

**KOSOVO ART ACADEMY  
INSTITUTIONAL AND PROGRAM EVALUATION**

**ACADEMIC OFFENCES AND BAD ACADEMIC PRACTICE  
Section I of the Code of Ethics and Conducts**

*6<sup>TH</sup> of March, 2020, Prishtina*

## ACADEMIC OFFENCES AND BAD ACADEMIC PRACTICE

Update from 06/03/2020

### Index

Annex 1 .....	4
Normal Tariff for bad Academic practice and Academic offences (Students on taught programmes).....	4
Annex 2 .....	5
Academic offences committed overseas (taught courses) .....	5
1. Introduction .....	6
2. Definitions .....	6
Cheating in examinations .....	6
2.2 Unauthorised material .....	7
2.3 Plagiarism.....	7
2.4 Acquiring and submitting work not written by the student .....	7
2.6 Collusion .....	7
2.7 Repeated bad academic practice.....	7
2.8 Reuse of assessed material .....	8
3 Actions to be taken in the event of suspected academic offences .....	8
3.1 Informing the Quality and Assurance Officer and Director of Studies .....	8
3.1.1 Bad academic practice.....	8
3.1.2 Cheating in examinations .....	8
3.2 Actions taken by the Quality and Assurance Officer and Director of Studies.....	8
3.2.1 Consultation with the Director of Student & Academic Services .....	8
3.2.2 Departmental Hearing .....	9
3.2.3 Standard penalties .....	9
3.2.4 Student’s right of appeal against a Decision of a Quality and Assurance Officer.....	10
3.3 Referral to Academic Offences Panel.....	10
4. Actions to be taken in the event of suspected academic offences or bad academic practice (Research Students).....	10
4.2 Where it is suspected that work submitted .....	10
4.3 The student is entitled to be accompanied by a representative.....	11
4.4 After considering any representations from the student .....	11
4.5 The Panel shall consider the case .....	11
5 Academic Offences Panel.....	11
6. Protocols for the conduct of an Academic Offences Panel hearing.....	11
6.1 Full and fair hearing .....	11
6.2 A Panel hearing is a formal event.....	11

6.3 Hearing presences.....	12
6.4 Panel writing.....	12
6.5 Panel Procedure.....	12
6.5.1 Right to appear and to be accompanied.....	12
6.5.2 Right to call witness.....	12
6.5.3 Proven or not proven charges.....	12
6.5.4 Right to appeal.....	12
7. Guidance notes on the conduct of a Panel hearing.....	12
7.1 Introduction of the student.....	12
7.2 Reminder of the chargers.....	12
7.3 Case presentation.....	12
7.4 Student defence.....	12
7.5 Student concluding statement.....	13
7.7 Panel Chair announcement.....	13
7.7 hear the Panel Chair announcement.....	13
7.8 Panel decision.....	13
8. Outcomes/Penalties.....	13
8.1 Students on taught programmes.....	13
8.1.1 Expel the student.....	13
8.1.2 Reduce the degree classification.....	13
8.1.3 Suspend the student.....	13
8.1.4 Deem the student to have failed only that academic year.....	13
8.1.5 Failure in the component or module.....	13
8.1.6 Refer the matter back to the Academic Practice Officer.....	13
8.1.7 Minor consequence.....	13
8.2 Research students.....	13
8.3 Students on courses leading to professional qualifications.....	14
8.4 Academy rights.....	14
9. Appeal against the decisions of an Academic Offences Panel.....	14
10. Process for conducting an appeal against a decision of the Academic Offences Panel.....	15
10.1 Appealing procedure.....	15
10.2 Appealing dismissal.....	15
10.3 Appeals Committee.....	15

**Annex 1 : Normal Tariff for bad Academic practice and Academic offences (Students on taught programmes)**

**Annex 2: Academic offences committed overseas (taught courses)**

Activity	Instance	Action
<b>Bad Academic Practice</b>	First instance	Staff to discuss with student. Mark awarded to reflect proportion of work that is original content. Discussion recorded and reported to Quality and Assurance Officer (QAO).
		Staff refers to QAO normally by email so there is a record and informs student when feeding back on assignment.
	Second or more consecutive instances	QAO decides whether to meet student – normally within 10 working days – issues a written warning and recommends appropriate actions to avoid future instances. Recorded and reported.
		QAO may recommend that the mark awarded should reflect the proportion of work that is original content or, on occasion, recommend student fails assessment task or component(s) (with a mark of zero) and the module mark capped if appropriate and not disproportionate in effect
Multiple concurrent instances	QAO to investigate and using precedents makes judgement. Outcomes can include:	
<b>Academic Offence</b>	Any instance	1. Following discussion with the Executive Director (or nominee), QAO refers case to Academic Offences Panel.
		2. QAO recommends student fails module(s) (with a mark of zero).
		3. QAO recommends student fails component(s) (with a mark of zero) and the module mark capped if appropriate and not disproportionate in effect
		4. The QAO may require student to take remedial action as appropriate and in accordance with reassessment regulations.
		5. The QAO recommends that the mark awarded should reflect the proportion of work that is original content.
		a) Cheating in examinations or any form of assessment or similar, e.g. phased tests
		b) Plagiarism
		c) Acquiring and submitting an assessment in the language of English not written by the student him/herself
		d) Fabrication of results
e) Collusion		
f) Reuse of assessed material		
g) The use of translation software		
h) Other academic offences		

1. Where an academic offence has been committed at an associated institution overseas and it is not feasible to deal with the matter at the Kosovo Art Academy campus of the University the provisions outlined below shall apply.

- The provisions of section 3, Chapter 4 shall apply except that the QAO shall take action to inform the student of the allegation within 14 days of the offence being brought to his/her attention and will invite the student to make any representations the student thinks necessary, such representations to reach the QAO within 21 days.
- The QAO will decide whether to take the matter to an Academic Council Panel, taking account of any representations received from the student.
- If taking the matter to a Panel, the QAO shall formally approach the director of studies and Academic Senate (or nominee), detailing the allegations and requesting agreement to proceed to the establishment of a Panel.
- If agreement is given, the Director of studies and Academic Services (or nominee) shall, in consultation with the QAO, the appropriate /director and the associate institution, establish a Panel with membership from the associate institution equivalent to the membership of the standard Panel. Where appropriate, such a Panel may also include external and/or University membership.
- The Panel secretary will then give notice of the hearing in writing to the student. The Panel will act in strict conformity with the provisions of these regulations.
- The Panel will then report its findings and recommendations to the QAO.
- The Director of Studies and Academic Senate (or nominee) will seek the agreement with the appropriate PVC/Dean to the recommendations of the Panel and will then formally notify the student of the Academy's decision.

2. Any difficulties arising during this process will be referred by the Director of Studies (or nominee) to the appropriate Board of directors who will resolve the matter as s/he sees fit, reporting to the Academic Senate on actions taken.

## 1. Introduction

Students are expected to write assignments in their own words and to reference the sources they use in accordance with the conventions of their discipline. There are occasional exceptions where the exact words from existing sources need to be used in an assignment, including the use of direct quotations. However, students should note that using the work of others word for word in any work submitted for assessment should be done sparingly and only when absolutely necessary. Students should also note that there are conventions when quoting the work of others which should be followed.

Students who feel that they need assistance in writing appropriately should, in the first instance, seek guidance from their Module Leader or Professor/tutor.

## 2. Definitions

**Bad academic practice** is the presentation of work that is not the student's own as if it were. It is the passing off of ideas, data or other information that are not within the realm of common knowledge in the discipline as if such materials were originally discovered by the student, or it is the word for word duplication of short phrases in written work, in oral presentation, or equivalent duplication in non-written forms, where the source is not mentioned, and where such duplication is minor in scale. The expectation is that cases of bad academic practice are only likely to occur at the first level of an undergraduate award. However, there may be instances to be found throughout both undergraduate and postgraduate programmes.

It is an **academic offence** for a student to commit any act which is intended to modify or evade, in an unauthorised manner and/or by unfair means, the condition of assessment specified by the Academy in relation to a programme leading to an Academy award or an award offered by an external body. The following are examples of such an academic offence but do not represent an exhaustive definition:

### Cheating in examinations

A candidate commits the offence of cheating in an examination if s/he:

- Deliberately acquires advance knowledge of the detailed content of the examination
- Copies from the examination script of another candidate
- Allows another candidate to copy from his or her examination script
- Provides information to another candidate in an examination
- Communicates (or attempts to communicate) with another candidate in an examination
- Obtains any other assistance from another candidate
- Uses or has access to unauthorised material (as defined in 2.2 below)
- Impersonates another examination candidate or allows himself or herself to be impersonated
- Has access to an electronic communication device
- Does any other thing with the intention of gaining unfair advantage over other candidates.
- Refuses to comply with a reasonable request made by a member of Academy staff where they suspect an incidence of cheating.
- In such circumstances, all candidates concerned may be deemed to have
- Committed an academic offence.

2.2 Unauthorised material is defined as any textual or numeric material or any device which is not explicitly identified as authorised material in the examination paper rubric, and which may reasonably be considered to offer a candidate an unfair advantage.

It shall be an offence for a candidate to use or have access to unauthorised material at any time while the examination is in progress. The definition of ‘access’ includes material on the candidate’s person or on or by his or her examination desk.

### 2.3 Plagiarism

Plagiarism is the deliberate attempt to gain advantage by presenting any work, data or concepts (including drafts and work in progress) that are not the student’s own as if they were. An example of this may be the word-for-word substantial duplication of phrases or sentences in written work, or in oral presentations and the creative arts, whether or not the original source is mentioned.

This definition of plagiarism also extends to non-written forms of production (for example, in performance, design, the making of artefacts or other objects) where equivalent duplications are made; this is sometimes referred to a ‘visual plagiarism’. An example of this may be where a student’s work copies, parodies, appropriates, pays homage to, or pastiches a specific source/artistic work but fails to acknowledge or reference the influence or significance of this source. In all cases, such sources may include the work of other students at the Academy or another institution or contracted third parties.

The Academy reserves the right to test any work submitted by a student, for consideration by an academic member of staff, for plagiarism. This includes the submission of student work to third parties for electronic testing. Content submitted to such third party providers is only ever disclosed to another Academy or equivalent institution in the event of matching text being found.

### 2.4 Acquiring and submitting work not written by the student

It is an academic offence for a student to acquire (or attempt to acquire) and then subsequently submit work that they have not written or produced themselves. Examples of this can include, but are not limited to, work that is purchased from third parties and/or online sources and work that has been substantially amended and/or improved by a third party.

### 2.5 Fabrication of Results

It is an academic offence for a candidate to claim to have carried out experiments, observations, interviews or any form of research which s/he has not, in fact, carried out.

### 2.6 Collusion

Collusion is the deliberate attempt to gain advantage by presenting work that is not solely the student’s own as if it were where the source of the unreferenced work is that of another student who has connived to deceive. Being party to collusion in providing material for another student is just as much an academic offence as using such material. Collusion is recognised by the duplication of passages or phrases in written work or in oral presentations, or equivalent duplication in non-written forms, and it necessarily involves a conspiratorial attempt to deceive. Collusion must not be confused with the good practice of collaborative learning and peer support. Collaborative learning means that a student may benefit from sharing third-party material (books, articles etc) but unless the student is explicitly instructed to plan, organize and write an assignment in a group of two or more, the student must plan, organize and write assignment work individually.

### 2.7 Repeated bad academic practice

As per the definitions in Annex 1 students who have repeated cases of bad academic practice could be found to have committed an academic offence and will be dealt with accordingly.

### 2.8 Reuse of assessed material

It is an academic offence to include in work submitted for assessment material which has already been submitted for a different assessment (whether in the current programme or for a different award at this Academy or any other institution) unless such inclusion has been agreed with the appropriate module leader or equivalent and is fully referenced. Students can thus utilise previous work as a building block for future work as long as this is explicitly referenced.

## 3. Actions to be taken in the event of suspected academic offences

For information pertaining to research students please refer to section 4 of this chapter.

### 3.1 Informing the Quality and Assurance Officer and Director of Studies

#### 3.1.1 Bad academic practice

A finding that a student's work contains instances of bad academic practice may be made:

- at level 4, either by a module leader or other appropriate member of the academic staff without reference to a Quality and Assurance Officer,
- or by the appropriate Quality and Assurance Officer, if a module leader is unable to make a clear distinction between bad academic practice and plagiarism.

The appropriate Quality and Assurance Officer should be consulted on all suspected instances of Bad Academic Practice at levels 5, 6 and 7.

In addition, a Quality and Assurance Officer will always have the discretion to judge that a piece of work submitted to him/her on instead constitutes Bad Academic Practice.

#### 3.1.2 Cheating in examinations

In accordance with the requirements of the Instructions to Invigilators, an invigilator shall, where a candidate is suspected of contravening the 'Regulations for Candidates', endorse the candidate's script at the appropriate point with the time and with a brief description of the incident and shall inform the candidate that the circumstances will be reported to the appropriate Quality and Assurance Officer and the Chair of the relevant assessment board.

#### 3.1.3 Plagiarism, fabrication of results, collusion, reuse of assessed material and other academic offences other than bad academic practice

In the case of a student on a taught programme, when a supervisor, tutor or examiner suspects plagiarism, collusion, the fabrication of results, reuse of assessed material, or any academic offence other than bad academic practice in any work which forms part or all of a unit of assessment, s/he shall report the matter to the appropriate Quality and Assurance Officer and notify the Chair of the candidate's assessment board for information.

3.1.4 Any student has the right to draw the attention of a Quality and Assurance Officer to any suspicions of an academic offence.

### 3.2 Actions taken by the Quality and Assurance Officer and Director of Studies

#### 3.2.1 Consultation with the Director of Student & Academic Services

In the case of a taught course student, the Quality and Assurance Officer will act in accordance with protocols devised by the Quality and Assurance commission. This will include establishing whether the case is a first offence. The Director or nominee will provide guidance on appropriate courses of action in order to provide for consistency and fairness across the Academy.

#### 3.2.2 Departmental Hearing

Where it is suspected that work submitted by a student is not their own work, the Quality and Assurance Officer may require the student to attend an oral examination or practical test in advance of a formal hearing. The examination or test would normally be conducted by the Module or Subject Leader or the director of studies or the Quality and Assurance Officer (with additional subject specialist if required). The purpose of this examination or test is to establish whether the student's familiarity with the work and subject is consistent with authorship of it. At least five working days' notice should be given of such an examination or test.

**In cases of academic offences**, within ten working days of receiving a report from a member of staff or from an examiner/invigilator, the Quality and Assurance Officer, shall take action to inform the student concerned in writing of the allegation and invite the student to a formal hearing. At the hearing the student may make representations and submit any appropriate evidence.

**In the case of bad academic practice**, the matter will be dealt with in accordance with the tariff set out in Annex 1 to this Chapter.

The student is entitled to be accompanied by a representative. The student can choose to decline an invitation to attend the hearing and can make written representations instead, in which case the matter will be decided in the student's absence.

After considering any representations from the student, including any evidence in mitigation, the Academic council will decide whether there may be any substance to the allegations.

The Council can decide:

- to take no further action if s/he believes there is no case to answer
- to take action in accordance with the options given in the Bad Academic Practice and Academic Offences Tariff (Annex 1 to this Chapter)
- to refer the case to the Academic Senate Panel as a major offence (see 3.3 below)

In addition to any action taken by the Quality and Assurance Officer and/or director of studies in accordance with the relevant tariff, the piece of work in question will be awarded a mark, normally by the Module Leader, for consideration by the relevant assessment board. This mark will reflect the degree to which the work is impaired by bad academic practice and will normally be determined on those elements of the work which are not impaired by bad academic practice. Alternatively, and in exceptional circumstances only, the Module Leader may require the work to be resubmitted.

In all cases the Quality and Assurance Officer will record the decision and inform the Academic Council & Academic Senate (or his/her appointed nominee) of the outcome.

### 3.2.3 Standard penalties

Provided the student admits the academic offence or bad academic practice, shows contrition and is not currently under investigation for another academic offence and provided the offence is minor the matter will be dealt with in accordance with the tariffs set out in Annex 1 to this Chapter.

In cases where a student has clearly exercised considerable ingenuity and forethought in preparing and/or secreting unauthorised material during an examination the Quality and Assurance Officer may refer the case to an Academic Council Panel even if it is the student's first academic offence. This may also be the case if there is evidence of (or suspicion of) collusion between students in relation to cheating during an examination.

Any cases where a standard penalty has been imposed must be reported to the Academic Council within ten working days following the meeting. A formal note and a copy of the written warning will also be placed on the student's file.

If the student has been failed in the work or module, then the assessment board shall determine whether s/he has the right to be reassessed in that work or module, subject to the Academy's normal re-assessment regulations and any specific subject, programme or module regulations.

All re-assessments require that the student has sufficient re-assessment credits remaining. If the student has insufficient reassessment credits remaining then the marks presented to the assessment board shall stand and an appropriate decision made.

### 3.2.4 Student's right of appeal against a Decision of a Quality and Assurance Officer

If a student believes that a Quality and Assurance Officer's decision was not reached in accordance with the procedures described in these regulations then the student may present his/her case, giving reasons, to the Student representative & Academic Senate (or his/her appointed nominee) in writing within 10 working days of the date on which the Quality and Assurance Officer notified the decision to the student.

On receipt of such written representation the Director, Academic council or nominee will review the action taken by the Quality and Assurance Officer. If there are good grounds for the appeal, the Director will appoint two Academic Practice officers from outside the student's Faculty to consider the case. The decision of the students representative & Academic council (or his/her appointed nominee) shall be final and not subject to review by any other Academy body.

### 3.3 Referral to Academic Offences Panel

Cases involving students on taught programmes must be referred to the Academic Council, where appropriate, in accordance with the guidance given in the tariffs at Annex 1 to this Chapter. If there is any doubt, the matter must be referred to the Academic Senate Panel.

If the Quality and Assurance Officer decides to refer the case to the council, the Panel shall consider the case and shall be responsible for determining whether, and the degree to which, the allegations have been substantiated.

If the matter is referred to the Academic Offences Panel, the Academic Practice Officer shall provide the Panel with the Academic Services, supervisor's, tutor's or examiner's original report and any other information or observations which the Academic Practice Officer wishes the Panel to consider. The Academic Practice Officer will normally be required to attend the Panel meeting.

## **4. Actions to be taken in the event of suspected academic offences or bad academic practice (Research Students)**

In the case of a research student, when a supervisor or examiner suspects either bad academic practice or an academic offence the matter shall be reported to the Faculty Head of Research Students (FHRS).

4.2 Where it is suspected that work submitted by a research student is not their own (including drafts and work in progress) the FHRS will require the student to attend a meeting to discuss the allegation. During the hearing an oral examination may be undertaken to establish whether the student's familiarity with the work is consistent with authorship of it. At least five working days' notice shall be given of this meeting.

4.3 The student is entitled to be accompanied by a representative (as outlined in the Glossary to these Regulations). At the meeting the student may make representations and submit any appropriate evidence. The student can choose to decline an invitation to attend the meeting and can make written representations instead, in which case the matter will be decided in the student's absence.

4.4 After considering any representations from the student, including any evidence in mitigation, the FHRS will decide whether there is any substance to the allegations. If the FHRS believes there is substance then the matter will be referred to the Academic Offences Panel. If necessary, the FHRS will seek input from an Academic Practice Officer (from within their Faculty) who will advise on procedural matters and precedent where appropriate.

4.5 The Panel shall consider the case and shall be responsible for determining whether, and the degree to which, the allegations have been substantiated. The FHRS will be required to attend the Panel hearing to present the Faculty case.

## **5 Academic Offences Panel / Discipline Committee**

An Academic Offences Panel shall consist of:

- Chair: the Director of Studies, Head of Academic Senate
- The Ethics Committee
- In the case of students on taught courses, a member of academic staff who has either been trained or is already experienced in such matters.
- The President of the Student Assembly and/or the Student Ambassador/Secretary and the Student representative of the Department.
- The HR Officer
- Head of the Quality Assurance office or Deputy.

No member shall have been involved in the case concerned.

## **6. Protocols for the conduct of an Academic Offences Panel hearing**

6.1 Panels must take steps to ensure that a student accused of an academic offence is given a full and fair hearing. In disciplinary proceedings such as these, the Panel need only determine whether or not an offence has occurred 'on a balance of probabilities'. Members should demonstrate that the Panel has been 'both fair and reasonable' in its handling of the case.

6.2 A Panel hearing is a formal event, which may have grave implications for the student and for the Academy. The fact that the matter has reached the stage of a full hearing means that the accusation against the student is serious. It is most important that the evidence, including all relevant documents and records of communications between staff and students, should be carefully prepared in advance of the hearing. Members of staff representing the Academy at a hearing will wish to present themselves and their case in a professional manner, commensurate with the seriousness of the occasion.

6.3 It is expected that the QAO or Director of studies and the Students who has been involved in the case will normally attend the panel hearing to present the faculty's case to the Panel.

6.4 The accused student will be given at least ten working days' notice in writing of the Panel meeting and of the procedures to be adopted at the hearing. The case may then be heard whether or not the student attends for the hearing.

6.5 The procedure adopted by the Panel shall always accord with common fairness and shall provide for the following:

6.5.1 The accused student has the right to appear and be heard and to be accompanied by a representative (as outlined in the Glossary to these Regulations), who may speak on the student's behalf. If the student intends to exercise the right to be accompanied by a representative, s/he shall so inform the Academic Support Office in writing in advance of the hearing.

6.5.2 The Panel has the right to call witness and to examine any documentation it considers necessary.

6.5.3 The Panel will decide whether the charge is or is not proven and will decide on the penalty if the charge is proven. It will pass its conclusions to the relevant Assessment Board for recording.

6.5.4 Subject to the student's right of appeal, the Director of Student & Academic Services (or his/her appointed nominee) will inform the appropriate members of Senior Staff of the Panel's decision. If a student is not to be permitted to be reassessed and is to be expelled from the Academy, the Director of Student & Academic Services will issue the notification of expulsion. Copies of the notification shall be sent to the appropriate PVC/Dean of Faculty, Faculty Associate Dean Academic and, in the case of a research student, the Chair of the Research Degrees Committee.

## **7. Guidance notes on the conduct of a Panel hearing**

The following notes are provided as guidance on the conduct of an Academic Offences Panel hearing:

7.1 The Panel members should be introduced to the student and it should be confirmed that the student has received the paperwork, including a copy of the procedures.

7.2 The student should be reminded of the charge against him/her and asked whether s/he admits or denies the charge.

7.3 The person making the allegation of the academic offence will present the case, calling witnesses and presenting evidence as appropriate. The Panel and the student shall have the opportunity to question the complainant and the witnesses. All such questions should be addressed through the Panel Chair.

7.4 The student shall have the opportunity to present a defence, calling witnesses and presenting evidence as appropriate. The panel and the complainant shall have the opportunity to question the student and the witnesses. All such questions should be addressed through the Panel Chair.

7.5 The student will be asked to make a concluding statement, presenting evidence of extenuating circumstances if wished.

7.6 The Panel will then go to into private session to consider the case and reach a decision.

7.7 All participants will then be invited to return to hear the Panel Chair announce the decision, the reasons for that decision and, where the allegation has been found to be proven, the penalty.

7.8 The decision of the Panel shall be final, subject only to the normal procedures available to students for reconsideration of decisions concerning failure or termination of studies. (See 8 below).

## **8. Outcomes/Penalties**

### **8.1 Students on taught programmes**

If a student on a taught programme is found to have committed an academic offence the Panel shall have authority to impose an appropriate penalty which can include the following:

8.1.1 Expel the student; the expulsion to incorporate failure of any and all assessments or examinations taken during that academic year. The student will not be eligible for readmission to the Academy at any time in the future.

8.1.2 Reduce the degree classification achieved or to be achieved by the student by one class (applicable to final level students only).

8.1.3 Suspend the student from the Academy for one year (or part thereof) and deem the student to have failed only that academic year (or specified part thereof) and permit the student to retake its assessments with or without attendance as determined by the Panel. Overall module marks for any reassessments will be capped.

8.1.4 Deem the student to have failed only that academic year (or specified part thereof) and permit the student to retake its assessments with or without attendance as determined by the Panel. Overall module marks for any reassessments will be capped.

8.1.5 In certain circumstances the Panel may impose a failure in the component or module (with a mark of zero) without referring the matter back to the Academic Practice Officer for reconsideration. Overall module marks for any reassessments will be capped.

8.1.6 Refer the matter back to the Academic Practice Officer for reconsideration under their powers and in accordance with the tariff in Annex 1 to this Chapter.

8.1.7 Any reassessments successfully attempted as a consequence of a candidate being found guilty of an academic offence would normally lead to a minimum pass grade for the module overall.

The outcome shall be reported to the appropriate Assessment Board.

### **8.2 Research students**

If a research student is found by the Panel to have committed an academic offence the Panel shall have authority to expel the student or to take such other action as it deems appropriate. However, the normal penalty for an academic offence in such cases would be expulsion.

The outcome shall be reported to the Research Degrees Committee and the Graduate School Office.

## **9. Appeal against the decisions of an Academic Offences Panel**

A student has the right of appeal against the decision of a Panel normally on the following grounds only:

- That there is new and relevant evidence which the student was demonstrably and for the most exceptional reasons unable to present at the Panel hearing. This may include evidence of extenuation.
- That the Panel did not comply with its procedures as set out in sections 6 and 7 above in such a way that it might cause reasonable doubt as to whether the result would have been different had the Panel complied.
- That there is evidence of prejudice or bias

In the event of an appeal, the decision of the Panel will not be carried out until the appeals process is concluded.

## **10. Process for conducting an appeal against a decision of the Academic Offences Panel**

10.1 Any student wishing to appeal against a decision of the Academic Offences Panel shall give notice of the appeal in writing, stating clearly the specific grounds on which the appeal is based as listed in section 9 above, and providing appropriate documentary evidence. This notice of appeal must be submitted to the Director of Student & Academic Services in writing, within ten working days of receiving formal notification of the Academic Offences Panel decision.

10.2 Notwithstanding the above, the Director of Student & Academic Services may dismiss and appeal at this stage if in his/her absolute opinion it should appear that the grounds of appeal are so lacking in substance that further consideration would not be justified.

10.3 On receipt of such a notice the Director of Student & Academic Services (or appointed nominee) shall convene the Academic Offences Appeals Committee and arrange for the appeal to be heard. The Academic Offences Appeals Committee shall comprise:

- Chair: The Head of the board of directors or a relative board member
- The President of the Students' Union or his/her nominee who shall be a member of the Students' Union Executive Committee.
- A member of the Academic Senate.

No person who has been consulted or involved in the particular case shall act as a member of the Academic Offences Appeals Committee.

10.4 The appellant and the complainant will be given notice in writing of the hearing and the members of the Academic Offences Appeals Committee. Due notice of appeal will be considered to have been given on posting the notice and supporting information to the student's last recorded address, not less than ten working days before the date of the hearing. If the student does not attend the hearing, the appeal shall be considered to have lapsed.

If the student, on good grounds, wishes to object to any member of the Appeals Committee, the student shall submit his/her objections in writing to be received by the Director of Student & Academic Services at least five working days before the hearing. If the grounds are upheld, an alternative member of the Committee will be identified with due care to ensure that there are no good grounds for the accused student to object to the substitute member.

10.5 The procedure adopted by the Academic Offences Appeals Committee shall be determined by the Committee and shall provide for the following:

10.5.1 The appellant has the right to appear and be heard and to be accompanied by a representative (as outlined in the Glossary to these Regulations).

10.5.2 The Academic Offences Appeals Committee has the right to call witnesses and to examine any documentation it considers necessary.

10.5.3 The Academic Offences Appeals Committee may set aside, vary or confirm the Academic Offences Panel's findings and/or may set aside, vary (including increasing) or confirm the penalty imposed. The decision of the Appeals Committee is final and not subject to review by any other Academy body.

10.5.4 The Academic Offences Appeals Committee shall inform the Director of Student & Academic Services and the PVC/Dean of the student's Faculty of its decision.

General Regulations and Procedures Affecting Students 2019/2020