send this information to the Associate Dean, Learning and Teaching, in the Faculty concerned. The Invigilator will provide:
* A completed report form stating in detail the exact nature of the suspected offence. The report must be signed by the Chief Invigilator and witnessed by the second Invigilator.
* In the event that another student witnesses and reports the offence, the report form must contain details of the suspected offence and be signed by the Chief Invigilator and the student who witnessed the event.
* Any supporting evidence such as written or electronic notes, calculators, audio devices, dictionaries, etc.
* Where an Invigilator discovers notes written on the body of a student, the Chief Invigilator will witness the notes being transcribed onto the report form by the second Invigilator. Both Invigilators will then sign the form.
	1. An Internal Examiner who suspects that a student has breached the Regulation 7: Assessment Regulations should inform the Associate Dean Learning and Teaching in the Faculty in which the student is registered for their award, in writing, as soon as possible after the breach has been identified. The information provided by an Internal Examiner when reporting suspected academic misconduct in relation to an essay or assignment undertaken outside a formal examination will comprise:
* A completed [Allegation Report Form,](http://www.bradford.ac.uk/student-academic-services/breaches-appeals-complaints/breaches/information-for-staff) signed by the Internal Examiner concerned, including a detailed account of the exact nature of the allegation.

**Together with**

* A Turnitin Similarity Report

**Please Note**: The Similarity Report will identify only the percentage of material that has been taken from a source or sources; it will not tell an Examiner whether the sources have been correctly referenced or not. It is the responsibility of the Internal Examiner to analyse the Report to check whether this material has actually been referenced correctly by the student. The Internal Examiner should report only the total percentage of material they believe to have been taken from unattributed sources. Reports sent to the Chair without such analysis will be returned to the Examiner.

Please contact the [Centre for Educational Development](http://www.bradford.ac.uk/educational-development/) for assistance in using the Turnitin Similarity Index to identify plagiarism.

* 1. The Chair of the Board of Examiners will ensure that that the student is provided with copies of all evidence prior to formal consideration of the case.
	2. It will be the responsibility of the Associate Dean, Learning and Teaching to allocate the consideration of the breach case to Chair of the appropriate Board of Examiners. The Chair of the Board of Examiners will review the evidence provided and make a judgement as to whether a *prima facie* case exists.
	3. In the event that no case is found to exist, the allegation will be dismissed, the Internal Examiner will be instructed to assign a mark to the assessment in question and all record of the allegation will be struck from the student’s records.
	4. In the event that a *prima facie* case is found to exist, the student will be **required** to attend an interview with the Chair of the Board of Examiners, and their Personal Academic Tutor or other designated individual, where they may present their response to the allegation made against them. In communicating with the student the Faculty will follow the principles of the procedures detailed within section 5.1 below.
	5. A student appearing attending an interview with the Chair of the Board of Examiners may be accompanied by a friend, who must be a member of the University or a member of the Student’s Union advisory staff.
	6. A student may not bring legal representation to this meeting without prior consent obtained from the Academic Registrar, which will be granted only in exceptional circumstances.
	7. In the event that the prima facie case is found and relates to a second or subsequent offence by the student, the Chair of the Board of Examiners will refer to matter to the Student Casework Team. The procedures detailed within section 4 below, will then be followed.
	8. Where the allegation concerns a first offence, the Chair of the Board of Examiners will consider the evidence and the response made by the student and decide whether the allegation should be dismissed, or whether the evidence supports a penalty being imposed in respect of a breach of regulations.
	9. In the event that the allegation is dismissed the Internal Examiner will be instructed to assign a mark to the assessment in question and all record of the allegation will be struck from the student’s records.
	10. The Chair of the Board of Examiner’s summary power comprises the authority to determine an academic penalty in accordance with the approved [University Penalty Tariff.](http://www.bradford.ac.uk/student-academic-services/breaches-appeals-complaints/breaches/information-for-staff/)
	11. For the purposes of these regulations, students will have been deemed to have achieved a pass in an element of assessment on achieving a mark of 40%, or the pass mark specified by the relevant course regulations.
	12. Where the first instance of a case of academic misconduct committed by a first or foundation year student takes the form of plagiarism, it, **will not** be counted as an attempt at assessment. Academic misconduct taking other forms, and any subsequent case, however, will be counted as an attempt at assessment.
	13. In all instances, an allegation against a student will be considered on a case-by-case basis, and full cognisance of any extenuating circumstances and/or evidence presented by the student will be taken into account when determining any penalty to be applied.
	14. **Translations:** It is the responsibility of the student to provide, where necessary, an authorised translation of any evidence of extenuating circumstances which is not written in English.

	**Authorised translators include:**
* The University of Bradford Language Centre.
* A professional translator (the translation must be accompanied by a formal invoice for the services of the translator which includes their formal credentials).
* An academic employed by the University or by another University (the translation must be accompanied by a formal letter, on University letter headed paper, providing the credentials of the translator).
	1. The Chair of the Board of Examiners summary powers do not include the imposition of any penalty whereby the consequences would preclude the student from completing the award on which they are registered.
	2. All students who are found answerable for cases of plagiarism, at whatever stage of their studies, will be required undertake and complete a Plagiarism Awareness Programme which will be delivered by the Library Services. Students will be referred to and supported by [appropriate specialists](http://www.bradford.ac.uk/library/about-us/contact-us/subject-librarians/) from the Library. The programme contains a number of assessments designed to assess their understanding of what constitutes plagiarism and of the appropriate referencing convention within their Faculty.
	3. The requirement for students to attend the Plagiarism Awareness Programme is part of the penalty imposed on the student in respect of the Academic Misconduct Regulations. The Subject Librarian will be copied into the outcome or Completion of Procedures letter sent to the student and will contact the student directly and ask them to attend the Programme. The Student Casework Team and the Faculty will be informed by the Subject Librarian when the student has completed the Plagiarism Awareness Programme.
	4. If after two attempts to establish contact, the student does not attend the Programme, the Subject Librarian will inform the Faculty and the Student Casework Team. It is then the responsibility of the Faculty to ensure that the student attends Library Services for support, or, if attendance at the Programme is not forthcoming, to make arrangements to suspend the student from their course of study.
	5. The responsibility for the subsequent monitoring of the student rests with the student’s Personal Academic Tutor, or designated equivalent within the Faculty.
	6. Data to support an evaluation and review of this process will be provided to the Learning and Teaching Committee on an annual basis.
	7. Students will be informed, via email, of the outcome of their case by their Personal Academic Tutor within three University working days of their meeting with the Chair of the Board of Examiners. Faculties will issue the student with a letter, normally via email, detailing the outcome of the investigation and the penalty applied within 21 University working days of the date of the student’s interview with the Chair of the Board of Examiners.
	8. The Faculty will provide the following information to the Student Casework Team within 14 University working days of the case being resolved at Faculty level (this may be done by means of a copy of the correspondence detailing the outcome of the investigation).
* The name and UB number of the student
* The nature of the offence
* The course of study and the module involved
* The penalty imposed/notice of dismissal of the case
	1. In the event that a student wishes to appeal against the penalty imposed by the Chair of the Board of Examiners, they should inform the Student Casework Team of this fact within 20 University working days of the meeting with the Chair. The Student Casework Team will then arrange for the case to be heard by an independent Investigating Officer via an Academic Misconduct Hearing. The decision of the independent Investigating Officer/Associate Dean in such cases will be final and **will not** be subject to any further appeal.
	2. Students who decline to attend an interview with the Chair of the Board of Examiners, and their Personal Academic Tutor will be assumed to be admitting the allegation against them. They will be **required** to attend an interview and discuss the matter with their Personal Academic Tutor. They will also be **required** to attend the Plagiarism Awareness Programme. Failure to engage with either of these requirements, which are an essential element of their learning experience, will result in the student being unable to progress into the next stage of their course, or to graduate (as appropriate) until these requirements have been addressed.
	3. For the purposes of these regulations, students will be deemed to have achieved a pass in the specified assessment on achieving a mark of 40%, or the pass mark specified by the relevant course regulations.
	4. A mark specified as a penalty for a breach of assessment regulations may not be set aside in favour of a mark achieved for assessment in that module at a previous attempt.

Students must achieve a mark pass mark in all plagiarised assessments and elements of assessment prior to receipt of an award. Students, who are found accountable for academic misconduct at supplementary assessment, where their original attempt at assessment achieved a compensatable mark, must retake and pass that assessment or element of assessment in which they have been found accountable for academic misconduct.

* 1. A penalty will be applied and re-assessment required, prior to the receipt of an award, in the following cases:
* Students who achieve a legitimately compensatable mark but are required to undertake supplementary assessment in that module due to failures in other modules and are subsequently found accountable for a breach in the supplementary assessment of that module.
* Students who are studying part time and undertake supplementary assessment according to normal practice prior to their full profile of marks being available and are then found accountable for a breach in this supplementary assessment.

# Reporting the suspected academic misconduct in relation to All Other Undergraduate and Postgraduate Students and First and Foundation Year Second and Subsequent Offences.

* 1. Where an examiner suspects that a case of academic misconduct has occurred they should cease to consider the student’s work and should not assign a mark to the assessment.
	2. In relation to a formal examination or a laboratory or class test conducted under examination conditions, it is the responsibility of the Invigilator to provide evidence of the suspected academic misconduct to the Student Casework Team, who will inform the Associate Dean Learning and Teaching in the Faculty concerned of the suspected offence. The Invigilator will provide:
* A completed report form stating **in detail** the exact nature of the suspected offence. The report must be signed by the Chief Invigilator and witnessed by the second Invigilator.
* In the event that another student witnesses and reports the offence, the report form must contain details of the suspected offence and be signed by the Chief Invigilator and the student who witnessed the event.
* Any supporting evidence such as written or electronic notes, calculators, audio devices, dictionaries, etc.
* Where an Invigilator discovers notes written on the body of a student, the Chief Invigilator will witness the notes being transcribed onto the report form by the second Invigilator. Both Invigilators will then sign the form.
	1. Where an allegation is made in respect of a module delivered to a student within the Faculty in which they are registered for an award the Internal Examiner who suspects that a student has committed academic misconduct should inform the Associate Dean Learning and Teaching in the Faculty in which the student is registered for their award, in writing, as soon as possible after the suspected academic misconduct has been identified.
	2. Where an allegation is made in respect of a module delivered to a student who is not registered on an award in the Faculty of module delivery:
* The Student Casework Team will be notified of the allegation by the Faculty which delivers the module.
* An allegation letter will be sent to the student by the Student Casework Team; this letter will be copied to a contact in the student’s home Faculty.
* The Student Casework Team will copy both the home Faculty and the Faculty delivering the module into the outcome or Completion of Procedures letter
	1. Although an assessment of the percentage of text plagiarised is a reasonable starting point, in disciplines where the overall coherence of the written work is important and rests primarily on a core philosophical argument or on a set of test or survey results upon which the rest of the assignment is built, then it is reasonable to argue that the significance of the plagiarised work should be taken into account, in addition to the amount of unattributed text.

	**It is the responsibility of the Faculty** to identify, not only the amount of unattributed text but also, whether the text which has been plagiarised is incidental to the assignment or whether it is fundamental to the entire argument contained within the assignment.

	For example:

	If the core argument in a thesis has itself been plagiarised in its entirety and the rest of the thesis is devoted to debating this argument's validity and application, then it could be argued that the essential part of the thesis has been plagiarised. This might, in percentage terms, be quite low; however, it is the impact of its removal on the coherence of the assignment that will be taken into consideration by the Investigating Officer or the Investigating Committee.
	2. The information provided to the Student Casework Team by an Internal Examiner when reporting a suspected breach of assessment regulations in relation to an essay or assignment undertaken outside a formal examination will comprise:
* A completed report form, signed by the Internal Examiner concerned including a detailed account of the exact nature of the allegation and the attempt number in relation to the assessment.

**Together with**

* A Turnitin Similarity Report.

**Please Note:** The Similarity Report will identify only the percentage of material that has been taken from a source or sources; it will not tell you whether the sources have been correctly referenced or not. It is the responsibility of the Internal Examiner to analyse the Report to check whether this material has actually been referenced correctly by the student. The Internal Examiner will report only the total percentage of material they believe to have been taken from unattributed sources.

Please contact the [Centre for Educational Development](http://www.bradford.ac.uk/educational-development/) for assistance in using the Turnitin Similarity Index to identify plagiarism.

* 1. A copy of this documentation should be retained within the Faculty for reference by the Presenting Officer in the event that the case is considered by an Investigating Committee
	2. The Invigilator or Internal Examiner may not introduce any additional evidence to support the allegation after this point. In cases where additional evidence is introduced it is the responsibility of the Student Casework Team to ensure that the student is provided with copies of the evidence prior to formal consideration of the case.
	3. In cases where the suspected breach of assessment regulations relates to a final year or postgraduate dissertation, thesis or project, Internal Examiners may submit an analysed Turnitin report, however, a copy of the student’s assignment and a copy of each of the sources from which the student has taken material, marked up **black** and cross-referenced to demonstrate where the source material appears within the assignment, must also be submitted for consideration by the Investigating Committee.
	4. Where, in the view of the Student Casework Team, insufficient evidence has been provided to support the allegation the Student Casework Team and the Associate Dean Learning and Teaching will jointly take the decision that the evidence is deficient to the extent that the case will not be taken forward. The Associate Dean Learning and Teaching will arrange for appropriate evidence to be provided to the Student Casework Team or, where such evidence is not available, will ensure that the work is marked and progressed in the normal manner.
	5. Where, in the view of the Student Casework Team, the evidence presented more appropriately supports a case of poor academic practice, the Student Casework Team and the Associate Dean Learning and Teaching will jointly take the decision that the deficiencies within the assignment would more judiciously be considered under the appropriate mark scheme.
	6. In all cases of poor academic practice, the student will be warned in writing by either the Faculty or by the Student Casework Team (dependent on the stage at which the judgement is made) about the consequences of any future lapse in referencing conventions. In such cases the student will be assisted by their Personal Academic Tutor to prepare a development plan. This plan will require the student to engage with the [Academic Skills Advice Service](http://www.bradford.ac.uk/learner-development/)  in order to access appropriate support in developing their academic writing skills and understanding referencing conventions.
	7. In such cases the Student Casework Team will hold data relating to the allegation only for such time as is required to provide statistical information about the process to the University. After such time the records relating to the allegation will be deleted.
	8. A penalty will be applied and re-assessment required, prior to the receipt of an award, in the following cases:
* Students who achieve a legitimately compensatable mark but undertake supplementary assessment due to failures in other modules and are subsequently found accountable for academic misconduct in relation to supplementary assessment.
* Students who are studying part time and undertake supplementary assessment according to normal practice prior to their full profile of marks being available and are then found accountable for academic misconduct in this supplementary assessment.

# Communication with the Student

Where, in the view of the Student Casework Team, the evidence presented is sufficient to support the allegation, the Student Casework Team will write to the student detailing the allegation, providing a copy of the evidence presented by the Faculty. During term-time the correspondence will be sent to the student’s local contact address and by email to their Bradford email account.

**Students will be informed that unless they inform the Student Casework team otherwise, any further correspondence about the allegation will take place via email to their Bradford email account.**

* 1. It is the responsibility of the student to ensure that their current contact address is maintained within the student records system.
	2. The Student Casework Team will invite the student to make a written or email response to the allegation; this response should include details of any extenuating circumstances, and any supporting evidence which may impact upon the case.
	3. The correspondence to the student will include directions on how to access Regulation 7: Assessment Regulations and any other information required (as appropriate).
	4. Students will be directed to contact a member of the Students’ Union advisory staff to gain assistance in writing their response to the allegation ubu-advice@bradford.ac.uk,
	5. Students will be permitted 14 days in which to make this response and will be advised that failure to respond may be taken as an indication that they do not wish to contest the allegation. In the event that a student requires additional time in which to make their response, they should contact the Student Casework Team to inform them of this fact and the reasons for it.
	6. It is the responsibility of the student to provide, where necessary, an authorised translation of any evidence of extenuating circumstances which is not written in English.

	Authorised translators include;
* The University of Bradford Language Centre.
* A professional translator (the translation must be accompanied by a formal invoice for the services of the translator which includes their formal credentials).
* An academic employed by the University or by another University (the translation must be accompanied by a formal letter, on University letter headed paper, providing the credentials of the translator).

# Establishing a prima facie case

* 1. After the 14 days have elapsed the Student Casework Team will send a summary of the case, together with the supporting evidence, to an Investigating Officer. The Student Casework Team will also send any response to the allegation that has been made by the student. The Investigating Officer will normally be a Dean, Associate Dean, Head of School or Division, or Head of other senior academic within a Faculty other than that in which the student is registered.
	2. It will then be the responsibility of the Investigating Officer to establish whether a prima facie case of a breach of assessment regulations exists. This decision will be communicated to the Student Casework Team normally within one week of the Officer receiving the allegation.
	3. The Student Casework Team and/or the Investigating Officer will be permitted to seek additional information from the Invigilator/Internal Examiner in the event that the response to the allegation provided by the student raises issues that require further clarification.
	4. In the event that the Investigating Officer decides that there is no prima facie case, the student, and the student’s Faculty, will be informed and no further action will be taken.
	5. In such cases the Student Casework Team will hold data relating to the allegation only for such time as is required to provide statistical information about the process to the University. After such time the records relating to the allegation will be deleted.

# Determination of Procedures to be followed

* 1. If the Investigating Officer decides that there is a prima facie case in respect of a breach of regulations they will, at the same time, consider whether the case is sufficiently minor that it can be dealt with by the Investigating Officer using their summary powers.
	2. An Investigating Dean’s summary powers comprise the authority to determine an academic penalty in accordance with the [University Penalty Tariff](http://www.bradford.ac.uk/student-academic-services/breaches-appeals-complaints/breaches/information-for-staff/) up to and including a maximum penalty of the failure of the student in the unit(s) of assessment concerned (i.e. the recording of a mark of 0%).
	3. An Investigating Officer’s summary powers **do not** include the imposition of any penalty whereby the consequences of that penalty would lead the student to be excluded from the University or would preclude the student from completing the award on which they are registered.
	4. An instance of academic misconduct by a student, other than the first instance of plagiarism committed by a first or foundation year student, will be counted as an attempt at assessment.
	5. Where, in the opinion of the Investigating Officer, the penalty incurred might exceed that which is permitted within the Investigating Officer’s summary powers, the case will be referred to an Investigating Committee.
	6. In the event that a *prima facie* case is found in relation to a suspected breach of assessment regulations involving an undergraduate, postgraduate or doctoral project, thesis or dissertation, or in the case of the suspected purchase of material from an essay writing site or company, the matter will automatically be referred for consideration by an Investigating Committee.

# Consideration by an Investigating Officer

The following procedures will apply in cases to be dealt with by an Investigating Officer under summary powers:

* 1. At any point in the proceedings a student may request that their case be considered by means of attendance at a formal Academic Misconduct Hearing with an Independent Investigating Officer.
	2. In all instances, an allegation against a student will be considered on a case-by-case basis, taking full cognisance of any extenuating circumstances and/or evidence presented by the student. The Investigating Officer will consider evidence that has been provided by the student’s Faculty, alongside any response to the allegation made by the student and will have the power to conduct such investigations relating to the allegation as may seem to them to be appropriate, including seeking further information from the Faculty and/or from the student; this may include inviting the student to attend a formal Academic Misconduct Hearing.
	3. In the event that the allegation is admitted by the student in their response, the Investigating Officer will consider any extenuating circumstances submitted by the student and will determine an appropriate academic penalty in accordance with the [University Penalty Tariff](http://www.bradford.ac.uk/student-academic-services/breaches-appeals-complaints/breaches/information-for-staff/) up to and including a maximum penalty of the failure of the student in the unit(s) of assessment concerned (i.e. the recording of a mark of 0%)
	4. In the event that the allegation is not admitted by the student, or in the event that the student does not respond to the allegation, the Investigating Officer will come to a conclusion as to whether or not, on the balance of probabilities, there has been a breach of the Examination or Assessment Regulations (as outlined in Regulation 7). This decision will be made on the basis of the initial report from the Invigilator/Internal Examiner, the supporting evidence, the student’s response (if provided) and any further investigations that the Investigating Officer has conducted, including an Academic Misconduct Hearing if called.
	5. If the Investigating Officer concludes that no academic misconduct has taken place the student’s Faculty will be informed the student will be informed in writing and no further action will be taken.
	6. In such cases the Student Casework Team will hold data relating to the allegation only for such time as is required to provide statistical information about the process to the University. After such time the records relating to the allegation will be deleted.
	7. If, on the balance of probabilities, it is determined that academic misconduct has taken place, the Investigating Officer will determine an appropriate academic penalty in accordance with [University Penalty Tariff](http://www.bradford.ac.uk/student-academic-services/breaches-appeals-complaints/breaches/information-for-staff/) up to and including a maximum penalty of the failure of the student in the unit(s) of assessment concerned (i.e. the recording of a mark of 0%).

	For the purposes of these regulations, students will have been deemed to have achieved a pass in an element of assessment on achieving a mark of 40%, or the pass mark specified by the relevant course regulations.
	8. All students who are found answerable for cases of plagiarism, at whatever stage of their studies, will be required undertake and complete a Plagiarism Awareness Programme which will be delivered by [Library](http://www.bradford.ac.uk/lss/) Services. Students will be referred to and supported by [appropriate specialists](http://www.bradford.ac.uk/library/about-us/contact-us/subject-librarians/) from the Library. The programme contains a number of assessments designed to assess their understanding of what constitutes plagiarism and of the appropriate referencing convention within their Faculty.
	9. The requirement for students to attend the Plagiarism Awareness Programme is part of the penalty imposed on the student in respect of the Breach of Assessment Regulations. The Subject Librarian will be copied into the outcome or Completion of Procedures letter sent to the student and will contact the student directly and ask them to attend the Programme. The Student Casework Team and the Faculty will be informed when the student has completed the Plagiarism Awareness Programme.
	10. If after two attempts to establish contact, the student does not attend the Programme, the Subject Librarian will inform the Faculty and the Student Casework Team. It is then the responsibility of the Faculty to ensure that the student attends LSS for support, or, if attendance at the Programme is not forthcoming, to make arrangements to suspend the student from their course of study.
	11. The responsibility for the subsequent monitoring of the student rests with the student’s Personal Academic Tutor, or designated equivalent within the Faculty.
	12. If after two attempts to establish contact, the student does not attend the Programme, the Subject Librarian will inform the Faculty and the Student Casework Team. It is then the responsibility of the Faculty to ensure that the student attends LSS for support, or, if attendance at the Programme is not forthcoming, to make arrangements to suspend the student from their course of study.
	13. Data to support an evaluation and review of this process will be provided to the Learning and Teaching Committee on an annual basis.
	14. In determining the penalty the Investigating Officer will take into consideration the extent and seriousness of the breach. When considering whether there was an attempt to deceive on the part of the student, the Investigating Officer may consider evidence of previously proven academic misconduct. The Investigating Officer will also take full account of the response submitted by the student and any mitigation the student may have provided.
	15. The Student Casework Team will contact the student informing them of the outcome of the case and the nature of the academic penalty, via email, as soon as possible after the Investigating Officer has made a decision.
	16. The Student Casework Team will, at the same time, inform the student’s Faculty of the Investigating Officer’s decision and the academic penalty imposed. It will be the responsibility of the Faculty to ensure that the penalty is carried out, that the University’s records are amended as appropriate and that other areas of the University, such as Student Support Services, are informed of this decision.

	It will be the responsibility of the Faculty to draw the attention of the Student Casework Team to any subsequent occurrence of the student being suspected of a breach of assessment regulations.
	17. Any student who wishes to contest and appeal the findings of an Investigating Officer is entitled to have their case reviewed by an Independent Officer. Students must write to the Student Casework Team, within 10 working days of receipt of the letter informing them of the outcome of the Investigating Officer’s Investigation, to request a formal Independent Academic Misconduct Hearing. This right of appeal applies even if the student has asked, during the investigatory process, for their case to be heard by an Investigating Officer in person.
	18. The decision of any subsequent Academic Misconduct Hearing by an Independent Investigating Officer will be final and will not be subject to any further appeal.
	19. For the purposes of these regulations, students will be deemed to have achieved a pass in the specified assessment on achieving a mark of 40%, or the pass mark specified by the relevant course regulations.

	A mark of zero specified as a penalty for academic misconduct, may not be set aside, compensated, condoned for credit or excluded from any calculation for the classification of an award other than in exceptional circumstances, and then only after full consideration of the case by a Board of Examiners. Such decisions must be approved by the Deputy Vice-Chancellor (Academic) prior to the results being published and/or made available to students.

# Conduct of a Formal Academic Misconduct Hearing

* 1. In the event that a student wishes to appeal or contest the finding or penalty of the Investigating Officer they are entitled to request a formal hearing with an Investigating Officer who is independent from the Investigating Officer who originally considered their case. The student will be asked to complete an Investigating Officer’s Hearing form outlining their reasons for requesting a meeting with the Investigating Officer. The Investigating Officer will normally be a Dean, Associate Dean, Head of School or Division, or Head of other senior academic within a Faculty.
	2. A student may appeal or contest the finding of the Investigating Officer on the following grounds:

9.2.1 That there are undisclosed extenuating circumstances which, for good demonstrable reason, were not made available at the time;

9.2.2 That there was a procedural irregularity in the assessment or examination or in the consideration of the alleged academic misconduct;

9.2.3 That there was prejudice or bias on the part of the examiner or invigilator.

* 1. Any such Academic Misconduct Hearing will be arranged at a time of mutual convenience and will comprise the Investigating Officer, a member of the Student Casework Team and the student. The Investigating Officer may invite a representative of the student’s Faculty to present evidence to support the allegation and to answer questions.
	2. Where the allegation involves collusion between two or more students, the students will be invited to attend separate hearings. If the students wish to attend a joint hearing, a request must be made to the Student Casework Team.
	3. The student may be accompanied by a friend, who must be a member of the University or a member of the Students’ Union advisory staff.
	4. A student may not bring legal representation to this meeting without prior consent from the Academic Registrar, which will be granted only in exceptional circumstances.
	5. The conduct of the Academic Misconduct Hearing will be as the Investigating Officer considers fair and reasonable, always ensuring that the student has the opportunity to inspect all the evidence against them and to present their case in full.
	6. At the conclusion of the Hearing, based on the evidence presented and the discussion with the student, the Investigating Officer will either uphold or revise the original decision of the Investigating Officer. The Student Casework Team will confirm the outcome of the Hearing in writing to the student within 7 University working days.
	7. The outcome of the Academic Misconduct Hearing constitutes the completion of the University of Bradford’s procedures to be followed in the event of suspected academic misconduct. There is no further right of appeal under the Regulations Governing Appeals by Students against and Aspect of their Academic Assessment as the criteria under which a student may appeal preclude such a case.
	8. Students who chose to engage in this final part of the procedures will be issued with a Completion of Procedures letter. They will be informed that, should they be dissatisfied with the outcome of their case, they may be able to apply for a review of their case to the [Office of the Independent Adjudicator for Higher Education](http://www.oiahe.org.uk/) (OIA) providing that the complaint they take to the OIA is eligible under its Rules.

	Such complaints to the OIA must be made within twelve months of the date of the Completion of Procedures letter.
	9. Notwithstanding the above, it will not be open to the student to request a further Academic Misconduct Hearing if one has already been called under the provisions of section 8 above.
	10. In the event that a student fails to attend an Academic Misconduct Hearing that they themselves have requested, without notifying the Student Casework Team in advance that they are unable to attend, the Hearing will not be rescheduled. The student’s case will be reviewed on the basis of the written evidence they have provided to request the Hearing. A decision will be communicated to the student within seven days of the Hearing date.

# Remit and Composition of an Investigating Committee

* 1. Where, in the opinion of the Investigating Officer, the penalty incurred might exceed that which is permitted within the Investigating Officer’s summary powers, the case will be referred to an Investigating Committee.
	2. Where a prima facie case is found in relation to an undergraduate, postgraduate or doctoral project, thesis or dissertation, it will automatically be referred for consideration by an Investigating Committee. Retrospective cases of academic misconduct will automatically be referred to an Investigating Committee.
	3. An Investigating Committee will be constituted by or on behalf of the Senate and will comprise the following:
* A chairperson – A senior academic from a Faculty other than that in which the student is registered or in which the module resides and who has not had any previous involvement in the case.
* Two additional members of academic staff, each from a Faculty other than the Faculty in which the student is registered. (Where two members from the same Faculty are members of the Committee they will be taken from different Schools/Divisions within the Faculty).
* A member of the Student Union Executive.
	1. The membership of the Investigating Committee will remain constant throughout the hearing of the case and the Chairperson will be present throughout.
	2. The Student Casework Team will be present throughout the hearing of the case for the purposes of the provision of regulatory advice and the production of a formal record of the proceedings.

# The Presenting Officer

* 1. The Associate Dean, Learning and Teaching, will be asked by the Student Casework Team to assign a Presenting Officer to the case. This request will be made at least 10 University working days prior to the meeting.
	2. The Presenting Officer must be an academic member of the Faculty, preferably the Project or Dissertation Supervisor or the examiner of the work in question.
	3. The Presenting Officer will make the case against the student at the Investigating Committee and will be required bring with them to the meeting:
* A copy of the evidence originally presented to the Student Casework Team;
* Details of the student’s module marks for their period of registration;
* A documented time-line of the student’s extenuating circumstances and any requests for extensions to submission deadlines;
* Details of the extenuating circumstances affecting the module and the assessment in question;
* Information as to whether or not the student has a registered disability;
* Details of the student’s attendance record on the course;
* Supervision records and copies of written feedback provided to the student in relation to the module and the assessment in question;
* A copy of the course and module handbooks and any other documentation provided to students in relation to academic referencing and plagiarism;
* The Faculty’s policy on the use by students of Turnitin.
	1. In the event that a Presenting Officer intends to call witnesses to support the allegation against the student, the Student Casework Team must be informed of the names of the witnesses and their relationship to the case at least 7 days prior to the meeting.
	2. The Student Casework Team will be required to inform the student of the names of the witnesses that the Presenting Officer intends to call at the Investigating Committee and of their relationship to the case at least 5 University working days prior to the meeting.
	3. Students will be provided with a copy of all the evidence on which the Investigating Committee will be asked to make a decision upon. This will be provided at least 5 working days prior to the date of the Hearing.

# Supporting the Student; the Student’s Friend

* 1. A student appearing before an Investigating Committee may be accompanied by a friend, who must be a member of the University or a member of the Students’ Union advisory staff.
	2. A student may not bring legal representation to this meeting without prior consent obtained from the Academic Registrar, which will be granted only in exceptional circumstances.
	3. The Student Advisor and the Academic Affairs Officer of the Student’s Union will be informed, by email, of the date of each Investigating Committee, and of the names of the students attending that Committee, at least 10 University working days prior to the meeting.

# Notification of an Investigating Committee

* 1. Students will be notified of the date arranged for the Investigating Committee at least 10 University working days prior to the meeting.
	2. The Student Casework Team will send to the student, at the address set out in 5.1 above, a letter specifying the date, time and place of the hearing and the allegation that has been made against them, together with a copy of all the supporting evidence provided by the Faculty.
	3. The student will be informed that they will be permitted to present written character references to the Committee to support their case.

	It is the responsibility of the student to provide, where necessary, an authorised translation of any evidence of character reference or evidence of extenuating circumstances which is not written in English.

	Authorised translators include;
* The University of Bradford Language Centre
* A professional translator (the translation must be accompanied by a formal invoice for the services of the translator which includes their formal credentials)
* An academic employed by the University or by another University (the translation must be accompanied by a formal letter, on University letter headed paper, providing the credentials of the translator).
	1. The student will be asked if they wish to call any witnesses to testify on their behalf against the allegations. The Student Casework Team must be informed of the names of the witnesses and their relationship to the case at least 7 days prior to the meeting.
	2. The Student Casework Team will be required to inform the Presenting Officer and the Committee of the names of the witnesses that the student intends to call at the Investigating Committee, and of their relationship to the case.
	3. Each of the members of the Committee will also be sent, under confidential cover, an agenda for the meeting, a copy of the appropriate Examinations and/or Assessment Regulations, details of the allegation made against the student and a copy of all the supporting evidence as provided by the Faculty.

# Non-attendance by a student at an Investigating Committee

* 1. In the event that a student informs the Student Casework Team that they are unable to attend on the date and at the time arranged for the Investigating Committee, the Officer will consider whether the student’s reason(s) for non-attendance are valid. If the reason(s) are deemed valid the Committee will adjourn its proceedings to a later date.
	2. If the Student Casework Team considers the reason(s) for the student’s non-attendance are **not valid**, the Committee will proceed in the student’s absence and will regard the student has having admitted no part in the allegation.
	3. A student may choose to inform the Student Casework Team that they are unable or unwilling to attend on the date and at the time arranged for the Investigating Committee. In such cases the student may wish to present an account of their case to the Committee in writing. The Officer will inform the student of the deadline for submission of their written testimony and will ensure that it is circulated to the Committee at least 5 University working days prior to the meeting.
	4. In the event that the student does not wish to, or does not attend the Investigating Committee, the student may ask a Student Union Advisor to meeting on their behalf and to read out their testimony in their absence.

# The normal conduct of an Investigating Committee

* 1. The Committee may, at any stage in the proceedings, dismiss all or part of the case.
	2. The Chair of the Committee may, at any stage during or prior to the meeting, decide in consultation with Student Casework Team and/or the Disabilities Office, the Mental Health Officer and the Student Advice Office, that the student’s interests would be best served by the case being heard in a more informal setting.

	In such cases the Chair will meet separately with the Presenting Officer prior to convening a sub-group, comprising the student, the Student Advice Office (or student’s friend) and the Student Casework Team. This group will discuss the allegation and determine a course of action and/or penalty as appropriate. The final decision to alter the venue and conduct of the meeting will rest with the Chair of the Committee only.
	3. The Committee will endeavour to conclude its proceedings during one meeting. However, should the Committee find it necessary to adjourn its proceedings, no more than one of its members may be absent when it is reconvened; where such a member is absent from a meeting, that member may not subsequently re-join the proceedings.
	4. The Student Casework Team will, at the start of the meeting, provide a synopsis of the procedures to those present.
	5. The Presenting Officer to present the case against the student.
	6. The Chairperson will ask the student whether they admit all or any of the allegation and will point out that evidence will only be called in respect of those aspects of the allegation that are **not so** admitted.
	7. The Presenting Officer will then be required to present each aspect of the case and present evidence to support the allegation. The Presenting Officer may call witnesses as appropriate. Witnesses must be concerned only with factual evidence relating directly to the current allegation. The following procedure will be adopted:
* The witness will be questioned by the Presenting Officer.
* The student and/or friend may question the witness.
* The witness will be asked to withdraw.
	1. The Chairperson will ask the student and/or friend if they wish to question the Presenting Officer with regard to the evidence presented.
	2. The Chairperson will ask the student to respond to the allegation and present evidence to support their case. The student may call witnesses as appropriate. Such witnesses must be concerned only with factual evidence relating directly to the current allegation. The following procedure will be adopted:
* The witness will be questioned by the student/and or friend.
* The witness may be questioned by the Presenting Officer.
* The witness will be asked to withdraw.
	1. At any stage in these proceedings members of the Committee may question the Presenting Officer, the student, the student’s friend or a witness on a point of clarification.
	2. The student will be asked if they wish to give an oral plea in mitigation and/or to submit written character references, providing that these have been obtained by the student in advance of the Hearing.
	3. The student, friend and the Presenting Officer will be asked to withdraw while the Committee discuss the case. The Committee will consider whether it is satisfied on the balance of probabilities that the allegation has been proved in part or in full.
	4. In reaching its decision about whether the allegation has been proven in part or in full and about whether there was an intention to deceive on the part of the student the Investigating Committee may consider similar fact evidence in order to reach such a judgement. This evidence will normally comprise information about previously proven cases of academic misconduct by the student. It may also comprise emails and other evidence relating to access by the student to unauthorised web sites or essay writing companies. This evidence will be made available to the Committee by the Student Casework Team.
	5. In all instances, an allegation against a student will be considered on a case-by-case basis, taking full cognisance of any extenuating circumstances or evidence presented by the student.
	6. In the event that the Committee find the allegation has been proven, in part or in full, the Committee will discuss and determine the nature of the penalty to be imposed.
	7. The Committee may impose an academic penalty such as seems to the Committee to be appropriate to the circumstances of the particular case, up to and including permanent expulsion from membership of the University, and permanent exclusion from any part of the University or its precincts.
	8. In the event that a student is permanently excluded from study at the University, where the appropriate credit has been accumulated, the student will be permitted to exit any interim award and/or associated credit which their academic record permits.
	9. The student, the friend and the Presenting Officer will then be recalled to hear the decision of the Committee. The Chairperson of the Committee will communicate this decision.
	10. The decision of the Committee, the nature of the penalty being imposed and the consequences of imposing the penalty in relation to the student’s academic career will be confirmed to the student in writing within 7 working days of the meeting date, by means of a formal Completion of Procedures letter.
	11. Where the Committee recommends the expulsion of a student from the University, or the rescinding of a degree already awarded by the University, this will be presented to Senate for their explicit approval by the Academic Registrar.

Notwithstanding section 15.19 above, where the Committee recommends the expulsion of a student from the University, the student will be informed of the recommendation, however a Completion of Procedures letter will not be issued until approval from the Senate is received.

# Appeals

* 1. The decision of the Investigating Committee can be subject to appeal on the following grounds:
* That there were procedural irregularities on the part of the Investigating Committee;
* That there were extenuating circumstances which affected the student’s ability to determine right from wrong, and which, for good reason, were not disclosed at the time of the Investigating Committee;
	1. An appeal should be submitted within ten working days of the notification of the decision of the Investigating Committee.
	2. Where an Investigating Committee has determined that a student be expelled from the University or that a degree already awarded be rescinded, the student’s right to appeal will apply following approval of the decision from Senate. An appeal should be submitted by the student within ten working days of being informed of the decision of Senate.
	3. If a student does not wish to submit appeal, or once the appeal outcome has been decided, students will be issued with a formal Completion of Procedures letter. They will be informed that, should they be dissatisfied with the outcome of their case, they may be able to apply for a review of their case to the [Office of the Independent Adjudicator for Higher Education](http://www.oiahe.org.uk/) (OIA) providing that the complaint they take to the OIA is eligible under its Rules.

	Such complaints to the OIA must be made within **twelve months** of the date of the Completion of Procedures letter.

# Student’s assessment or progression whilst cases are pending resolution

* 1. In order not to disadvantage students who have cases which are pending consideration and resolution, Faculty will permit such students to undertake supplementary assessment at their own risk in the modules which are under investigation.

	It should be made clear to affected students that any notification of supplementary assessment is independent of and separate from any outcome of the decision on the module(s) in question and should in no way be taken as an indication thereof.
	2. Likewise, students who would otherwise be progressing into the next stage of their studies will be permitted to re-register, on the understanding that the resolution of the allegation against them may necessitate their withdrawal or intercalation from the course.

# Quality Enhancement

* 1. The Investigating Officer and/or Chair of the Committee may document learning points for the Faculty arising from the information supplied at the meeting or during the investigation. These issues will be communicated to the Faculty in writing via the Associate Dean and the Dean of Faculty. The Investigating Officer/Chair of the Committee will ask for a response to these points from the Dean, or their nominee, within a specific timeframe. The response, and any actions arising as a consequence of the learning points, will be signed off by the Dean of Faculty.
	2. The outcome of the consideration of the learning points is intended to contribute to the enhancement of the student experience and the quality of University of Bradford awards and as such, any issues arising from learning points may be discussed by the Learning and Teaching Committee of the University.

# Monitoring and Reporting

* 1. It will be the responsibility of the Student Casework Team to provide Faculties with data relating to the outcomes of breach cases involving their on an annual basis.
	2. It will be the responsibility of the Student Casework Team to provide a University overview for consideration during the Annual Monitoring Process. This document will include a full data set (at University and Faculty level) and recommendations for policy/procedural development in response to issues arising from Faculty level impact assessments. A formal report on academic misconduct will be made to the Learning and Teaching Committee on an annual basis.
	3. It will be the responsibility of each Faculty to undertake an Impact Assessment of the Faculty’s breach data by diversity categories, and to provide an analysis of this information for inclusion, by the Student Casework Team, in the overview document.
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