

H/02/27/02

**e-Business Meeting of the Senatus Academic Policy and Regulations Committee
(APRC)
to be held Tuesday 25 October – Monday 31 October 2022**

AGENDA

For approval		
1.	Academic Misconduct Procedure & responses to queries raised by APRC For approval	APRC 22/23 1A
For comment		
2.	Online exam arrangements for 2022/23 For comment	APRC 22/23 1B CLOSED

Comments should be directed to the paper author and Convener of APRC, Dr. Paul Norris (P.Norris@ed.ac.uk), copied to APRC Administrator, Olivia Hayes (Olivia.Hayes@ed.ac.uk).

Senate Academic Policy and Regulations Committee

25 October 2022

Proposed Changes to the Academic Misconduct Investigation Procedures

Description of paper

1. This paper proposes changes to the Academic Misconduct Investigation Procedures.

Action requested / recommendation

2. APRC is asked to approve the proposed amendments to the Academic Misconduct Investigation Procedures. Appendix 1 includes a summary of the proposed amendments to the Procedures, with a rationale for the changes. Appendix 2 includes an updated version of the Procedures, highlighting the amendments.

Background and context

3. The Academic Misconduct Investigation Procedures ([academicmisconductprocedures.pdf](#)) set out the process which should be followed when handling cases of suspected academic misconduct within the University. The next scheduled review of the Procedures is not due until 2023/24. Since the last review of the Procedures, in 2018/19, the volume of cases referred to the College Academic Misconduct Officers (CAMO) within each of the Colleges has significantly increased. This has had a severe impact upon the workload of the CAMOs and their capacity to handle cases in an efficient and timely manner.
4. Whilst the Academic Misconduct Investigation Procedures are applied locally at College level, Academic Services work closely with the CAMOs, as a group, to monitor and address any ongoing issues which may arise and discuss any implications that these may have for the Procedures. Due to the significant increase in the volume of cases since the last review, the CAMO group recommend that the Procedure is amended now. Their view is that immediate amendments are necessary in order to ensure that cases are handled in an efficient and timely manner and to minimise any distress that students may experience as a result of any delays which may occur.
5. The CAMO group have therefore proposed the changes explained in Appendix 1.
6. The CAMO group have discussed further amendments to the Procedures (in addition to those proposed in this paper). The CAMO group have agreed that these should be brought to APRC at a later date as further work is required prior to these being proposed to APRC. The group's view is that these additional changes will be necessary ahead of the next review in 2023/24. Therefore, the CAMO group would like to propose returning to APRC with further changes at a later meeting during this academic year (2022/23), to seek approval for these changes to be implemented ahead of the 2023/24 session.

Discussion

7. A summary of the proposed amendments to the Procedures is provided in Appendix 1. A version of the Procedures showing the proposed amendments is provided Appendix 2. **APRC is asked to approve the proposed amendments.**

Resource implications

8. The proposed amendments to the Procedures do not carry any significant resource implications. It is intended that the amendments to the role of the School Academic Misconduct Officer (SAMO) do not have significant implications in terms of workload. The changes are intended to address workload pressures currently faced by CAMOs.
9. CAMOs have consulted on the proposed changes with School Academic Misconduct Officers in their Colleges.

Risk management

10. In order to ensure that cases of suspected academic misconduct are handled fairly and sensitively, it is vital that the process is conducted in an efficient but thorough manner. The proposed changes will support this.

Responding to the Climate Emergency & Sustainable Development Goals

11. The proposals within this paper have no impact on the Climate Emergency and Sustainable Development Goals

Equality & diversity

12. The proposed amendments do not raise any specific equality and diversity concerns. The proposed amendments have been suggested to ensure that the investigation process is conducted in a fair, efficient and timely manner in order to minimise delays and any potential distress to students involved.

Communication, implementation and evaluation of the impact of any action agreed

13. Should APRC approve the amendments, the Procedures will be finalised, published for use immediately and implemented at College level.
14. Academic Services will communicate the changes in an e-mail to relevant staff in Schools, Colleges and Support Services.

Author

Roshni Hume
Academic Policy Officer
Academic Services

Presenter

Roshni Hume
Academic Policy Officer
Academic Services

Freedom of Information (Is the paper 'open' or 'closed')

Open

Senate Academic Policy and Regulations Committee

25 October 2022

Proposed amendments to the Academic Misconduct Investigation Procedures

Response to queries raised at 22 September 2022 meeting of APRC

APRC considered proposed changes to the Academic Misconduct Investigation Procedures on 22 September 2022 and asked Academic Services to provide a response to queries which had been raised at the meeting. The response is provided below.

If APRC approve the proposed amendments to the Academic Misconduct Procedures following review of the response below, the updated Academic Misconduct Procedures will be finalised and will be implemented from the date of APRC approval.

1. Record Keeping

APRC raised a query in relation to how misconduct offences and penalties are currently recorded and how this information is shared between Schools e.g. in the event that a student is enrolled on a joint degree or is taking an outside course in another School.

As the academic misconduct investigation process is devolved to Colleges, Academic Services contacted Colleges to enquire about their practice in relation to this. All three Colleges confirmed that records are held at College level and that School Academic Misconduct Officers are and will continue to be encouraged to check whether a student has a previous record. It is also understood that proven instances of academic misconduct are reported to the student's 'home-School' in the event that the misconduct takes place in relation to an outside course. It is envisaged that this information will be reiterated to School Academic Misconduct Officers by Colleges as part of an update if the proposed amendments to the procedures are approved. Additionally, the expectation is that College Academic Misconduct Officers will take responsibility for asking School Academic Misconduct Officers to share information in relation to penalties applied in a timely fashion to ensure that accurate records are held.

2. How will penalties be applied in Pass/Fail courses?

Academic Services contacted each of the Colleges to propose that in situations where the misconduct is significant enough to change a student's outcome from a Pass to a Fail, then this should be referred to a College Academic Misconduct Officer for consideration. If the extent of the misconduct is not as significant and can be dealt with by a warning or further advice, then this should be handled by the School Academic Misconduct Officer. The Colleges were in agreement with the proposal. It is envisaged that this will be communicated to School Academic Misconduct Officers by Colleges as part of an update if the proposed amendments to the procedures are approved.

3. APRC had raised a query regarding the application of penalties by School Academic Misconduct Officers in relation to the weight of the assignments that they are dealing with i.e. in courses where there is a single piece of assessment and the application of a 10 mark penalty could have significant implications for the student's grade.

The Colleges explained that they would expect School Academic Misconduct Officers to exercise their judgement in cases such as these and confirmed that School Academic Misconduct Officers

are encouraged to communicate with College Academic Misconduct Officers with regards to any cases which are complex or are likely to have significant implications for the student. It is therefore, envisaged that School Academic Misconduct Officers will continue to be encouraged to discuss such cases with the College Academic Misconduct Officers before deciding how to proceed.

4. APRC had also raised a query regarding the extent to which School Academic Misconduct Officers had been consulted in relation to the proposed changes to the procedures.

The Colleges confirmed that School Academic Misconduct Officers have been consulted in relation to the proposed changes and that the changes would be welcomed.

5. APRC had raised an additional point in relation to establishing a position in relation to providing students with an outcome after a resit diet.

It is envisaged that this issue will be addressed in further proposed changes to the procedures ahead of the 2023/24 session.

6. APRC had suggested minor amendments to the proposed changes to the Academic Misconduct Investigation Procedures. The draft document (Appendix 2) has been amended accordingly and the amendments have been highlighted both within the summary table below and within the draft procedures.

Section(s)	Proposed Amendment(s)
3.2	It is proposed that a SAMO may, at their discretion, invite a student to a preliminary meeting before deciding how to proceed with the case. It is envisaged that this will allow the SAMO the opportunity to gather further information about the alleged misconduct.
3.3	<p>It is proposed that the remit of the School Academic Misconduct Officers is expanded to allow them to deal with a case, provided that it meets the following criteria:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - The SAMO is satisfied that the case has come about through a genuine lack of understanding by the student; and - It is a first offence; and - The SAMO believes that the case is minor in nature and can be appropriately dealt with by issuing a warning or applying a mark penalty of no more than 10 marks in accordance with the relevant Common Marking Scheme <p>Currently, it is not within the SAMO's remit to apply a mark penalty. It is envisaged that this will alleviate the number of minor cases being referred to CAMOs for investigation and also allow students the opportunity to learn from their mistakes.</p>
3.4	<p>The following amendment is proposed:</p> <p><i>"Cases which satisfy the criteria cited in section 3.3, the SAMO or another relevant member of academic staff will address the issue with the student in assessment feedback, by e-mail, or in a meeting within 15 working days of receiving an allegation of misconduct. The student should be issued with a warning and/or penalty, and advised to seek support from the Institute of Academic Development or other study skills/misconduct resources. A record of the breach must be maintained by the SAMO and the student should be warned about the consequences of any further misconduct allegations."</i></p>

	<p>It is envisaged that this will allow the students concerned to be directed to appropriate sources of support to help ensure that they have an opportunity to learn from their mistakes.</p> <p>This has been amended in light of feedback from APRC which highlighted that a turnaround time for SAMO's handling cases should be included within the procedures.</p>
3.5	<p>The following amendment is proposed to ensure consistency in practice and clarify any ambiguity in relation to marks applied where cases of misconduct are proven:</p> <p><i>"A face value mark that is appropriate for the work as submitted and assuming no misconduct has occurred should be determined by this point. A fair estimate mark that is suitably reflective of the student's level of scholarship should also be established".</i></p> <p>This is to ensure that there is a record of the face value mark and the mark which is suitably reflective of the student's ability.</p>
3.7	<p>It is proposed that the SAMO must refer cases to the CAMO within 15 working days of face value marks having been released. Cases of suspected academic misconduct which are found outside of this period must also be referred for CAMO consideration within 15 working days of when the allegation arises.</p> <p>This amendment has been proposed due to reports of significant delays in referring cases to the CAMO in some cases resulting in severe delays in informing students of the outcome of the investigation. It is envisaged that this will minimise delays in referral.</p> <p>Following feedback from APRC, the wording of this section has been altered and is presented as follows:</p> <p><i>"The SAMO must refer cases to the CAMO within 15 working days of face value marks having being released. Any allegations which arise outside of this period must also be referred to the CAMO within 15 working days of being detected."</i></p>
3.9	<p>The following amendment is proposed as a result of varying practice in relation to the ratification and publication of marks and it is envisaged that it will ensure consistency in practice across the University:</p> <p><i>"When a case has been referred to the CAMO, marks must not be ratified by Board of Examiners or published until the investigation has been concluded."</i></p>
4.2 & 4.5	<p>References to the role of 'Personal Tutor' have been replaced with 'Personal Tutor / Student Adviser' to reflect the upcoming changes within the Student Support System.</p>
5.4(g)	<p>It is proposed that the following amendment is made to the list of penalties which are available to the CAMO:</p> <p><i>"In addition to any actions taken under sections a-f above, the CAMO may also do the following: (g) Issue a formal warning and/or ask the student to attend a mandatory meeting with the SAMO to discuss good academic practice."</i></p> <p>It is envisaged that this amendment will help students improve their practice and limit repeat offences.</p>

7. APRC had also raised a query in relation to the workload implications the proposed amendments would have upon School Academic Misconduct Officers. This change would not result in an increase in the number of cases SAMOs handle, because under the current process, all cases are considered by SAMOs before being passed to CAMOs. The change would be in the application of a mark penalty in some cases and reporting this outcome to the student, rather than preparing documentation and passing the case to the CAMO: this change is not likely to create a significant increase in workload.

Roshni Hume, Academic Services

October 2022



Academic Misconduct Investigation Procedures

Purpose of Procedure

This document sets out the University's procedures for dealing with suspected cases of academic misconduct by students or graduates of the University. These procedures apply to all types of academic misconduct including plagiarism, self-plagiarism, collusion, falsification, cheating, deceit and personation.

The University takes very seriously any suspected incidences of academic misconduct and aims to ensure that all suspected cases are investigated efficiently and dealt with appropriately.

Scope: Mandatory Procedure

All staff and students

Contact Officer

Roshni Hume

Academic Policy Officer

Roshni.Hume@ed.ac.uk

Document control

Dates	Approved: 30.05.19	Starts: 01.08.2019	Equality impact assessment:	Amendments: 11.12.15 02.06.16 16.06.17 05.07.18 30.05.19 24.09.20 <u>TBC</u>	Next Review: 2023/24
Approving authority	Academic Policy and Regulations Committee (APRC)				
Consultation undertaken	College Academic Misconduct Officers, College administrative staff dealing with academic misconduct, EUSA.				
Section responsible for procedure maintenance & review	Academic Services				
Related policies, procedures, guidelines & regulations	Academic Misconduct Report Form Code of Student Conduct Code of Student Conduct Guidance				
UK Quality Code	UK Quality Code – Assessment				
Procedures superseded by this procedure	Previous versions of the Procedures for Dealing with Suspected Academic Misconduct				
Alternative format	If you require this document in an alternative format please email Academic.Services@ed.ac.uk .				
Keywords	Academic misconduct, plagiarism, self-plagiarism, collusion, falsification, cheating, deceit, personation				



Academic Misconduct Investigation Procedures

1. Definition of academic misconduct

- 1.1 Academic misconduct is defined by the University as the use of unfair means in any University assessment. This includes assisting a student to make use of unfair means, and doing anything prejudicial to the good conduct of the assessment. Examples of misconduct include (but are not limited to) plagiarism, self-plagiarism (that is, submitting the same work for credit twice at the same or different institutions), collusion, falsification, cheating (including contract cheating, where a student pays for work to be written or edited by somebody else), deceit, and personation (that is, impersonating another student or allowing another person to impersonate a student in an assessment).
- 1.2 These procedures explain how the University investigates allegations of academic misconduct in relation to any work submitted for assessment. The University may also investigate cases where a student is alleged to have committed an act of academic misconduct in a piece of work which has not been submitted for assessment at the University (e.g. a conference paper or publication) under the Code of Student Conduct, where this may represent a breach of the Code:
www.ed.ac.uk/files/atoms/files/codeofstudentconduct.pdf
- 1.3 Staff investigating allegations of academic misconduct will make a decision based on the balance of probabilities. This means that they will be satisfied that an academic misconduct offence has been committed if they consider that, on the evidence available, it is more likely than not that an offence has been committed.
- 1.4 A School Academic Misconduct Officer (SAMO) and a College Academic Misconduct Officer (CAMO) may nominate a deputy to hold meetings with students in cases where there is a conflict of interest or where subject specific expertise is required e.g. where there is reasonable doubt that a student's work may not be their own and further enquiry into the student's work is required in order to establish whether there is a potential case of academic misconduct.

A. Suspected academic misconduct in assessed work submitted for taught courses

2. Reporting of suspected academic misconduct in taught courses

- 2.1 Any member of staff who has evidence that a student may have committed an academic misconduct offence in an assessed piece of work submitted for a taught course must complete an Academic Misconduct Report Form. They will submit the form and any other relevant documentation to the School Academic Misconduct Officer (SAMO), informing the relevant Course Organiser. The work under investigation will be assessed and awarded a face value mark prior to referral to the SAMO. The face value mark is the mark that the work is believed to merit based solely on the content as presented, assuming no academic misconduct has taken place.
 - 2.2 The Academic Misconduct Report Form is available at:
www.ed.ac.uk/academic-services/staff/discipline/academic-misconduct
- ### 3. Investigation by the School Academic Misconduct Officer (SAMO) – suspected academic misconduct in taught courses



Academic Misconduct Investigation Procedures

3.1 The SAMO is responsible for deciding whether there is a case to answer. The SAMO will discuss the case with the relevant Course Organiser and/or marker and can consult with the College Academic Misconduct Officer (CAMO) if necessary. If the SAMO decides that there are grounds for investigation, they will determine whether they are able to deal with the case or whether it needs to be referred to a CAMO.

3.2 A SAMO (or nominee) may, at their discretion, invite a student to a preliminary meeting before deciding how to proceed with the case. The student may be accompanied at that meeting by a member of the University community, e.g. their **Personal Tutor** / Student Adviser or an adviser from the Edinburgh University Students' Association Advice Place. The SAMO or CAMO may not draw any inference if the student chooses not to attend the meeting. If the student is unable to attend in person, the SAMO will consult with the student and select one of the following options:

- To conduct the meeting electronically (e.g. by video, web-camera, etc.); or
- To offer the student the opportunity to make a written submission.

~~A SAMO will be able to deal with the case if it meets all of the following criteria:~~

- ~~• It is a first offence (the relevant College can advise where it is a potential repeat offence);~~
~~**and**~~
- ~~• The SAMO is satisfied that the case has come about through a genuine lack of understanding by the student; **and**~~
- ~~• The SAMO believes that the case can be appropriately dealt with without recourse to a mark penalty.~~

~~In cases where the SAMO is unsure about whether the criteria above apply, the SAMO should consult the CAMO, who will determine whether the SAMO can deal with the case.~~

3.3 The case will not require referral to the CAMO provided that it meets all of the following criteria:

- The SAMO is satisfied that the case has come about through a genuine lack of understanding by the student; **and**
- It is a first offence (the relevant College can advise where it is a potential repeat offence);
and
- The SAMO believes that the case is minor in nature and can be appropriately dealt with by issuing a warning or applying a mark penalty of no more than 10 marks in accordance with the relevant Common Marking Scheme.

In cases where the SAMO is unsure about whether the criteria above apply, the SAMO should consult the CAMO, who will determine whether the SAMO can deal with the case.

~~The SAMO cannot apply a mark penalty or make any alteration to marks for cases outlined above in 3.2.~~

3.4 For cases which satisfy the criteria in 3.3, the SAMO or another relevant member of academic staff will address the issue with the student in assessment feedback, by email, or in a meeting within 15 working days of receiving an allegation of misconduct. The student should be issued with a warning and/or penalty, and advised to seek support from the Institute of Academic Development or other study skills/misconduct resources. A record of the breach must be maintained by the SAMO and the student should be warned about the consequences of any further misconduct allegations.



Academic Misconduct Investigation Procedures

~~For cases identified by the SAMO as poor scholarship rather than academic misconduct, the SAMO or another relevant member of academic staff will address the issue with the student in assessment feedback, by email, or in a meeting. If appropriate, the SAMO will return the assessment to the marker to determine a mark that fairly reflects the student's own contribution.~~

- 3.5 A face value mark that is appropriate for the work as submitted and assuming no misconduct has occurred should be determined by this point. A fair estimate mark that is suitably reflective of the student's level of scholarship should also be established.

~~A SAMO (or nominee) may, at their discretion, invite a student to a preliminary meeting before deciding how to proceed with the case. The student may be accompanied to that meeting by a member of the University community, e.g. their Personal Tutor or an adviser from the Edinburgh University Students' Association Advice Place. The SAMO or CAMO may not draw any inference if the student chooses not to attend the meeting. If the student is unable to attend in person, the SAMO will consult with the student and select one of the following options:~~

- ~~• To conduct the meeting electronically (e.g. by video, web camera, etc.); or~~
- ~~• To offer the student the opportunity to make a written submission.~~

- 3.6 The SAMO will refer all cases which fail to meet the criteria set out at 3.32 above to the CAMO. Allegations of serious misconduct, including examination misconduct and contract cheating, will always be referred to the CAMO.

- 3.7 The SAMO must refer cases to the CAMO within 15 working days of face value marks having been released. Any allegations which arise outside of this period must also be referred to the CAMO within 15 working days of being detected.

- 3.8 When referring a case to the CAMO, the SAMO must complete the relevant section of the Academic Misconduct Report Form and submit this with any relevant documentation to the College Academic Misconduct Administrator.

- 3.9 When a case has been referred to the SAMO or the CAMO, marks must not be ratified by Boards of Examiners or published until the investigation has been concluded.

4. Investigation by the College Academic Misconduct Officer (CAMO) - suspected academic misconduct in taught courses

- 4.1 The CAMO is responsible for investigating all cases of suspected academic misconduct referred to them by a SAMO and for deciding on the penalty (if any) to be applied. As part of this investigation, the CAMO should ascertain whether or not this is the student's first academic misconduct offence.

- 4.2 If the CAMO considers there is a case to answer, they will write to the student suspected of academic misconduct describing the alleged offence and inviting the student to respond to the evidence reported by the School. The CAMO will copy the initial correspondence to the student's Personal Tutor / [Student Adviser](#) and encourage the student to speak with their Personal Tutor / [Student Adviser](#).

- 4.3 Where the student acknowledges the offence and there is sufficient information for the CAMO to make a decision, the CAMO may decide that there is no need for a formal academic misconduct interview. In such cases the CAMO will write to the student and the SAMO, to



Academic Misconduct Investigation Procedures

inform them of the outcome and any penalty decision. The SAMO will advise the Convener of the relevant Board of Examiners of the decision and any penalty to be enacted (see Section 6). If the CAMO's recommendations relate to specific staff members, the SAMO will forward each recommendation to the relevant staff member. Where appropriate, the SAMO, or another member of academic staff, will also offer to meet with the student concerned in order to provide advice on academic best practice

- 4.4 In all other cases, the CAMO will invite the student to attend an interview. The interview will be conducted by a panel chaired by the CAMO (or nominee), and including at least one representative SAMO from that College (not from the same School as the student). The CAMO will be assisted by a note-taker who will take a record of the meeting.
- 4.5 Where the CAMO conducts an interview with the student, this should be held in person wherever possible. The student may be accompanied by a member of the University community, e.g. an adviser from the Edinburgh University Students' Association Advice Place, or their Personal Tutor / [Student Adviser](#). If the student is unable to attend in person, the CAMO will consult with the student and select one of the following options:
 - To conduct the interview electronically (e.g. by video, web-camera, etc.); **or**
 - To offer the student the opportunity to make a written submission.
- 4.6 In exceptional cases, the panel may invite an academic staff member with relevant specialist knowledge to attend the interview as an expert witness. In such cases, the expert will provide specialist knowledge to assist the panel in making a decision. However, the expert will not form part of the panel, and will not be involved in any decision making.
- 4.7 The purpose of the interview will be to enable the panel to obtain further relevant information about the alleged academic misconduct offence and to allow the student the opportunity to put forward their response to the allegation. The panel will take this information into account when deciding on any penalty to be applied.
- 4.8 Following the interview, the CAMO will send a confidential report of the meeting to the student. The student will be given the opportunity to comment on the accuracy of the report. The CAMO will then approve a final version of the report.
- 4.9 The CAMO, in consultation with the rest of the panel, will decide on the penalty, if any, to be applied (see 5.1 below). The CAMO will inform the student of the decision as soon as possible following the outcome of the meeting.
- 4.10 The CAMO will send a report of the meeting, the outcome, and any recommendations arising from the case, to the reporting SAMO.
- 4.11 The SAMO will forward the outcome of the case, including any penalty to be enacted, to the Convener of the relevant Board of Examiners (see section 6). If the CAMO's recommendations relate to specific staff members, the SAMO will forward each recommendation to the relevant staff member.
- 4.12 If an allegation of academic misconduct is upheld in relation to a student registered on a programme with Fitness to Practise requirements, further action may be taken under the relevant College Fitness to Practise Procedure. This will not involve reinvestigating the allegation of academic misconduct.



Academic Misconduct Investigation Procedures

5. Penalty decisions available to the College Academic Misconduct Officer (CAMO) - academic misconduct in taught courses

5.1 In deciding whether or not it is appropriate to apply a penalty, and which penalty to apply, the CAMO will take into account the severity, perceived intent and benefit to the student of the academic misconduct, as well as any previous academic misconduct offences.

5.2 Any penalty will apply **only** to the specific work under investigation, which in itself may represent only a part of the overall course assessment. The College will retain a record of any penalties applied by the CAMO, but this will not appear on a student's transcript. In cases where one or more students have colluded on a piece of work, penalty decisions for each student will be made on an individual basis.

5.3 Where the student claims that the affected assessment was impacted by special circumstances, the CAMO will advise the student to request consideration of these by the appropriate Special Circumstances Committee. The CAMO will not take account of special circumstances in reaching a penalty decision.

5.4 The following options are available to the CAMO:

- (a) To decide that there is no case to answer and no penalty is therefore to be applied;
- (b) In the case of a first offence which is a result of poor scholarly practice rather than any deliberate attempt to deceive, the CAMO may decide that a mark penalty will not be appropriate;
- (c) A penalty deducting 10, 20 or 30 marks from the face value mark will be applied. The penalty applied should be proportionate to the offence. The face value mark must be expressed as a percentage using the relevant [Common Marking Scheme](#) (e.g., 15/20 must be presented as 75% so that, for example, a 30 mark penalty would reduce the mark to 45%);
- (d) The mark is to be reduced to zero;
- (e) In cases where students have colluded in producing a piece of work, the face value mark may be split (not necessarily equally) between the students involved. For instance, a face value mark of 70 may be split equally between two students, so that each student receives a mark of 35;
- (f) In serious cases or where the student has a record of having committed a number of previous academic misconduct offences, the CAMO may decide to refer the case for disciplinary action under the Code of Student Conduct. In such cases, the CAMO investigation is equivalent to that of the Conduct Investigator for other student conduct cases, and no further investigation is required under the Code of Student Conduct. The CAMO may refer the case to a Student Discipline Officer, or to the Student Discipline Committee, as appropriate. If referring to the Student Discipline Committee, the CAMO should contact the Secretary to the Student Discipline Committee to discuss the matter. Details of the University disciplinary procedures and of the penalties available to Student Discipline Officers and the Student Discipline Committee under the Code of Student Conduct are available at:
www.ed.ac.uk/academic-services/staff/discipline/code-discipline

[In addition to any actions taken under sections a-f above, the CAMO may also do the following:](#)

- (g) [Issue a formal warning and/or ask the student to attend a mandatory meeting with the CAMO to discuss good academic practice.](#)



Academic Misconduct Investigation Procedures

~~The CAMO may choose to issue a formal warning in addition to one or more of the above.~~

6. Application of penalties by the Board of Examiners - taught courses

- 6.1 The Board of Examiners is required to apply the penalty determined by the College Academic Misconduct Officer (CAMO). It cannot apply any additional penalty for the offence. If the student has submitted Special Circumstances relating to the affected assessment the Board will take into account the decision of the Special Circumstances Committee when reaching its decision, in accordance with the Special Circumstances Policy:
www.ed.ac.uk/academic-services/students/assessment/special-circumstances/

B. Suspected academic misconduct in work submitted for postgraduate research programmes (other than taught components, which are investigated in line with A)

7. Reporting of suspected academic misconduct in postgraduate research programmes

- 7.1 Any member of staff who has evidence that a student undertaking a postgraduate research programme may have committed an academic misconduct offence (in the thesis or other work submitted for assessment and/or progression) must complete an Academic Misconduct Report Form in conjunction with the relevant SAMO. They must submit the form and any other relevant documentation to the CAMO.
- 7.2 The Academic Misconduct Report Form is available at:
www.ed.ac.uk/academic-services/staff/discipline/academic-misconduct

8. Investigation by the College Academic Misconduct Officer (CAMO) – suspected academic misconduct in postgraduate research programmes

- 8.1 The CAMO is responsible for investigating all cases of suspected academic misconduct referred to them by a SAMO and for deciding on the penalty (if any) to be applied.
- 8.2 If the CAMO considers that there is a case to answer, the CAMO will arrange for an academic misconduct panel comprising the CAMO and one other relevant academic member of staff (for example a relevant College Dean or a Graduate School Director or School Academic Misconduct Officer from a different School in the same College) to interview the student, following the same procedure as outlined in 4.5-4.8.
- 8.3 The CAMO, in consultation with the rest of the panel, will decide on the penalty, if any, to be applied (see 9.1 below). The CAMO will inform the student of the decision as soon as possible following the outcome of the meeting. The CAMO will provide the student's principal supervisor with an outline of the decision.
- 8.4 Except in cases referred for further consideration under the Code of Student Conduct, once the CAMO has approved the report of the meeting and decided on the penalty (if any) to be applied, the CAMO will submit a written report to the SAMO for forwarding to the Convener of the relevant Board of Examiners. This will include details of any penalty which the Board must apply in light of the decision (see section 9 below).



Academic Misconduct Investigation Procedures

9. Penalty decisions available to the College Academic Misconduct Officer (CAMO) – academic misconduct in postgraduate research programmes

9.1 In deciding whether or not it is appropriate to apply a penalty, and which penalty to apply, the CAMO will take into account the severity, perceived intent and benefit to the student of the academic misconduct, as well as any previous academic misconduct offences.

9.2 Where the student claims that the affected assessment was impacted by special circumstances, the CAMO will advise the student to request consideration of these by the appropriate Special Circumstances Committee. The CAMO will not take account of special circumstances in reaching a penalty decision.

9.3 The following options are available to the CAMO:

- (a) Decide that there is no case to answer and no penalty is therefore to be applied;
- (b) Allow the student to edit and resubmit the work having corrected the affected section(s)*;
- (c) Instruct the examiners to reassess the work with the affected sections removed (without offering the student the chance to edit)*;
- (d) Deem the thesis (or dissertation, or other assessment or components of assessment) to have failed and instruct the Board of Examiners accordingly;
- (e) In serious cases or where the student has a record of having committed a number of previous academic misconduct offences, the CAMO may decide to refer the case for disciplinary action under the Code of Student Conduct. In such cases, the CAMO investigation is equivalent to that of the Conduct Investigator for other student conduct cases, and no further investigation is required under the Code of Student Conduct. The CAMO may refer the case to a Student Discipline Officer, or to the Student Discipline Committee, as appropriate. If referring to the Student Discipline Committee, the CAMO should contact the Secretary to the Student Discipline Committee to discuss the matter. Details of the University disciplinary procedures and of the penalties available to Student Discipline Officers and the Student Discipline Committee under the Code of Student Conduct are available at:

www.ed.ac.uk/academic-services/staff/discipline/code-discipline

*Options (b) and (c) may involve the thesis no longer being fit for a specific award.

9.4 Where the work affected has been submitted for annual review the CAMO will submit a report, including a recommendation, to the student's annual review panel.

9.5 The relevant College will keep a record of any penalties applied by the CAMO, but this will not appear on a student's transcript.

10. Application of penalties by the Board of Examiners – postgraduate programmes

10.1 The Board of Examiners is required to apply the penalty determined by the College Academic Misconduct Officer (CAMO). It cannot apply any additional penalty for the offence. If the student has submitted Special Circumstances relating to the affected assessment the Board will take into account the decision of the Special Circumstances Committee when reaching its decision, in accordance with the Special Circumstances Policy:

www.ed.ac.uk/academic-services/students/assessment/special-circumstances/

11. Students funded by UK Research Councils



Academic Misconduct Investigation Procedures

- 11.1 Where there is evidence that a student who is receiving funding from one of the UK Research Councils may have committed an act of academic misconduct in their research, the University is required to report this to the relevant Research Council. Staff reporting suspected academic misconduct to the relevant CAMO should indicate on the Academic Misconduct Report form where a student is funded by a UK Research Council. Should the CAMO decide that there is a case to answer, they will notify the School, who will inform the relevant Research Council of the allegations against the student, and provide updates on the outcome of the case.
- 11.2 Policies and guidance relating to research integrity for students funded through UK research councils are published by UK Research and Innovation (formerly known as Research Councils UK), and can be found online at:
www.ukri.org/about-us/policies-and-standards/research-integrity/

C. Suspected academic misconduct by graduates of the University

12. Reporting of suspected academic misconduct – graduates

- 12.1 Any member of staff who has evidence that a graduate of the University may have committed an academic misconduct offence that could impact upon the award, or classification of award, including the award of postgraduate Merit or Distinction, must complete an Academic Misconduct Report Form in conjunction with the relevant SAMO. They should submit the form and any other relevant documentation to the CAMO.

13. Investigation by College Academic Misconduct Officer (CAMO) - graduates

- 13.1 If the CAMO considers there is a case to answer, the CAMO will write to the graduate notifying them of the allegations and inviting them to attend an interview. The interview procedures for graduates are identical to the investigation and interview procedures for enrolled students (sections 4.2 to 5.4 for taught courses, and 8.2 to 9.6 for research programmes).
- 13.2 Following investigation the following options are open to the CAMO:
- If there is no case to answer, or if it is concluded that academic misconduct is proven but was taken into account at the time of the original award, the CAMO will report the case and the outcome of the investigation to the Convener of the relevant Board of Examiners. No further action will be taken;
 - If the allegation is found to be proven, but is unlikely to have impacted on the award or classification of award (including the award of postgraduate Merit or Distinction) made to the graduate, the CAMO will report the case and the outcome of the investigation to the Convener of the relevant Board of Examiners. No further action will be taken;
 - If the allegation is found to be proven, and is likely to have impacted on the award or class of award made to the graduate, the CAMO will refer the case for disciplinary action under the Code of Student Conduct. In such cases, the CAMO investigation is equivalent to that of the Conduct Investigator for other student conduct cases, and no further investigation is required under the Code of Student Conduct. The CAMO may refer the case to a Student Discipline Officer, or to the Student Discipline Committee, as appropriate. If referring to the Student Discipline Committee, the CAMO should contact the Secretary to the Student Discipline Committee to discuss the matter. Details of the University disciplinary procedures and of the



Academic Misconduct Investigation Procedures

penalties available to Student Discipline Officers and the Student Discipline Committee under the Code of Student Conduct are available at:

www.ed.ac.uk/files/atoms/files/codeofstudentconduct.pdf

D. Review of a College Academic Misconduct Officer (CAMO) decision

14. Request for a review by the Board of Examiners

- 14.1 If the Board of Examiners believes that there is a justifiable reason to challenge the CAMO's decision about the penalty to be applied, the Convener may request that the decision be referred for review by the CAMOs of the University's other two Colleges jointly. The relevant Convener will submit a request in writing to the relevant contact in Academic Services, outlining the reasons for challenging the decision. The Convener will write to the student to inform them that their case has been referred for review, explaining that the final course result has therefore not yet been agreed.
- 14.2 Academic Services will arrange for the case to be reviewed by the CAMOs of the other two Colleges. The original investigating CAMO will be required to submit a copy of all of the case documentation which was considered by the CAMO along with copies of the report and decision letter. Each CAMO will be sent the documentation and will be asked to come to a decision separately before meeting to discuss the case; this meeting may be held by correspondence. The CAMOs may decide to invite the student to a further academic misconduct interview, following the same procedure as outlined in section 4.5. The CAMOs may be assisted by a note-taker who will take a record of the meeting.
- 14.3 Once the meeting and any further academic misconduct interview has been held, the two reviewing CAMOs will make a joint decision about whether or not to uphold the original investigating CAMO's decision, to rescind a penalty or to apply an alternative penalty. In determining an alternative penalty, the reviewing CAMOs may only choose from those penalties listed in 5.4 (for work submitted as part of a taught course), 9.3 (for students undertaking postgraduate research programmes) and 13.2 (for graduates).
- 14.4 Academic Services will notify the Convener of the Board of Examiners and the student in writing of the joint CAMO decision. The original investigating CAMO will be informed of the outcome of the review. The Board will be required to adhere to that decision and cannot request a further review. The Convener of the Board of Examiners will write to the student to inform them of the final course result agreed by the Board.

15. Student right of appeal

- 15.1 CAMO decisions resulting in mark penalties are ratified by Boards of Examiners. Students have a right to appeal decisions made by Boards of Examiners, including decisions affected by the outcome of an academic misconduct investigation. Students wishing to submit an academic appeal should refer to the University's Student Appeal Regulations and related guidance at:
www.ed.ac.uk/academic-services/students/appeals

24 September 2020