

CARDIFF
UNIVERSITY

PRIFYSGOL
CAERDYDD

**ACADEMIC MISCONDUCT
PROCEDURE
(RESEARCH STUDENTS)**

Document Title	Academic Misconduct Procedure (Research Students)
Version	3.0
Date Approved by Senate / ASQC	First approved: 19.06.2019 (Senate) Current version: 17.05.2022 (minor changes) (ASQC)
Date of Effect	01.08.2022
Document Owner	Education Governance (PGR Quality and Operations)
Contact	pgr@cardiff.ac.uk
Parent Regulation	Student Conduct Regulations
Related Documents	Academic Integrity Policy

Alignment with the Expectations and Core practices of the revised UK Quality Code for Higher Education

This procedure aligns with the following relevant Expectations and Core practices of the [UK Quality Code for Higher Education](#):

Expectations for standards	Expectations for quality
The academic standards of courses meet the requirements of the relevant national qualifications framework.	Courses are well-designed, provide a high-quality academic experience for all students and enable a student's achievement to be reliably assessed.
The value of qualifications awarded to students at the point of qualification and over time is in line with sector-recognised standards.	From admission through to completion, all students are provided with the support that they need to succeed in and benefit from higher education.
Core practices for standards	Core practices for quality
The provider ensures that the threshold standards for its qualifications are consistent with the relevant national qualifications frameworks.	The provider has sufficient appropriately qualified and skilled staff to deliver a high-quality academic experience.
	The provider has fair and transparent procedures for handling complaints and appeals which are accessible to all students.

	Where the provider offers research degrees, it delivers these in appropriate and supportive research environments.
	The provider supports all students to achieve successful academic and professional outcomes.
Common practices for standards	Common practices for quality
The provider reviews its core practices for standards regularly and uses the outcomes to drive improvement and enhancement.	The provider reviews its core practices for quality regularly and uses the outcomes to drive improvement and enhancement.
	The provider engages students individually and collectively in the development, assurance and enhancement of the quality of their educational experience.

Academic Misconduct Procedure (Research Students)

1. Introduction

- 1.1 This procedure applies to students pursuing research degrees, including the research elements of professional doctorates, for the duration of their studies and to graduates with a research degree awarded by the University.
- 1.2 Definitions of academic misconduct and of academic misconduct in research are included in the [Academic Integrity Policy](#).
- 1.3 Should you cease to be a student during the course of an investigation of allegations of academic misconduct, the procedure will continue to its conclusion.

2. Identifying and Reporting Concerns

- 2.1 Concerns regarding academic misconduct may be identified at any stage during your studies or following the award of your degree. The resulting action will depend on the nature of the concerns and the point at which they are raised, as described below.
- 2.2 The identifier of the concerns may be a member of your supervisory team, a reviewer or examiner, or any other person internal or external to the University.
- 2.3 Where concerns are identified by a member of your supervisory team as part of the regular review of your work, your supervisors will give due consideration to the seriousness of the issue. They will determine whether it is reflective of a training deficiency that might be addressed through skills development, or whether the concerns should be raised with the Director of Postgraduate Research. If your supervisors agree that concerns need not be raised further at this time, a record of additional training requirements will be included in supervision notes and will be reflected in your Training Needs Analysis, but no further action will be taken.

Concerns raised during the course of your studies, prior to the examination process

- 2.4 If concerns are raised about the work you conduct or present for any purpose during the course of your studies, before you submit your thesis for examination (or re-examination in the case of resubmission), the identifier of those concerns will be asked to submit a written report outlining those concerns and with appropriate evidence to your Director of Postgraduate Research (or their nominee).
- 2.5 If concerns are raised during an Annual Review, the Chair of your Review Panel will be asked to produce a report on behalf of the Panel.

Concerns raised during the examination process, outside the viva

- 2.6 If, when reviewing the thesis you have submitted or resubmitted for examination, including corrections, the Examining Board Convenor or an examiner has concerns regarding academic integrity, they will be asked to report the concerns in writing to your Director of Postgraduate Research/nominee, including all available evidence.
- 2.7 If concerns relate solely to careless or poor presentation of results or referencing techniques, examiners have the discretion to allow you to address those concerns through required amendments to the thesis, where this is an available outcome of the examination. This will be reported in the examination result and report paperwork but no further action will be taken.
- 2.8 Where the Examining Board Convenor or the examiners determine to raise concerns, you will be notified by the Director of Postgraduate Research or their nominee that the examination process is being suspended pending a review of the concerns.

Concerns raised during the viva

- 2.9 If, during the course of your viva, a member of the Examining Board has concerns regarding academic integrity, the Chair will bring the viva to a close and no decision will be recorded.
- 2.10 You will be notified by the Chair that the examination is being suspended pending investigation into concerns over academic integrity.
- 2.11 The Chair of the Examining Board will submit a written report to the Director of Postgraduate Research/nominee.

Concerns raised after the award of your degree

- 2.12 If concerns are raised after your degree has been awarded, the identifier of the alleged misconduct will be asked to provide a written statement with evidence, for submission to the Chair of the Awards and Progress Committee.

Forward reporting of concerns

- 2.13 Your Director of Postgraduate Research or their nominee is required to report all allegations of academic misconduct in research to Education Governance (PGR Quality and Operations) in order for the University to be confident that it complies with the expectations of the Concordat to Support Research Integrity and of funders, where appropriate. If it a requirement of your funder to do so, the allegations and the outcome of the investigation will be reported to them.

3. Stage 1: preliminary review

- 3.1 The Director of Postgraduate Research or the Chair of the Awards and Progress Committee, as applicable, will initiate a preliminary review of the reported concerns. They will conduct the preliminary review or will nominate an alternative member of staff to do so on their behalf. This will always be the case if they are also your supervisor or the identifier of the concerns.
- 3.2 Your School's Academic Misconduct Co-ordinator, who investigates concerns in relation to taught students, may be asked to advise on the conduct of the preliminary review. Turnitin or similar plagiarism detection software may be used.
- 3.3 The Director of Postgraduate Research or nominee will inform Education Governance (PGR Quality and Operations) of the outcome of the Stage 1 preliminary review, for onward reporting to Student Cases.

Concerns raised during the course of your studies, prior to the examination process

- 3.4 On the basis of the written concerns, the supervisor's response, where provided, and any additional evidence, the Director of Postgraduate Research or their nominee will decide:
 - .1 to dismiss the concerns; or
 - .2 to take remedial follow-up action; or
 - .3 to refer the concerns to the Head of School for a Stage 2 formal investigation.
- 3.5 The Director of Postgraduate Research or their nominee will dismiss the concerns, where, on the balance of probabilities, they are unfounded or insufficiently evidenced.
- 3.6 The Director of Postgraduate Research or their nominee will take remedial follow-up action where, on the balance of probabilities, the review has confirmed the concerns raised but, due to their level of seriousness and/or other relevant circumstances, referral to the next stage of the Procedure is not warranted. The Director of Postgraduate Research/nominee will decide one or more of the following:
 - .1 you will be required to attend further training;
 - .2 you will be required to revise written work or research method;
 - .3 an alternative University procedure may be implemented.
- 3.7 Where the concerns indicate that your practical or written work falls short of the expected academic standard, the Director of Postgraduate Research or their nominee may consider that implementation of the Unsatisfactory

Progress or Engagement Policy and Procedure (Research Students) is an appropriate remedial action.

Concerns raised during any part of the examination process

- 3.8 On the basis of the written concerns and any additional evidence, the Director of Postgraduate Research or their nominee will decide:
- .1 to dismiss the concerns; or
 - .2 to refer the concerns to the Head of School for a Stage 2 formal investigation.
- 3.9 If the Director of Postgraduate Research/nominee determines that, on the balance of probabilities, the concerns are unfounded or insufficiently evidenced, they will be dismissed. The examination process will continue and the thesis will be assessed in the usual way.
- 3.10 If the viva was suspended pending review of the concerns, you may be required to attend a continuation of the viva, unless the Examiners are confident that a decision can be reached on the basis of your performance prior to suspension of the viva.
- 3.11 If the Director of Postgraduate Research/nominee decides that a Stage 2 formal investigation is warranted, the examination process will be suspended until the concerns are investigated. If a viva has been arranged, it will be postponed until the outcome of the investigation is known.

Concerns raised after the award of your degree

- 3.12 The Chair of the Awards and Progress Committee will conduct a preliminary review of the case and will determine whether a Stage 2 formal investigation is warranted.
- 3.13 If the Chair of the Awards and Progress Committee dismisses the allegation, no further action will be taken.
- 3.14 If the Chair of the Awards and Progress Committee refers the matter to a Stage 2 formal investigation, your thesis will be held with restricted availability in the University's digital repository or library until the investigation has concluded.

4. Stage 2: formal investigation

- 4.1 The Head of School will appoint a senior member of the School's academic staff to act as an Investigating Officer. Where the allegation relates to more than one individual and those individuals are/were based in different Schools, the Heads of the relevant Schools will decide who should appoint the Investigating Officer and lead the investigation according to the circumstances of the case.

- 4.2 The Investigating Officer will consider the allegation, and will meet with you and any relevant parties to establish the facts of the case.
- 4.3 You will be given at least 14 days' notice of the meeting and will be asked to confirm your attendance or decline the invitation within 7 days of receiving the invitation.
- 4.4 You will be provided with a copy of the written allegation and all available evidence, including any response from your supervisor, at least 7 days before the meeting.
- 4.5 If you are unable to attend the meeting in person, you may request to have the meeting by telephone or other electronic means. You may also provide a written statement in response to the allegation in place of, or in addition to, attending the meeting.
- 4.6 You may be accompanied at the meeting by a friend, a member of the Student Advice team, or another professional representative. You will be expected to provide your own responses to questions from the Investigating Officer.
- 4.7 If you do not accept the meeting invitation or provide a written statement, the matter will be considered by the Investigating Officer without your input.
- 4.8 The Investigating Officer will keep a record of the meeting and you will be provided with a copy of the notes. You will be asked to confirm the accuracy of the notes. You may, in addition, submit your own notes to the Investigating Officer within 7 days of the meeting.
- 4.9 Following the meeting and after the 7 days permitted for a response, the Investigating Officer will produce a report on their findings and provide a copy of the report and all associated documentation to the Head of School or their nominee. You will receive a copy of the documentation.
- 4.10 The Head of School or their nominee will consider the Investigating Officer's report and all available evidence, including any written statement you have provided, and will determine, on the balance of probabilities, whether academic misconduct has occurred.
- 4.11 In taking a decision on any sanctions, the Head of School or their nominee will also consider whether there have been any previous allegations and/or whether there are exceptional circumstances or mitigating factors for which you have provided evidence, and the extent to which they are likely to have impacted upon your judgement.
- 4.12 The Head of School or their nominee will decide one of the following, if a degree has not been awarded:

- .1 to dismiss the allegation where, on the balance of probabilities, it is unfounded or there is insufficient evidence that academic misconduct has taken place (see section 9 - Dismissal of Allegations);
 - .2 that, on the balance of probabilities, academic misconduct has taken place but due to the level of seriousness and/or other relevant circumstances, the matter does not warrant referral to a Stage 3 Academic Integrity Panel, and one or more of the following actions will be taken:
 - you will be required to attend further training;
 - you will be required to revise written work or research method;
 - a note will be placed on your record, to remain for the period of your registration, so that this may be considered in any future suspected incidents; any further allegations will be considered as more serious than a first incident;
 - an alternative University procedure will be implemented;
 - .3 that, on the balance of probabilities, academic misconduct has taken place, and the concerns should be referred to a Stage 3 Academic Integrity Panel.
- 4.13 If a degree has been awarded, the Head of School will submit a report and a recommendation to the Chair of the Award and Progress Committee, for consideration under University Ordinance 15 (Awards of Cardiff University).
 - 4.14 The Head of School may also refer the concerns to an Academic Integrity Panel in cases of complexity, where the Head of School is unable to determine whether or not academic misconduct has taken place.
 - 4.15 The Head of School or their nominee will notify you of the decision within 7 days of receiving the Investigating Officer's report.
 - 4.16 The Head of School or their nominee will inform Education Governance (PGR Quality and Operations) of the outcome of the Stage 2 formal investigation, for onward reporting to Student Cases.
 - 4.17 You may challenge a decision under this section (other than where a concern is dismissed or where the concern is referred to a Stage 3 Academic Integrity Panel) by using the University Review Procedure.
- 5. Stage 3: Academic Integrity Panel**
- 5.1 An Academic Integrity Panel will consider all cases referred by the Head of School or their nominee within 28 days of the referral being made.
 - 5.2 The Panel will comprise 3 members of senior academic staff from outside your School who have been trained in the use of this Procedure. One member will act as Chair. Where the case concerns academic misconduct in

research, the Panel membership will include a member from outside the University in place of one of the members of senior academic staff. The Head of Student Cases or their nominee will act as secretary to the Panel.

- 5.3 The Panel will receive a copy of the original allegation and any further evidence submitted as part of the Stage 2 formal investigation.
- 5.4 The Panel will invite you and your Head of School or their nominee to attend a meeting in order to discuss the allegation. Where the allegation involves more than one individual from different Schools, all relevant Heads of School or their nominees may attend. The Panel may also invite other relevant parties or seek further information as considered necessary.
- 5.5 You will be given at least 14 days' notice of the meeting and will be asked to confirm your attendance or decline the invitation within 7 days of receiving the notification.
- 5.6 You will be provided with a copy of all evidence available to the Panel at least 7 days before the meeting. You will also be notified at this stage of the attendance of any other parties invited by the Panel.
- 5.7 If you wish to submit a further statement or additional evidence, this should be supplied to the secretary at least 7 days before the Panel meeting. You may also invite your own witnesses to attend if relevant to the matters being considered by the Panel. You should make their details known to the secretary at least 7 days before the Panel meeting.
- 5.8 If you are unable to attend the meeting in person, you may request to attend by telephone or by other electronic means.
- 5.9 You may be accompanied at the meeting by a friend, a member of the Student Advice team, or another professional representative. You will be expected to provide your own responses to questions from the Panel.
- 5.10 If you do not accept the invitation, the meeting will be held in your absence.
- 5.11 If your research studies are/were funded by a UK Research Council, the Research Council will be notified that an Academic Integrity Panel has been convened to consider alleged academic misconduct. A representative of the Research Council will be invited to attend as an observer. They will not be a member of the Panel and will not be permitted to participate in the investigation or to influence the Panel's decision.
- 5.12 If the case involves more than one student or candidate, they may be heard at the same time and by the same Panel, unless one student, candidate, or graduate requests that the case be heard separately. If you wish to provide the Panel with evidence of mitigating factors, you will be permitted to do this confidentially, unless it makes allegations against the other(s) involved.

- 5.13 The Head of School or their nominee will present the allegations to the Panel and you will have an opportunity to respond. You may pose questions to the Panel, Head of School or their nominee and other invited parties.
- 5.14 The Panel will consider all available evidence and determine whether, on the balance of probabilities, the allegation is proven. If proven, the Panel will determine the penalty that should be imposed, which will be proportionate to the case being considered.
- 5.15 The Panel will determine one of the following outcomes:
- .1 that the allegation is dismissed (see section 9 - Dismissal of Allegations); or
 - .2 that, on the balance of probabilities, academic misconduct has taken place.
- 5.16 Where the Panel determines that, on the balance of probabilities, academic misconduct has taken place, it may impose one or more of the following actions and sanctions:
- .1 any of the actions or sanctions listed under 4.12;
 - .2 you will be required to provide a written apology to your supervisor or any other individuals affected by the misconduct;
 - .3 you will be permitted to amend your thesis and resubmit it for further examination within a period of time specified by the Panel;
 - .4 you will be issued with a formal reprimand which will remain on your record for the period of registration;
 - .5 a recommendation will be made to the Academic Registrar that you are excluded temporarily for a specified period;
 - .6 a recommendation will be made to the Academic Registrar that you are excluded permanently from the University.
- 5.17 You will be notified of the Panel's decision and the procedure for review, in writing, within 7 days of the meeting. A copy of the notification will be provided to the Head of School and the Head of Registry.
- 5.18 Where the Panel considers it appropriate that an additional University Procedure be implemented, the Chair of the Panel will refer the case to the Head of Student Cases.

6. **Request for review**

- 6.1 You will be informed of your right to request a review of the decision under the University Review Procedure. A request for review must be made on one

or more of the grounds set out in the Procedure and must be received by the Student Cases team in the Registry within 14 days of the notification being sent.

7. Dismissal of allegations

- 7.1 If the allegation is dismissed, no documentation relating to the allegation and the associated investigations will be retained on your student record.
- 7.2 Where concerns had been raised at the examination stage and the examination was suspended pending outcome of the investigation, the examination process will continue and the thesis will be examined in the usual way.
- 7.3 Where concerns had been raised during a viva, you may be required to attend a continuation of the viva, unless the Examiners are confident that a decision can be reached on the basis of your performance prior to suspension of the viva.
- 7.4 Where concerns had been raised after conferment of your award, your thesis will be made available in the University's digital repository or library, subject to any agreed period of embargo.