

# Academic Misconduct Report Form



## STRICTLY CONFIDENTIAL

This form is intended to report incidents of suspected academic misconduct arising from one, or multiple, submissions for a single assessment on a single course.

All suspected cases of academic misconduct should be discussed with the Course Organiser and reported to the relevant School Academic Misconduct Officer (SAMO) in the first instance. The SAMO will decide whether the case can be handled at School level or should be referred to the College Academic Misconduct Officer (CAMO).

**Please note** that if the cases are formally investigated the student(s) will be provided with a copy of the report, with other students anonymised as appropriate.

## PART ONE: For completion by the member of staff reporting the incident

### 1. STAFF DETAILS

Name of staff member reporting the suspected offence			
Role (e.g. Course Organiser / Marker)			
Course organiser (if different)		Date of submission to SAMO	
School of SAMO			
Name of SAMO		Date of referral to College	

### 2. ASSESSMENT DETAILS

Course (Title, code and credits)	
Name of assessment item	
Proportion of course mark (%)	
Convenor of Course Board of Examiners	
Convenor of Progression Board of Examiners (if different)	
Name and Date (if know) of Exam Board	

*Supporting documents:* Please provide one copy of any specific instructions / advice given to students about Academic Misconduct or good scholarly practice that are relevant to this assessment. Please also provide course-level material that should be excluded from originality considerations, if applicable. **Unless stated otherwise, it will be assumed that students were expected to work individually on the assessment.**

You may provide supporting documents as attachments or as accessible web links.

# Academic Misconduct Report Form



## 3. INCIDENT DETAILS

*Important note:* The information provided in this section, read in conjunction with supporting documents, should allow both the nature and extent of areas of concern to be located quickly and unambiguously. In some cases, the description on the form may suffice; in other cases, it may be necessary to highlight the relevant sections of the submissions and/or source material.

Record the student(s) suspected of misconduct below. Where multiple students are involved, please use an anonymising reference code (e.g A, B etc. please note that exam numbers are not fully anonymous)). In this context 'multiple' refers to where there are pieces of work submitted for the same assessment that match each other i.e. suspected collusion/plagiarism among students taking the same course.

The Face Value Mark is the mark that is appropriate for the work as submitted assuming no misconduct has occurred.

The Fair Mark Estimate is the mark which fairly reflects the student's own contribution to the work (see guidance notes).

Both should be expressed as a percentage (e.g., a mark of 16/20 is entered as 80%).

Ref.	Student name	Matric number	School & Programme	Year	Face Value Mark (%)	Fair Mark Estimate (%)

*Add extra rows as required*

<b>Have the Face Value Marks been released to students?</b>	<input type="checkbox"/> Yes	<input type="checkbox"/> No
---	------------------------------	-----------------------------

State below the reasons for suspecting academic misconduct and details of evidence gathered to date.

Please **include only factual, impartial statements**: do not speculate on potential motivations for the suspected misconduct. Make an academic judgement and describe both the nature and extent of areas of concern. Please remember that that if the cases are formally investigated the student(s) will see the report.

- The '*nature*' of issues might include for example, presence of verbatim or closely paraphrased text, use of unattributed sources, exam misconduct, self-plagiarism, secondary citation, etc.
- The '*extent*' of issues should indicate of the proportion of the work affected by potential academic misconduct; for example, the proportion of pages of work affected. Raw similarity scores from Turnitin should not be relied on for this as they constitute evidence only if contextualised.

# Academic Misconduct Report Form



*Supporting documents:* Attach one copy of each piece of affected work submitted by each student, and of each piece of source material that may have been additionally plagiarised.

Where Fair Mark Estimates were provided above, please state how these were obtained. Otherwise describe the benefit gained from the suspected misconduct. For example: "the affected question was worth 20 marks of a 100 mark paper, therefore the benefit gained is up to 20%"

## PART TWO: For completion by the SAMO

### 4. REFERRAL DECISION

SAMOs may, at their discretion, invite a student to a preliminary meeting or request a written statement before deciding how to proceed with the case (Procedure 3.2).

<b>Have the student/s been invited to a preliminary meeting?</b>	<input type="checkbox"/> Yes	<input type="checkbox"/> No
--	------------------------------	-----------------------------

If preliminary discussions with the student have taken place, please summarise the outcome of these and include any appropriate documentation:

Following review of evidence, please record your decision with respect to referral:

Ref	No case to answer*	SAMO outcome	Referral to CAMO
A			
B			

*\*No academic misconduct case to answer; however, SAMOs may suggest the marker to provide feedback to the student about minor scholarship issues via the existing feedback/marking rubric*

If referral to CAMO required, please proceed to Section 6.

# Academic Misconduct Report Form



## 5. SAMO OUTCOME

Available outcomes:

- Issue student/s a warning
- Issue student/s a warning and apply a penalty of 10 marks to the Face Value Mark (or reduce mark to 0 if component worth 5% or less)

Please record your decision with respect to each student using the same identifying reference (e.g. A, B, ...) as above.

Ref	Warning	Penalty
A		
B		

*Add extra rows as required*

SAMO conclusion and comments on the outcome:

## 6. CAMO REFERRAL

Complete this section only if one or more students are referred to CAMO.

SAMO conclusion and comments on the referral:

If previous warnings or penalties were given to the student by the SAMO please summarise these:

By referring to CAMO you confirm that

- this case does not meet the criteria allowing the SAMO to deal with it (Procedure 3.3)
- you have informed the Convenor of the relevant Board of Examiners and Teaching Organisation

# Academic Misconduct Report Form



- you have included all relevant documentation to date, including those items listed at section 2 above and the information requested on this page.

# Academic Misconduct Report Form



## GUIDANCE NOTES

### Section 1

The Course Organiser should endorse any Academic Misconduct report, even if they are not the marker of the affected work. The Course Organiser should also seek advice from their SAMO if any aspect of the reporting procedure is unclear.

### Section 2

It is helpful for investigators to have a copy of the instructions given to students so that they can interpret the comments in Section 3. This should include material (e.g., code templates) that were provided to the students, that are present in the work referred and must therefore be discounted from consideration. Where relevant, instructions on acceptable collaboration between students should also be included, along with specific instructions about Academic Misconduct or good scholarly practice. Unless stated otherwise, it will be assumed that all work was to be done independently with no collaboration allowed.

### Section 3

This section can be duplicated if there are multiple groups of students submitting similar work for the same assignment.

Please ensure that the student's name appears only in the table at the top of the page, and use an identifying code (A, B, C or similar) to refer to them in the rest of the report. The report can then be anonymised efficiently by blanking rows of the table.

Under *School & Programme* it is sufficient to enter the name (abbreviated if necessary) of the student's School (e.g., Informatics, SBS etc) and the level of programme they are enrolled on (BSc, MA, MEng, MSc etc).

Under *Year* enter the normal year of study on the relevant degree programme. E.g., students who entered directly into Year 2 should be entered as "2"; visiting students following the third year of a degree programme should be entered as "3" etc.

The *Face Value Mark* is the mark that is appropriate for the work as submitted assuming no misconduct has occurred. This is that mark that will be awarded if it is found that there is no case to answer. You should indicate whether the Face Value Marks have been returned to the students, which should usually be the case (as all marks are provisional).

Please also provide a *Fair Mark Estimate*. This is a mark that would appropriately reflect the student's own contribution to the assessment in question, under the assumption that the affected sections are found not to be their own. Where similarities are found between submissions from different students in the same class, you should work on the basis that these similarities have arisen by plagiarising from an external source or via collusion.

Both the Face Value Mark and Fair Mark Estimate should be expressed as a percentage of the total mark for the assessment in question. Do not weight these marks by, e.g., the contribution to the overall course mark. For example, if the Face Value mark for an assessment is 16/20 the Face Value Mark is entered as 80% no matter what the contribution to the course mark is. Exclude late penalties from these marks.

If you are unable to estimate a Fair Mark, please instead describe the benefit to the students.

The summary of evidence should be brief but specific. Examples: "The code in newton\_raphson.py is identical in all three submissions, excluding comments"; "All three

# Academic Misconduct Report Form



students solve this problem with an unusual approach that was not adopted by any other students on the course”.

## **Sections 4 to 6 (SAMO only)**

These sections can also be duplicated if there are multiple groups of students submitting similar work for the same assignment. Please ensure you use the same identifying codes as in Section 3.

Before determining appropriate referral, it is possible to hold a preliminary meeting with the students. In the latter case, a summary of the discussions should be recorded: a single statement can apply to a sequence of meetings, if this appropriately reflects the discussion. Please ensure that you continue to use identifying codes rather than student names.

As per the Academic Misconduct Investigation Procedure, it is possible for an incident to be handled by the SAMO. SAMOs can issue a warning, request that the issue is dealt with via marking, or apply a penalty. Where a penalty is applied, this will be considered a first offense.