

Academic Misconduct Policy and Procedures 2025/26

Introduction	2
AM1. Scope and definitions	2
AM1.1 Scope	2
AM1.2 The forms of academic misconduct	2
AM1.3 General principles	4
AM2. The Academic Misconduct procedures	9
AM 2.1 Roles and responsibilities	9
AM2.2 Initiating procedures	11
AM2.3 StAMP Investigatory Panel procedure	15
AM3. Academic Misconduct penalties	19
AM3.1 Misconduct that occurs in a probationary module	19
AM3.2 Penalties for plagiarism, collusion and false authorship on non-probationary modules	20
AM3.3 Penalties for cheating/breach	24
AM3.4 Corrective pedagogic requirements	25
AM3.5 Mitigation of penalties in light of compelling personal circumstances	25
AM4 Academic Misconduct Disciplinary Procedure and Fitness to Practice	27
AM4.1 Situations in which the Academic Misconduct Disciplinary Procedure should be used	27
AM4.2 Initiating Academic Misconduct Disciplinary Procedures	27
AM4.3 Procedure for Academic Misconduct Disciplinary cases after a case to answer has been found	28
AM4.4 Fitness to Practise	28
AM5. Appeals	29
AM5.1 Appeals by students	29
AM5.2 Appeals by the SCA representative	29
AM6. General advice and training for students	29
AM6.1 Establishing understanding	29
AM6.2 Specific instructions to students in relation to working in groups	30
AM6.3 Online programmes	31
AM6.4 Practical and research projects	31
AM6.5 Use of unauthorised third-party support, particularly custom assignment writing services	31
AM7. General advice to schools/departments and examiners	31
AM7.1 Establishing understanding	31
AM7.2 Probationary modules	32
AM7.3 Grade descriptors/assessment criteria	32
AM7.4 Detection	32
AM7.5 Appropriate support for students in open assessments	32
AM7.6 Feedback from StAMP members to their school/department	33
AM7.7 Assessment Design to mitigate risks of misconduct	33
AM Appendix 1: Documenting and considering evidence of false authorship	34
AM Appendix 2: Procedure for Academic Misconduct in Low-credit assessment	35

Introduction

Academic integrity is fundamental to the reputation of individual scholars and to academic institutions. As a signatory of the [QAA's Academic Integrity Charter](#), the University of York is committed both to developing high standards of academic practice among its students and to safeguarding the standards of its academic awards by detecting and acting upon cases of academic misconduct. The policies and procedures described in this booklet are mainly concerned with the second of these aims, but they also suggest guidelines for informing and educating students about good and bad academic practice.

AM1. Scope and definitions

AM1.1 Scope

This policy and procedures applies to all taught modules and programmes leading to the award of credit or qualifications of the University as delivered or awarded by the University, including collaborative provision, unless the form of provision is approved to be out of scope by the Chair of University Education Committee (UEC) in consultation with the Chair of the Standing Committee on Assessment (SCA). They also apply to the credit-bearing taught components of research degrees. They apply to all assessed work, even if that work does not contribute to an award, to module marks or to progression. Academic misconduct policies and procedures may apply to the assessments of students who are also staff members.

This policy and procedures do not apply to the research components of a Postgraduate Research programme. Academic misconduct in relation to any formal assessment of PGR programmes, other than those that relate to credit-bearing taught modules undertaken by PGR students, is dealt with under Appendix A2: [PGR Academic Misconduct Policy](#) of the [Policy on Research Degrees](#).

This policy should be read in conjunction with the [University Regulations](#).

In exceptional cases where suspected academic misconduct cannot be straightforwardly covered by these procedures, the Chair of SCA, or their nominated representative, will decide on the appropriate course of action.

The policy and procedures for academic misconduct are monitored and reviewed by SCA on behalf of UEC and University Senate. Management of the procedures and records connected to academic misconduct is the responsibility of the Exams and Graduation Team in [Student Education and Experience](#), who may be contacted by email on academic-misconduct@york.ac.uk.

AM1.2 The forms of academic misconduct

The University is committed to developing high standards of academic practice among its staff and students, and to safeguarding the standards of its academic awards to individuals. The University regards any form of academic misconduct as an extremely serious matter ([see Regulation 5.7](#)).

Academic misconduct offences are divided into two categories:

- **Assessment offences** are committed by a student(s) in work submitted for assessment for their own programme of study and for which the penalty or judgement can be applied to the assessed piece of work.

- **Disciplinary offences** are offences committed by students, or staff, that are intended to gain an advantage in assessment (for themselves or for others) where the penalty cannot normally be attached to a specific piece of their own academic work.

In order to be confident about the standards of academic awards it is essential that work submitted for assessment is a fair reflection of the abilities of the student having used *legitimate* resources and forms of support in the production of their academic work.

AM1.2.1 Assessment Offences

- 1) **Plagiarism** – the presentation of ideas, material, or scholarship sourced from the work of another individual or group available in a public or private source without sufficient acknowledgement via appropriate referencing and citation.
- 2) **Collusion between students taking the same assessment** – the creation of work which is submitted for assessment where two or more students have worked together or shared ideas, solutions or material where such working together or sharing is not officially approved for that assessment.
- 3) **(a) Breach and/or (b) Cheating** – failure to comply with the rules of an assessment e.g. unauthorised access to materials in a closed assessment/use of software in open assessment which has been specifically prohibited in the assessment specifications/breaches of ethical rules relating to an assessment/misrepresentation of word counts. (For guidance go to section [1.3.15](#) and [2.2.2](#)).¹
- 4) **False Authorship** - the production or adaptation of academic work (for example writing, computer code, images, data), in whole or part, for academic credit, progression and award whether or not a payment or other favour is involved, using unapproved, undeclared or falsely declared human (eg family members, friends, essay mills or other students not taking the same assessment) or technological assistance (eg generative AI or software).²
- 5) **Fabrication** – the attempt to gain advantage by incorporating falsified or fabricated material or data in work submitted for assessment or publication.

AM1.2.2 Disciplinary Offences

- 1) **Personation** – one, or both of, a) to produce work for another student with the reasonable expectation that the incorporation of that work is intended to deceive an examiner, such as appearing as another student in an assessment(s) or b) students providing material to commercial assignment writing services.
- 2) **Deception** – presenting fabricated or misleading evidence to gain advantage in assessment arrangements (e.g. exceptional circumstances affecting assessment), in making research proposals or providing false evidence of qualifications.
- 3) **Unethical research behaviour** – unethical behaviour in the undertaking of research or in seeking funding e.g. including failure to obtain appropriate permission to conduct research, unauthorised

¹ For guidance on prohibited software contact SCA@york.ac.uk

² Adapted from [the European Network for Academic Integrity's suggested definition of Unauthorised Content Generation](#). For further guidance on acceptable use of generative AI and software, see the [artificial intelligence use in assessment web page](#).

use of information which was acquired confidentially, failure to acknowledge work conducted in collaboration, fraud or misuse of research funds or equipment.

AM1.2.3 Differential procedures for assessment and disciplinary offences of academic misconduct

Assessment Offences 1-5 are dealt with within schools, departments and faculties through Standing Academic Misconduct Investigatory Panels (StAMPs).

Disciplinary Offences 1-3 are dealt with by University Regulation 7 Disciplinary Procedures or other existing mechanisms ([AM4](#)).

AM1.2.4 Academic misconduct alleged subsequent to the conferment of an award

Any offence, as defined above, alleged or discovered after the award of a degree from the University of York may be considered under [Ordinance 16: Deprivation or Revocation of Academic Qualifications](#).

AM1.3 General principles

AM1.3.1 Burden and standard of proof

It is sufficient to establish cases of academic misconduct 'on the balance of probabilities', rather than 'beyond all reasonable doubt'. This means that the StAMP needs only believe that it is more likely than not that misconduct occurred, rather than the process requiring that the evidence be indisputable that misconduct has occurred. Decisions must be supported by a rationale and evidence, both of which should be clearly explained to the student. The burden lies on the university to show, on the balance of probabilities, that the acts constituting the alleged academic misconduct occurred.

In the case of special mitigation of penalties ([3.5](#)) the burden of proof will be on students to prove (on the balance of probabilities) that their judgement was affected if they wish this to be taken into account in consideration of the appropriate penalty. Assessment of the evidence supplied for mitigation claims will be considered on the balance of probabilities.

AM1.3.2 Academic Judgement

Academic judgement is "a judgement that is made about a matter where the opinion of an academic expert is essential"³. It is therefore not open to appeal ([Reg 6.7.1.d](#)). In considering academic misconduct cases, the StAMP Investigatory Panel members are chosen so that there is academic expertise to make decisions that may involve academic judgement.

1. **Decisions that involve academic judgement:** When an academic staff member scrutinises assessed work as part of an academic misconduct investigation, they will seek to evaluate the evidence for misconduct in that piece of work and determine, on the balance of probabilities, whether an offence has been committed and the nature of that offence. They will also determine the extent of the academic misconduct. These decisions involve the exercise of academic judgement.
2. **Decisions that do not normally require academic judgement:** Once the nature and extent of the academic misconduct has been determined under step 1, the corresponding penalty set out on the penalty table in [Part 3](#) of the policy should be applied, as modified where necessary for any

³ Office for the Independent Adjudicator (OIA) [glossary](#), 2019.

mitigating factors as set out in [3.5](#). Once the extent of misconduct has been established, the corresponding penalty that must be applied and any mitigation to be considered, would not normally involve academic judgement. Establishing matters of fact, based on evidence, (e.g. establishing whether or there has been a breach of assessment rules) does not normally involve academic judgement.

AM1.3.3 Responsibility of the student

The student shall be considered responsible for the academic integrity of all work they submit for assessment, including group assessments. In relation to any allegation of academic misconduct under this policy, the question of whether the student has behaved (or intended to behave) dishonestly or unethically must not be a factor in the decision to report the case as academic misconduct or in determining whether any such academic misconduct has occurred. The pedagogic aim of this policy and its use of marks caps is to reflect the academic merit of any work produced by such misconduct. Therefore, expressions of guilt, remorse or lack of intent are not to be accepted either as justifications for any alleged misconduct or in determining how a student should be dealt with where such misconduct is established.

AM1.3.4 Penalising assessment offences of academic misconduct

Wherever possible it is the module to which the assessment is connected that should contain the penalty for academic misconduct. If a student is found to have committed academic misconduct on a submitted assessment the penalty must be applied to the mark of the submitted piece of work. This will ensure the effect of any mark reduction is proportionate to the stage of the degree. The mark awarded to a piece of work affected by academic misconduct must be treated the same as any other mark awarded as a part of the award (e.g. a module failed as a result of academic misconduct will be treated in the same way as a module failed for inadequate scholarship or incorrect work.)

The process for applying a marks cap is as follows:

1. The work is marked by the examiner while the academic misconduct case is being considered. The examiner determines a mark on the basis that the work has not been produced using any form of academic misconduct.
2. StAMP considers the case and if academic misconduct is found, agrees to a marks cap.
3. Late penalties and overlength penalties are applied to the uncapped mark.
4. The AM cap is then applied to the mark.

The marks cap is not the final mark for the assessment but the maximum mark achievable for the piece of work. After conclusion of the academic misconduct case, the final mark may be lower than the applied marks cap.

AM1.3.5 Exceptional Circumstances as a defence for academic misconduct

Where academic misconduct is alleged or suspected, a student may not use exceptional circumstances – as defined by the University's Exceptional Circumstances affecting Assessment Policy - as a defence to the academic misconduct. The only exceptions are cases where penalty mitigation as defined under [AM 3.5](#) applies. The Investigatory Panel should not infer the inability to differentiate between right and wrong from a more general diagnosis of mental health issues or the student's circumstances. If the panel considers that the circumstances are such that [AM 3.5](#) may apply, the matter should be referred to the Standing Committee on Assessment in line with that part of the policy.

In the event that exceptional circumstances are claimed and upheld against the same assessment for which a suspicion of misconduct is upheld, any marks caps applied to the original assessment will also apply to any 'sit as if for the first time' allowed, to compensate for the exceptional circumstances. The student must be informed of this, but may benefit from the 'sit as if for the first time' if their original mark was not as high as the cap set by the StAMP.

Examiners must not, if a claim of exceptional circumstances has been made, use the existence of those circumstances as a factor in the decision to report the case regardless of whether an Exceptional Circumstances claim has been accepted or not.

AM1.3.6 Failure to detect academic misconduct in the past

Where academic misconduct is alleged or suspected, a student may not use the failure of any member of academic staff to detect academic misconduct at an earlier point in time in their studies as a defence.

When a suspicion is raised about a given piece of work, schools/departments may not retrospectively refer any work which has been returned to the student with marks and feedback to an Investigatory Panel or apply penalties. Schools and departments may, however, review previous work outside of the Academic Misconduct procedures to determine if any pedagogic or formative feedback can be given to the student and considered by the school/ department based on patterns of behaviour across multiple pieces of work.

AM1.3.7 Misconduct in formative work

Formative assessment is primarily designed to give feedback on progress and inform development but does not contribute to a module mark. In this spirit, if the affected work does not count towards an award, a transcript mark, or a progression decision, the misconduct should normally be addressed by specific and extensive feedback on the issue that has raised concern.

AM1.3.8 Misconduct in re-assessment tasks

Where a student commits academic misconduct and subsequently fails a progression hurdle, a resit opportunity for the module or modules affected by academic misconduct may be granted if the programme regulations would ordinarily provide a resit opportunity to a student who had obtained the same profile of marks without misconduct. The marks obtained at resit will be used to make a progression decision in the usual way.

AM1.3.9 Misconduct by students repeating a year of study

Schools/ departments must clearly inform repeating students of the circumstances by which they may use their previously submitted work for their own learning, reference and summative assessment in line with the policy in section [AM1.3.13](#)).

AM1.3.10 Standing Academic Misconduct Panels (StAMPs) & Investigatory Panels

The Standing Academic Misconduct Panel (StAMP) is the mechanism by which the University ensures Academic Misconduct procedures reflect the assessment principles⁴.

The Standing Committee on Assessment, acting on behalf of the University, will constitute a Standing Academic Misconduct Panel (StAMP) for each of the three faculties. The StAMP should consist of nominated academic members of schools, departments or centres within the faculty. Schools/ departments will normally provide at least three academic members of staff to their faculty StAMP, but will be asked to identify substitute members to cover in the event of extended periods of absences of their StAMP representatives.

When a case of academic misconduct requires investigation by a StAMP, the investigating panel will be formed and will be chaired by a member of the school/departments from which the affected module originates and two other members from the faculty of which their school/departments is a member.

All personnel involved in StAMP or Investigatory Panels are expected to act with the highest standards. Potential conflicts of interest must be declared at the earliest opportunity to the Chair of the relevant panel, who will decide on the appropriate course of action. The test for determining whether a set of circumstances amounts to a conflict of interest should be whether an outsider, aware of the facts, could reasonably consider that the investigatory process might be compromised by the potential conflict of interest.

AM1.3.11 Probationary modules

Some modules will be deemed to be 'probationary'. Suspected incidents of *plagiarism and collusion* that take place in probationary modules can be dealt with outside of the normal procedures, and exclusively within the school/departments. The emphasis in terms of response should be on the student correcting their errors and understanding of academic integrity, although a marks reduction will normally still be appropriate. Modules in Stage 0 (Foundation) and 1 of all undergraduate programmes are deemed to be probationary unless otherwise approved (see below), as are all modules offered by the International Pathway College at both Foundation Certificate and Pre-Masters level.

Probationary modules in other stages of an undergraduate programme or anywhere on a Taught Postgraduate programme and non-probationary modules in Stage 0 or 1 of an undergraduate programme need the specific approval of SCA. In order to be approved as probationary the learning outcomes of the modules and assessments must be formally assessed and include *the development of writing and academic integrity skills*. Boards of Examiners should keep a record of any modules exceptionally included or excluded as probationary.

Offences other than plagiarism and collusion should be dealt with through a normal StAMP, even in modules which are otherwise probationary.

AM1.3.12 Second offences

A second offence means an academic misconduct offence:

⁴ See [Assessment & Feedback Principles](#)

- a) That is of the same class of offence as another academic misconduct offence ('the first offence') that student has been penalised for; and
- b) Where the assessment or assessment deadline to which that subsequent ('second') offence relates was subsequent to notification to the student of the outcome of the first offence.

Where both the first and second offence are of the same type and are penalised with an outright fail, the penalties for second offences apply (see section [AM3](#), Academic Misconduct penalties for disciplinary procedures [see AM4](#)).

AM1.3.13 Self-plagiarism and re-use of previously assessed work

Self-plagiarism is not deemed to be an academic offence under this policy due to different disciplines' approach to the reuse of assessed material within a degree. If a school/ department wishes to prevent students from re-using their work, they must make this clear in their school/departmental handbook and when informing students about accepted academic practices, must further clearly indicate what sanctions or penalties will be imposed (e.g. examiners ignore extensively re-used material) and include student guidance on referencing their own work.

See also [AM1.3.9](#) concerning re-use by repeating students.

AM1.3.14 Academic Misconduct in low-credit assessments

Minor academic misconduct in low-stakes (i.e. low credit equivalent) assessments can, in limited circumstances, be handled by individual schools/departments without referral to a full StAMP process and as set-out in [Appendix 2](#).

Low-Credit assessments, for this purpose, are defined as a distinct assessment that is worth the equivalent of ≤ 2 credits (e.g. 10% of a 20 credit module). A school/departmental record of the decision must be kept and students must be informed of their right to the case being considered by an academic misconduct panel in accordance with the full policy and procedure.

AM1.3.15 Ethical breaches:

Two types of ethical issue may occur in taught programmes:

1. Breaching the rules of an assessment, where that rule relates to ethical requirements (*Assessment Offence: Cheating/Breach*).

Consideration: If a student breaches ethical guidelines in a specific assessment, for example does not gain ethical approval for research, or has ethical approval rejected but carries out the research regardless, then this is considered a breach of assessment rules and the corresponding penalty tables must therefore be used. The panel should consider whether an advantage has been gained through the student's failure to adhere to ethical rules. If so, a marks cap should be considered. If, however, there is no obvious advantage to the student due to the failure, a warning will be appropriate. Usually there would be an advantage gained if a student did not adhere to ethical rules.

2. Breaching ethical expectations in undertaking research, but not specifically relating to a particular submitted piece of assessment (*Disciplinary Offence: Unethical Research Behaviour*).

Consideration: This may be unethical behaviour in the undertaking of research or in seeking funding e.g. failure to obtain appropriate permission to conduct research, unauthorised use of information which was acquired confidentially, failure to acknowledge work conducted in collaboration, fraud or misuse of research funds or equipment. Where unethical research behaviour that does not relate to any particular assessed piece of work is reported to the Academic Misconduct Administrator or is identified by the StAMP, the Chair should refer the process to the Academic Misconduct Disciplinary Procedure under [Regulation 7](#).

AM1.3.16 Academic misconduct alleged after the examination has taken place

If academic misconduct is alleged or suspected after the examination has taken place, but before the qualification has been awarded or conferred, the award or conferment process shall be suspended pending the outcome of an investigation conducted in accordance with this policy. If the StAMP investigatory panel decides that the academic misconduct warrants it, it may decide that a re-examination of the student is necessary. A re-examination under these circumstances shall be subject to the approval of the Special Cases Team.

If academic misconduct is alleged or suspected after the degree has been conferred, the Senate shall determine the action to be taken in accordance with [Ordinance 16](#).

AM1.3.17 Sample documents

Standard communications to students and a report template should be used to ensure that communication addresses and records all relevant issues.

Copies of such communications should be retained by the department on student records.

These template documents can be accessed through the StAMP folder in the Google drive to which all StAMP members have access and which can also be accessed from the [Academic Misconduct webpage](#).

AM2. The Academic Misconduct procedures

These procedures should be followed for students on all programmes.

They are illustrated in Appendices [1](#) and [2](#).

AM 2.1 Roles and responsibilities

AM2.1.1 Reporting examiner

The reporting examiner is the member of staff who identifies potential academic misconduct who may, in consultation with the relevant module coordinator, initiate any academic misconduct investigation. The examiner (or coordinator) must provide a clear rationale for their suspicions that an offence has been committed and any evidence in support of that suspicion. Either the examiner or module coordinator will be responsible for creating and providing initial information in the *Case Document* template ([available on the Academic Misconduct webpage](#)).

AM2.1.2 Module coordinator

The module coordinator is responsible for making a final decision as to whether a case should be initiated for any form of academic misconduct. They are responsible for discussing the case with an examiner who raises any concerns and ensuring that a clear case is presented by the examiner in any *Case Document* that the examiner completes. The module coordinator is responsible for overseeing and approving any reports of academic misconduct on their module.

AM2.1.3 School/departmental assessment administrators

Each school or department must ensure that all academic staff members know that they must refer suspected academic misconduct to the relevant assessments administration team or equivalent relevant staff and provide details of who should be contacted for this purpose.

Relevant assessment administrators must ensure that they know which members of staff within the school/department are StAMP members and should keep a log of assigned cases to ensure that they are distributed appropriately and not distributed to members of staff who are unavailable.

The assessment administrators are responsible for de-anonymising reported cases and updated Case Documents with the student's details, allocating them to school/departmental StAMP members when initially referred, for referring cases where it has been decided that there is a case to answer to the Academic Misconduct Team and for implementing the outcome of cases (such as imposing marks caps on work)⁵.

AM2.1.4 StAMP Investigatory Panel member

Each school/department will have nominated StAMP members whose responsibility it is to represent the school/department in each case and sit on Investigatory Panels for cases relating to other schools/ and departments in the same faculty. These StAMP members are responsible for providing their academic judgement on the case and contributing to the decision of the offence and penalty in line with the policy in a timely manner.

AM2.1.5 StAMP Investigatory Panel Chair & Chairing school/department

Each Investigatory Panel will be chaired by a StAMP member from the reporting school/department, who will be responsible for initially determining whether there is a case to answer and who will then act as Chair on the subsequent Investigatory Panel. The Chair is responsible for moving the case forward and communicating with the student, school/department and academic-misconduct@york.ac.uk. The Chair is responsible for ensuring that the proper procedures are followed and the policy is applied appropriately.

The Chairing school/department is required to supply administrative support for any meetings that are called to consider cases, and is responsible for sending out letters/emails to students and for concluding the procedures, using standard template letters and forms.⁶ Departmental administrative resources are also expected to be used for this work.

⁵ See [Amendments log](#).

⁶ The Academic Misconduct Team will provide StAMP members with access to these template letters.

AM2.1.6 SCA member

The SCA member provides oversight over the process to ensure that the proper procedures are followed and the policy is applied appropriately. The SCA member does not play a role in any decision making and is not required to attend hearings, however must monitor discussions in the case and review the penalty to ensure it aligns with policy.. SCA members are involved in the consideration of policy changes and the review of academic misconduct processes, procedures and data, and thus may support StAMP training.

AM2.1.7 SCA secretary

As the Academic Misconduct Policy is the responsibility of SCA, the SCA secretary may be called upon by the SCA member for assistance with interpretation of the policy. The Secretary is also responsible for the organisation of StAMP member training, consultation and policy updates. The SCA secretary will also organise the annual case review of academic misconduct cases and assist in producing the annual report of academic misconduct data to SCA and key findings to schools/departments.

AM2.1.8 Academic Misconduct Administrators (AMA)

The Academic Misconduct Administrators (AMA) act as the central point of contact at the University for setting up StAMP Investigatory Panels once a decision has been made that there is a case to answer and for tracking the progress of each case. It is the AMA's responsibility to maintain records, provide and update templates for cases, and check that the relevant documents have been provided to everyone who needs them. They may also alert the SCA member or a StAMP Investigatory Panel Chair if a case has not progressed. The AMAs are also responsible for identifying and initiating disciplinary proceedings for repeat, serious academic misconduct under [AM4.1](#).

AM2.1.9 Schools/Departments and units

Each school/department (and centre/unit wherever possible), should nominate at least three members of academic staff to act as their representatives on the StAMP relevant to their programmes of study. Where the misconduct relates to taught provision that is not fully within a particular school/ department/ centre, the case should be initiated in (and Chaired by a member of) the school/ department/ centre to which that taught provision is affiliated or to that of the discipline most relevant to the provision/ award in question for the purposes of StAMP proceedings.

AM2.2 Initiating procedures

AM2.2.1 Initiating academic misconduct procedures in cases of false authorship, fabrication, collusion or plagiarism

For the initiation of cases of suspected cheating see [2.2.2](#) below.

Where the examiner(s) believe that the assessed work contains evidence of academic misconduct, the examiner(s) must come to a decision about the extent of the suspected misconduct and decide whether to raise a case as set out under [2.2.3](#) below:

- a) Where an examiner considers that the work in question reflects poor academic practice rather than academic misconduct (see [AM 3.2.4](#)) the examiner should note this in the feedback and in the award of marks under the relevant assessment criteria or grade descriptors. Work that is purely

poor academic practice should not be investigated under the Academic Misconduct procedure. Instead, the student should receive feedback on the problematic aspects of their academic practice. If the person referring the case is not the module coordinator, the coordinator must be informed of, and consulted, about the possibility of academic misconduct.

- b) Where an examiner and module coordinator are of the opinion that the assessed work shows evidence of any form of academic misconduct, as defined under [AM 1.2](#) and of sufficient severity potentially to merit a penalty under the provisions of [AM 3](#), then the case should be referred to the assessment administration team or appropriate members of staff for the programme in question.
- i. The person referring the assessment should add details of the case to a *Case Document* template⁷ identifying the assessment suspected, the reasons for suspicion and the student/script under suspicion. At this point, the student might be anonymous so the relevant student number (e.g. from Turnitin) should be entered instead of the student's name. They should share the form with the relevant assessment administration team or appropriate member of staff and they should include such all evidence and statements to allow decisions to be made about the case (ideally including a Turnitin report or annotated copy of the script where relevant). Any report or accompanying statement should indicate specific pages, paragraphs or phrases which are raising concern, rather than simply being an indication of duplicated text, and should include enough detail to allow the panel to investigate without subject specific knowledge. In cases of false authorship the content as set out in [Appendix 1](#) should be included.
 - ii. The assessment administration team or appropriate member of staff should create a non-anonymised copy of the assessment and update the *Case Document* to identify the student by name and to identify any previous academic misconduct findings against the student.
 - iii. The assessment administration team or appropriate member of staff should pass the *Report*, the assessment and any other evidence supporting the allegation to one of the StAMP members in the school/department for their initial determination of whether there is a case to answer in accordance with [2.2.3](#) below. The Report should be updated (in sections 2 and 3) by the relevant administrator to identify that panel member as 'Chair'.
 - iv. Each school/department must ensure that there will be at least one member of StAMP available in order to make timely decisions on whether there is a case to answer. A decision should, ideally, be made within 2 working days of referral to the administration team by the examiner.
 - v. Where marking has been completed for a module that includes an assessment under suspicion of academic misconduct, marks must **not** be withheld, but must be released as a provisional mark in accordance with section 3.3 of the [Progression and Award Rules](#)⁸.

⁷ This can be accessed from the [Academic Misconduct webpage](#).

⁸ See [Amendments log](#).

AM2.2.2 Initiating the procedures in respect of breach/cheating in closed exams

Where the invigilators of a closed examination have reported a suspected case of cheating, any unauthorised material must be removed, a full report made using the 'Unauthorised Material Form' and the Exams and Graduation Office informed immediately following the exam.

i. **Breach: First offence**

In cases of cheating where a breach of assessment regulations has taken place but where no advantage is apparent (i.e. mobile phone found but not accessed during the assessment by the student), the report from the Senior Invigilator, the evidence and the details of the student will be checked by the Academic Misconduct Team. A formal warning letter will be issued to the student by the Academic Misconduct Team and a record kept. The student's home school/department should be informed.

In determining whether a breach is a first offence, breach and serious breach/cheating are considered different offences. Therefore a student still may receive a formal warning or penalty for breach of assessment rules even if they may have an ongoing cheating case. Subsequent breaches of assessment rules will be treated as a repeated breach and will therefore be capped at a compensatable fail.

ii. **Second Breach or Serious Breach/Cheating**

In all other cases of cheating (i.e. second offence or where the student may have gained an advantage), the report from the Senior Invigilator, the evidence and the details of the student will be checked by the Academic Misconduct Team. The information will then be forwarded to the assessments administration team of the student's home school/department to be considered by a StAMP member in the school/department to determine whether there is a case to answer as set out in [2.2.3](#) below. The Academic Misconduct Team must identify that this is a second offence.

AM2.2.3 Determining whether there is a case to answer.

A StAMP member in the relevant school/department must consider whether there is a case to answer.

- a) There is a case to answer if there is sufficient evidence for a StAMP Investigatory Panel to be able, *should the student not subsequently deny or otherwise explain the evidence against them*, to reasonably conclude on the balance of probabilities that:
- a. the student committed one or more of the forms of academic misconduct specified in [1.2.1](#); and
 - b. the misconduct is of sufficient seriousness to merit a penalty as specified in [Part 3](#) of this policy.
- b) In deciding whether there is a case to answer on the balance of probabilities, the StAMP member must consider whether it is more likely than not that the alleged academic misconduct took place by assessing the evidence and whether, if misconduct has occurred, it is of sufficient seriousness to merit any penalty under [Part 3](#) of this policy.

If the StAMP member is *not* convinced that there is sufficient evidence that academic misconduct has occurred, the student has no case to answer.

In deciding whether there is a case to answer, the StAMP member should bear in mind that a student is under no obligation to explain or justify the evidence against them, unless it is already strong enough to justify a finding of academic misconduct without any response from the student.

- c) The StAMP member determining whether there is a case to answer may conclude that other or additional types of misconduct may have occurred. If there is evidence of an additional type of academic misconduct other than that which was initially alleged (eg plagiarism in addition to fabrication) or an alternative type to what was alleged (eg plagiarism not false authorship), the StAMP member should consider whether there is also a case to answer for those other forms of misconduct instead of or in addition to what was originally alleged.

Care should be exercised before proceeding with multiple possible forms of misconduct; a panel member considering whether to proceed for more than one form of misconduct should consider the need for a clear and understandable case to be presented, which the student has a fair chance of responding to. Multiple allegations should only be made where there is genuine ambiguity as to what sort of misconduct is evident on the evidence presented.

- d) If the StAMP member decides that there is a case to answer for one or more forms of academic misconduct, the case assessment administration team for the school/department should be informed and told which type(s) of academic misconduct are established on the evidence.
- e) The assessment administration team for the school/department will then refer the case to the Academic Misconduct Team within the Exams Office by sending the completed *Case Document* and the supporting evidence used to determine whether there was a case to answer must also be included. The StAMP member who determined that there was a case to answer should also be identified as the Chair in Sections 2 and 3 of that document.

If the student suspected of academic misconduct is not a student within the school or department responsible for the module, the assessment administration team for the school/department should liaise with the student's home school/department to ensure that they have all necessary information (such as previous academic misconduct cases). The case remains the responsibility for the school/department responsible for the module.

- f) If there is no case to answer, the work should be returned to the examiner and the case closed.
- g) If the StAMP member concludes that there is evidence of poor academic practice, but not sufficient evidence to proceed with a case of academic misconduct, the StAMP member should identify this to the examiner and/or module leader for them to consider whether this may be reflected in the final mark awarded.

AM 2.2.4 Procedure once it has been determined that there is a case to answer

Where a StAMP member within a department has decided that there is a case to answer and the matter has been passed on to the Academic Misconduct Team, a member of the Academic Misconduct Team, acting on behalf of the SCA, should put together a StAMP Investigatory Panel. The StAMP member who determined that there was a case to answer should (unless there are reasons for doing otherwise) act as Chair on the Panel and the Academic Misconduct Team will appoint two other StAMP members and nominate an SCA contact for the Panel. The Panel should be assigned within 5 working days of the initial report.

AM2.2.5 Reporting of Academic Misconduct by third parties (students or external to the university)

The University will only investigate suspected incidents of academic misconduct reported by a third party if the person reporting the incident is identifiable and contactable and if sufficient and credible evidence is presented which points to academic misconduct. Details of the case will not be shared with the reporting external third party due to General Data Protection Regulations (GDPR). The University has a responsibility to protect students from malicious acts and considers that making inaccurate or misleading accusations of misconduct constitutes a serious breach of the University's disciplinary procedures ([Regulation 7](#)).

Anonymous reporting of academic misconduct will not normally be considered as this could impede investigation and prevent a fair and equitable resolution. Exceptionally such a report of academic misconduct may be considered if the University accepts there is a compelling reason, supported by sufficient and credible evidence, for it to be brought anonymously. This would be considered and approved by the Chair of SCA.

Where either a University of York student, or external third party, has reason to suspect a University of York student of academic misconduct, and the conditions outlined above are met, then this may be reported to academic-misconduct@york.ac.uk.

AM2.3 StAMP Investigatory Panel procedure

AM2.3.1 StAMP Investigatory Panel

A StAMP Investigatory Panel ('Panel') should consist of three members. The Chair will be the StAMP member in the school/department referring the case who initially determined that there was a case to answer. The two other members of the panel will usually be StAMP members from the same faculty.

The Panel may meet virtually if they prefer (including conducting discussions by email) and should consider the case in question against their previous StAMP experiences, to ensure consistency and to try and eliminate risk of bias. A designated member of SCA can advise the Panel on the process if required.

The SCA contact (who will be appointed as part of routine but does not play an active advisory role), the Academic Misconduct Team and all panel members must be copied into all relevant electronic correspondence between members of the Investigatory Panel and to the student and must also receive copies of any communications from the student. The SCA contact is not required to attend hearings with the student but must have sight of the record of any such meeting.

The Panel should be convened as quickly as possible so as not to delay unnecessarily the marking and feedback schedule of the reporting department. In the event that one of the members of the StAMP becomes unavailable to consider a case, the chair of the panel should inform academic-misconduct@york.ac.uk as soon as practicable to allow an alternate to be assigned.

AM2.3.2 Quoracy

A StAMP Investigatory Panel is quorate with 3 members for decision-making. If, however, a member of the StAMP panel has not responded within a reasonable time to communications from the Chair, the Chair has good reason to believe that a decision on the case is time-sensitive, and the Chair has agreed a decision with the other available member of the investigatory panel, the Chair is permitted to treat that agreement as a majority decision and conclude the case on that basis.

AM2.3.3 Investigation by a StAMP Investigatory Panel

Once a Panel has been constituted, it should follow this procedure:

- a) The Panel Chair (with support, where appropriate, from their school/departmental administration team) must:
 - Inform the student that academic misconduct is suspected and which form(s) of misconduct are suspected;
 - Provide the full details of the process to be followed;
 - Provide the full evidence that has been made available to the panel (including, in cases of collusion, the identify of any students with whom the student is alleged to have colluded);
 - Inform the student informed of their entitlement to respond to the Panel within 7 working days; and
 - Encourage the student to seek advice from supervisors, or York SU student advisors.

The information set out above contained in the template documents that Panels should use for the purposes of these communications and which Panel members can access from the [Academic Misconduct webpage](#).

- b) The student can, in response, submit a written statement and/or request an interview with the relevant StAMP Investigatory Panel. (Students should be made aware that there is no inherent benefit to an interview).

Upon receiving a student's written submission, the panel must consider whether the student's response seems appropriate and considered and if not, direct them to YorkSU Advice Service for support on writing their statement.

- c) Even if the student does not request an interview, the panel may require the student to attend one. Such an interview may be appropriate to determine the extent of any collusion or to explore more fully the process by which work suspected of false authorship or plagiarism was created. In such cases, all reasonable means must be taken to provide the student with any evidence or information against them that the Panel wishes to discuss, and to encourage them to acknowledge receipt of this information prior to the date of the interview. A panel may make this determination even after a written submission by a student.

In cases involving more than one student, the Panel may interview the students at this point in proceedings to establish whether it is likely to be a case of collusion or, for example, plagiarism of the work of one by the other. The students may be interviewed individually or together. If students are interviewed together, care must be taken to ensure that each student has a fair chance to be heard and to respond to allegations against them. The Panel should always interview students separately if any students make this request. If interviewed individually, each student must be informed of any things said by the other student that will impact on the determination of their case and must be given an opportunity to respond to such evidence.

- d) If the student does not request an interview and the Panel does not believe that it is necessary to conduct one, the Panel may determine the case based on the evidence submitted and any response and evidence provided by the student.
- e) If the student does not respond in the time specified or fails to attend an interview, the panel may make a determination of the case based on the evidence provided.
- f) Wherever possible, cases should be resolved prior to the school/departmental Board of Examiners meeting to ratify marks. It is accepted that the need to allow students to appropriately respond, and to allow the panel to reach a just decision may make this impossible. Where this is the case, the student's marks should be considered by a special ratification panel as soon as possible after the conclusion of the investigation.

AM 2.3.4 StAMP Investigatory Panel Interviews

- a) In the event that the student elects to attend an interview, or that the panel determines that an interview with the student is appropriate, the Chair of the StAMP Investigatory Panel must ensure that students are afforded sufficient time before the interview to seek advice or to arrange to be accompanied (at least 5 working days).
An interview can be conducted in-person or online. Where the meeting is conducted online, the Chair is responsible for ensuring that the student can be clearly heard and can engage effectively with the process.
- b) Students have the same right to be accompanied at a StAMP panel interview as they do for an academic appeal hearing: see the [Academic Appeals procedure](#) for details. A student may be accompanied by any member of the university and exceptions may be made for non-university accompaniment at the discretion of the Chair of the StAMP. The student must notify the Chair in advance (at least 1 working day before the hearing is due to take place) if they intend to bring a representative from outside the university. It is recommended that students contact York SU advice and support who may accompany them to the hearing.
- c) Any interview must include at least two members of the StAMP Investigatory Panel, including the Chair, and the third member should be consulted before any decision is made.
- d) The Panel will only base its decision on evidence the student has had sight of in advance and had the opportunity to respond to. The student must therefore be provided with any new evidence that the panel considers and reasonable time to consider it and make a response to it.
- e) Minutes of meetings of the Investigatory Panels must be saved in the relevant case folder.

AM 2.3.5 Consideration of evidence during StAMP procedures

- a) A StAMP member determining whether there is a case to answer or a Panel investigating academic misconduct should base their decisions on:
 - a. Evidence presented when the academic misconduct was alleged;
 - b. Evidence and explanations provided by a student following notification of a case to answer;
 - c. Any other evidence they have requested and obtained from the examiner, the school/department or the student that is relevant to consideration of the allegations

against the student. The StAMP Investigatory Panel can request further information from the student and/or the school/department. No decision should be made in relation to a matter unless a student has had a reasonable opportunity to comment on such additional evidence against them.

- b) In certain cases, StAMPs may consult university colleagues with specialist knowledge to help advise on the case. This may be in relation to computer coding, assessments, evidence in a non-native language or disabilities (in relation to affected judgement). Any additional information obtained by this process that is used in determining the case must be shared with the student so that they have an opportunity to comment on it.
- c) In cases of suspected false authorship, the StAMP should consider the evidence provided in the statement of suspicion of false authorship and may consider the previous assignments submitted by the student for a comparison. The panel has further powers to request an interview with the student and to receive preparatory documents for the assignment – for example, notes and drafts where available. Lack of preparatory work may be considered evidence of false authorship. If a student does not attend an interview or provide further information about the completion of their assessment, they have deprived themselves of the opportunity to show that they were the author of the assessment. In such a case, the Panel may reach such conclusions about the work as appear appropriate on the evidence they have before them and may take note of the student's failure to explain away any suspicious or incriminating features of the evidence. The Panel must not, however, treat the mere fact of the student refusing to attend or explain the evidence as indicative, in itself, of guilt: students are not under any obligation to attend hearings or answer questions about their work.

AM2.3.6 Outcomes of investigation or interview by a StAMP Investigatory Panel

- a) If, on the balance of probabilities and after considering the advice of the SCA representative in reaching its final decision, misconduct is established, the Panel determines the penalty to be applied in accordance with [Section 3](#) of this Policy, and by applying the additional guidance set out in [Section 4](#) of this policy. The Panel should consider whether any 'corrective pedagogic requirements' set out at [AM3.4](#) are required in addition to any marks cap penalty.
- b) If the Panel considers that the evidence presented proves (on the balance of probabilities) that the student has committed academic misconduct of a different type to that for which it was determined that there was a case to answer, the Panel may instead make a finding of academic misconduct for that other offence and impose penalties accordingly. In such cases, however, the student must have been given reasonable notice of the Panel's opinion and a reasonable opportunity to answer the case against them for the alternative type of misconduct (including, where appropriate further opportunities to present evidence or attend an interview).
- c) If the Panel concludes that there are likely to be sufficiently serious mitigating or exceptional circumstances to justify a mitigation of any penalty they have decided upon in line with [AM3.5](#), the Panel Chair should notify the Academic Misconduct Administrators of their decision. The Academic Misconduct Administrators must then refer the case to the Secretary to the SCA in accordance with the procedures set out in [AM3.5](#).

- d) Once a decision is made, this should be recorded by the Chair in the relevant case folder. The SCA representative on each case must be informed of the decision and, if concerned about the outcome, should raise these concerns and advise the Panel as to the appropriate outcome.
- e) The outcome of the decision should be communicated to the student using one of the templates provided by the Academic Misconduct team. The letter must state the appeal procedures and be sent to the student within 7 calendar days of the Panel's decision.
- f) A copy of the letter must also be forwarded to the Chair of Board of Examiners and assessments administrator in the student's school/department and to the module coordinator. The assessment administrator should update the student's records to ensure that information about the case outcome is stored.
- g) If the Panel decides that misconduct has not been proven to have occurred, the examiner(s) should be informed of this outcome and requested to assign a mark. If the Panel determines that there is no academic misconduct but that there is evidence of poor academic practice (as set out in [AM3.2.4](#) below), the Panel may recommend to the examiner that they consider this when assigning a mark for the work in accordance with the departments marking guidance, assessment criteria, etc. A marks cap cannot be imposed where it has been determined that there has been poor academic practice that does not constitute academic misconduct.
- h) On notification of an academic misconduct outcome, the Academic Misconduct Team should consider whether the student in question has committed a second academic misconduct offence as set out in [AM4.1](#) and [AM1.3.12](#) and, if so, inform the Secretary to SCA.

AM3. Academic Misconduct penalties

If a student is found to have committed academic misconduct on a submitted assessment the penalty must be applied to the mark of the submitted piece of work in accordance with the following penalty sections.

The application of penalties in accordance with the following tables are not decisions of academic judgement.

AM3.1 Misconduct that occurs in a probationary module

Offence	Appropriate responses
First offence of plagiarism	<p>Any/all of the following:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Marks cap • Thorough feedback if there is opportunity to submit further work on the module • Academic integrity tutorial to be completed 'as if for first time' • Undertake Turnitin training and use as condition of submission in future • Consult referencing guidance on the Academic Integrity webpages and Skills Guides • Correct work (de-anonymised) and show it to module examiners for checking of referencing as condition of progression
First offence of collusion	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Marks cap • Academic integrity tutorial to be completed 'as if for first time'

	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Independent work on a new attempt at the same assessment (de-anonymised), with module examiners checking that it is the student's own work, as condition of progression
Any offence of cheating, false authorship, fabrication	These offences are not treated any differently in a probationary module than in a non-probationary module. These offences should be referred to the StAMP process.
Second Offence	Plagiarism or Collusion: Formal Warning False authorship: Dealt with under Academic Misconduct Disciplinary Procedures (AM5).
Subsequent Offences of Plagiarism or Collusion	Treated as a first offence in line with modules which are not probationary, and so will be referred to an Investigatory Panel with the normal range of penalties available.

AM3.2 Penalties for plagiarism, collusion and false authorship on non-probationary modules

Where the work only evidences poor academic practice, no penalty should be imposed (see [3.2.1](#) below).

Where the work evidences more serious academic misconduct, use the table below and see [3.2.4](#) and [3.2.5](#) for the application of these principles.

Marks Cap→ Offence↓	0	29UG/39PG	39UG/49PG
Plagiarism	A submitted assessment completely or near completely copied from sources, which displays little or no independent academic value.	A submitted assessment that suggests that the inclusion of unattributed source material is characteristic of the general approach, where the work as a whole is predominantly based on unattributed source material and/or where key ideas central to the work are unattributed.	A submitted assessment that includes a significant proportion of unattributed material but where the panel judges there has been a genuine but flawed attempt to acknowledge source(s) and attribute appropriately.
Collusion	A submitted assessment so completely or near completely based on collusion that it displays little or no independent academic value.	A submitted assessment that suggests the inclusion of a significant proportion of the work or key ideas central to the work have resulted from collusion.	A submitted assessment that includes a proportion of material resulting from collusion but where the panel judges this was due to a genuine confusion by students over the distinction between working together and collusion, resulting in a breach of the rules against collusion.

Marks Cap→ Offence↓	0	29UG/39PG	39UG/49PG
False Authorship	A submitted assessment so completely or near completely based on unauthorised content that it displays little or no independent academic value.	A number of elements of the assessment are the result of unauthorised content or adaptation work or the submitted item consists mostly but not necessarily substantially of elements of unauthorised or adapted work.	The submitted assessment mostly reflects the student's own work but the panel concludes that the submitted work includes elements of content created by a person other than the student in a way that is unacknowledged or to an extent inappropriate for the assessment in question. Alternatively, the work in question has been substantially edited or adapted or improved by a person or software other than the student beyond what is permissible by the University's Policy on Acceptable Assistance with Assessments .
Fabrication	A submitted assessment has little or no academic value independently of the fabricated elements.	A number of elements of the submitted assessment are demonstrated to be based on fabrication or the work is based on a proportion of fabricated data, outcomes or experiences.	The submitted assessment mostly reflects the student's actual experiences but the panel conclude that elements of the submitted assessment are not-entirely-genuine accounts of the outputs, experiences or activities presented by the student, rather than being based on genuine experiences or data collection.

AM3.2.1 Determining whether to cap in the Compensatable Fail (CF) range

The award of a mark in the compensatable fail range (30-39 UG and 40-49 PGT) for serious plagiarism requires the student – as an absolute minimum – to have included a bibliographic entry allowing the examiner to identify each source used, even if the internal citation is not entirely transparent, is absent or the specified referencing style has not been followed. Where there is no attempt to acknowledge the source or the referencing is so unsystematic to be ambiguous, then a cap leading to an outright fail mark (see [3.2.2](#)) should be imposed.

For a Compensatable Fail mark to be justified in the case of collusion there would need at least to be reason for the student to believe that they were entitled to use the material they presented in the way they did.

This might include unacknowledged interpolation or extrapolation in a case of fabrication, or work produced as the result of authorised collaboration used in an inappropriate manner.

Work produced as the result of false authorship, fabrication or cheating will rarely, if ever, warrant a mark in the compensatable fail range.

AM3.2.2 Determining whether to cap the mark at a non-compensatable fail (29 UG; 39 PGT)

In cases of plagiarism, a mark may be capped at the non-compensatable mark (29 for UG; 39 for PGT) where the plagiarism is characteristic of the 'general approach'. Problems with the general approach to the assessment task may be indicated by numerous sentences of unattributed source material being found throughout the assignment. Work falling into the serious category may, in the view of the StAMP Investigatory Panel, follow a pattern that suggests an intention to deceive as opposed to errors in referencing or presentation that could reasonably be attributed to misunderstanding. Seriousness and intention is a matter of judgement for the StAMP Investigatory Panel. There is no specific quantity of unattributed work that mandates or prevents a Panel from concluding that there is a 'general approach'. Nor does the panel need to conclude that the lack of attribution was deliberate.

A cap at this level is also appropriate in plagiarism cases where the non-attribution, although not necessarily frequent, relates to core ideas or significant elements of the work as a whole.

A finding of a serious offence of collusion would be justified by a high level of duplication in work, particularly as regards key concepts, arguments or data in the submitted work. As with plagiarism, the determination of seriousness should not be made based on the total number of duplicate (or colluded) words, but rather the relative value of the colluded material to the submission compared to the work of independent academic value.

A mark above the pass mark is unlikely to be justified in any work containing fabrication or false authorship, or in exams affected by cheating where an unfair advantage or intention to gain an unfair advantage can be inferred from the circumstances. Where students are found to have committed fabrication or false authorship, the penalty would normally be a zero in the affected assessment.

AM3.2.3 'Unattributed material' and sufficient acknowledgement of sources

The aim in **all** assessed work should be for the student to make a clear distinction between their own ideas and those drawn from other sources. The University expects all scholars to be able to paraphrase source material with appropriate citations, include page references in the citations appropriately where material is quoted directly, present secondary citations in a way that makes clear the extent of their own scholarship, present data accurately, produce an accurate reference list and consistently follow the referencing system mandated by their school/department(s), or editors of journals and/or commissioners of other academic outputs.

The extent to which students deviate from this expectation will determine whether the student has committed academic misconduct or their work is merely indicative of poor academic practice. In the former case, the student should be investigated under this policy. In the latter case, where the flaws in the work simply constitute poor academic practice, this should be reflected in the marks given to the work and the extent to which a student should be judged to be deliberately misleading the examiner(s) in the presentation of the work. See [AM3.2.4](#) in relation to poor academic practice.

Sufficient acknowledgement of sources is also expected of students in closed examinations, although the form which that acknowledgement takes may be less stringent than in open assessments.

AM3.2.4 Poor academic practice

A penalty should not be imposed where the panel conclude that the work is flawed but that the level of such flaws only reflect poor academic practice in line with the following principles:

AM3.2.4.1 Poor academic practice in cases of plagiarism

Not all failures to reference adequately and to show the sources upon which a piece of work is based will constitute plagiarism. The threshold for work to constitute plagiarism is that the non-attribution of sources was, in the academic judgement of the Panel, significant. This must be determined in the context of the specific assessment task, referencing practices and by examination of the work as a whole.

Poor academic practice short of the standard specified in [AM3.2.1](#) should rather be dealt with in the awarding of marks under the school/department's assessment criteria or marking rubrics and by provision of feedback to the student. Situations that may constitute poor academic practice rather than plagiarism include:

- repeated minor errors or inconsistencies in referencing or bibliographic accuracy,
- inaccurate quotation,
- numerous or lengthy incidences of paraphrasing or synthesis of material that is inappropriately close to the wording of the original source and that therefore suggest a lack of understanding of referencing requirements and practices.

AM3.2.4.2 Poor academic practice in cases of false authorship

The threshold for false authorship cases should be determined with regard to the [Policy on Acceptable Assistance with Assessments](#). Any work that has been created or improved by a person other than the student beyond what is permitted in the particular assessment or under the Policy on Acceptable Assistance with Assessments should be considered as potential academic misconduct.

However, a Panel may conclude that there is a case of poor academic practice that does not merit a penalty if the student appears to have been attempting to comply with that Policy but to have failed to do so adequately in minor respects that have minimal impact on their authorship of the work in question. In such cases, the assessment should be referred back to the examiners to be graded according to the assessment criteria or rubric.

AM3.2.4.3 Poor academic practices in cases of collusion or fabrication

As a general principle, students can be expected to work independently for assessments and only rely on materials that have genuinely been produced for that assessment. A panel may, however, consider any evidence on the particular case and relevant to the context of the particular module that may have led to genuine confusion on the part of the student(s) which may explain minor instances of collusion or fabrication. Even in cases where there have been innocent or inadvertent failures on the part of students, however, there should be a finding of academic misconduct and the imposition of a marks cap if an identifiable element of the submitted work is not the student's own work (collusion) or is inaccurately

identified as the result of their own work or experiences (fabrication).

AM3.2.5 False Authorship and the improvement of assessed work by third parties prior to submission

The aim of assessment is to establish the level of understanding, skills and performance of the individual student enrolled. Third party involvement in the development or improvement of work undermines this purpose. Proofreading or other improvement of work by a person or by AI should only be done in accordance with the [Policy on Acceptable Assistance with Assessments](#) found on the [University's policies and procedures on assessment, marking, feedback and standards](#) webpage. Of particular note are that:

- Students are responsible for making the Policy on Acceptable Assistance with Assessments, which covers proofreading, translation and editing and the rules against false authorship, clear to any third party they ask to check their work for English language usage and presentation.
- Support given in acknowledgement of a specific disability, and agreed by the relevant Board of Studies, is not considered to be inappropriate support.

AM3.3 Penalties for cheating/breach

		UG	PGT
Serious Cheating	Dishonest breach of assessment regulations where there is sufficient evidence reasonably to infer an intention to gain unfair or inappropriate advantage. (e.g notes found with the student or on the student's body).	0	0
Cheating/ Serious Breach/ Repeated Breach	The panel may decide, in their academic judgement, to place the work in the compensatable fail range if there is a breach of assessment regulations where an unfair or inappropriate advantage (unintentional or otherwise) could be had or where other students have been disadvantaged by the breach (e.g. mobile phone ringing during the exam, bringing in one's own calculator or other data-storage devices, writing on the exam paper before the exam begins).	Marks Cap 39	Marks Cap 49
Breach (Second occurrence)	As below but where a student has already received a formal warning.	Marks Cap 59	Marks Cap 59
Breach (First occurrence)	Breach of assessment regulations where no advantage is apparent. (e.g unauthorised materials with no	Formal warning	Formal Warning

		UG	PGT
	perceivable advantage in a pocket or under table, such as keys or a credit card).		

AM3.3.1 Cheating: Unauthorised use of Calculators

In cases where a student has brought an unauthorised calculator into a formal examination where no special arrangement has been made by their school/department, should the StAMP Investigatory Panel conclude that they have obtained an unfair advantage, whether intended or not, their mark should therefore be capped at the compensatable fail grade (30-39 UG and 40-49 PGT). If pre-programmed information potentially relevant to the exam has been found on the confiscated calculator, then a mark of zero should be applied.

AM3.4 Corrective pedagogic requirements

The following measures can be taken regardless of the level of culpability, as corrective pedagogic requirements. Their completion can be set as a requirement for progression to the next stage of study or for completion of the award:

- Required to retake the academic integrity tutorial
- Required to undertake Turnitin training
- Required to consult referencing guidance on the [Academic Integrity](#) webpage
- Required to review the [student guidance on using generative AI and translation tools](#)
- Required to resubmit corrected work to module leader
- Required to resubmit corrected work to StAMP Chair
- Required to meet with Learning Enhancement Team to discuss the work

AM3.5 Mitigation of penalties in light of compelling personal circumstances

Once the StAMP Investigatory Panel has decided that, on the balance of probabilities, academic misconduct has occurred, the StAMP Investigatory Panel will agree a penalty in accordance with the tables in Section 3 of this Policy. The StAMP cannot decide a lesser penalty due to the existence of exceptional or mitigating circumstances. In coming to their decision, the StAMP Investigatory Panel should only consider the nature of the academic misconduct and the appropriate penalty based on the extent, including the seriousness of the misconduct.

If, however, the panel feels that the student's personal circumstances are of such a nature and seriousness that they may justify penalty mitigation under [AM3.5.1](#), they should refer the matter to the Academic Misconduct Administrators so that a Penalty Mitigation Panel can be established.

AM3.5.1 Circumstances that may be considered

Exceptional circumstances, as defined by the [Exceptional Circumstances affecting Assessment Policy](#) on the [University's policies and procedures on assessment, marking, feedback and standards](#) webpages, are not

normally relevant to consideration of whether or not an offence has been committed. However, there are some **limited** circumstances in which they may be taken into account as a mitigation when considering the penalty. These are:

- i. The personal circumstances were of such severity that their impact on the student's judgement at the time that the academic misconduct offence occurred makes it appropriate, in the opinion of the Panel, to impose a less serious penalty by reason of those circumstances.
- ii. A specific disability, or other chronic condition, which clearly impacted the student's judgement, or their capacity to comply with academic standards. This may be taken into account where, through no fault of the student, such a disability has not been accounted for through a reasonable adjustment or where that adjustment was not made in time for the assessment. If the specific disability, or its impact, has not been declared to the University, and hence is not addressed in a university Student Support Plan (SSP), a compelling, and evidenced, explanation for this will need to be provided.

Evidence of a direct impact on the students' judgement or capacity as specified in i or ii above will need to be provided to justify penalty mitigation. Such evidence must show that the student's circumstances are of such magnitude and significance that it would be, in the opinion of a Penalty Mitigation Panel and on the balance of probabilities, inappropriate to impose the penalty which would otherwise be indicated by the tables in Section 3. The Penalty Mitigation Panel should not infer the inability to differentiate between right and wrong from the mere fact of a general diagnosis of mental health issues or the general nature of a student's circumstances.

The student will be encouraged to disclose any such mitigating circumstances, and their impact, as part of their statement in response to the StAMP Investigatory Panel Chair, at the point at which the StAMP Investigatory Panel has decided that there is a case to answer.

AM3.5.2 Process for determining penalty mitigation for academic misconduct

- a) Where a StAMP Investigatory considers that the circumstances of a case as presented to them during their investigation are likely to justify the mitigation of a penalty in line with [AM3.5.1](#), they make a decision as normal on the penalty (consulting [Section 3](#) of this Policy) without consideration of any mitigating circumstances. The Chair of the panel should additionally, however, notify the Academic Misconduct Administrators that they consider the case merits consideration for penalty mitigation upon the exceptional circumstances that it was made aware of.
- b) The Academic Misconduct Administrators will notify the Secretary to SCA, who will convene a Penalty Mitigation Panel (PMP) composed of the StAMP Investigatory Panel Chair for the case, the Chair of the SCA (or delegate) (to Chair PMP) and a nominated member of the Special Cases Team. The Deputy Director of Student Services and the Secretary of the SCA will be in attendance.
- c) The PMP may consider the case via email, online or meet in person. The should be provided with all the evidence presented to the StAMP Investigatory Panel and, in particular, all such evidence that is believed to justify any mitigation. They may request further evidence or information in order to make a decision.
- d) The PMP will consider whether or not the penalty should be adjusted applying the test established in [AM3.5.1](#) above.

- e) The PMP chair will inform the Academic Misconduct Administrators, the Investigatory Panel and the student of the outcome.

AM4 Academic Misconduct Disciplinary Procedure and Fitness to Practice

AM4.1 Situations in which the Academic Misconduct Disciplinary Procedure should be used

The procedure set out in this section should be used in two situations:

1. Where a student is alleged to have committed a 'disciplinary offence' (personation, deception or unethical research behaviour) as defined in [AM1.2.2](#); or
2. Where a student has been found to have committed a second serious academic misconduct offence as defined in [AM1.3.12](#).

These types of cases are dealt with under the principles and procedures as set out in [Regulation 7](#) of the University's Ordinances and Regulations following the procedure set out in this section of this policy. The sanctions that may be imposed are those specified in [Regulation 7.4](#). Academic Misconduct Disciplinary offences, if proven, constitute Level II misconduct under [Regulation 7.2.5](#).

In the event that misconduct is discovered or suspected subsequent to the award of a degree, or other award, [Ordinance 16](#) applies.

AM4.2 Initiating Academic Misconduct Disciplinary Procedures

AM4.2.1 Initiating procedure for a disciplinary offence

Where a suspected disciplinary offence as defined in [AM1.2.2](#) is detected within a school/department, the same process for determining whether there is a case to answer should be followed as for an academic misconduct offence as set out at [AM2.2.1](#) (i.e. the case is referred first to the relevant assessment administrators, then to a StAMP member in the school/department to determine whether there is a case to answer and, if there is, the case file is passed on to the Academic Misconduct Administrators). Once they have been notified by a school/department that there is a case to answer for a disciplinary offence, the Academic Misconduct Administrators should notify the Secretary to SCA who will manage the case and forward the case file and all evidence and details about the case.

AM4.2.2 Initiating procedure for a second serious academic misconduct offence

Where a student has committed any previous academic misconduct offence, all such cases should be noted in the Case Document.

Where an academic misconduct case has concluded and has resulted in a serious outcome (i.e. capping at the outright fail mark or imposition of a mark of 0), the Academic Misconduct Administrators must consider whether the outcome constitutes a second offence as defined in [AM1.3.12](#). If they conclude that it does,

the Academic Misconduct Administrators should report the case to the Secretary to SCA who will manage the case, sending the Case Document and all relevant evidence and records relating to the case.

AM4.3 Procedure for Academic Misconduct Disciplinary cases after a case to answer has been found

- a) Once a case is referred to the SCA Secretary, the Secretary will manage the case proceedings and act as the investigating officer (or appoint an appropriate delegate), including assisting in collating documents for the panel's consideration.
- b) SCA Secretary must then confirm a senior member of SEE or LLAW (i.e. Deputy Director of Student Education and Experience etc.) to be the Disciplinary Manager for the case.
- c) The Disciplinary Manager will:
 1. Work with the investigating officer or delegate thereof;
 2. Decide whether or not there is case to answer, which triggers a Level 2 disciplinary panel;
 3. Form a Disciplinary Panel with 3 senior members of the university. This should include:
 - The Head of Department of the student under investigation - or delegate thereof,
 - A suitable Academic staff member (e.g. SCA, Special Cases or Ethics Committee members but not involved in the StAMP cases considered for this disciplinary offence) and
 - A suitable member of Student and Academic Services (e.g. Head of Student Success, Head of Academic Quality & Development etc.). In the event any of these are unavailable a suitable delegate may be approved by the Disciplinary Manager.
- d) The Disciplinary Manager must:
 1. Invite the student to make a written submission and present any evidence or to attend a hearing in relation to the case; and
 2. Explain to the student what other evidence the panel will be considering (the evidence from StAMP panel) in line with the Principles of [Regulation 7.3](#).
- e) It is the Disciplinary Manager's responsibility to ensure the panel undertakes discussion of the matters presented (in-person, online or by email correspondence) and reaches a decision within the parameters of Regulation 7. As Academic Misconduct is considered a Level 2 offence under [Regulation 7](#) - the panel may consider all the sanctions under [7.4.2](#) up to and including suspension or expulsion.

AM4.4 Fitness to Practise

Where an academic misconduct offence has been established and this raises concerns about a student's fitness to practise, or if other disciplinary offences are related to the incident of misconduct, then the University's Fitness to Practise or Disciplinary procedures should also be consulted and invoked where necessary.

AM5. Appeals

AM5.1 Appeals by students

When a student is informed of the outcome of the StAMP Investigatory Panel consideration of their case they must be advised that they have a right to appeal by following the process on the [Complaints and Appeals](#) webpage. If they are dissatisfied at the end of that process, they may make a complaint to the Office for the Independent Adjudicator for Higher Education.

Students may **only** appeal against decisions of any Panel making decisions under this policy on the grounds that:

- i. The procedures set out in this Policy were not followed properly;
- ii. The Panel reached a decision that was not reasonable in all the circumstances;
- iii. New evidence is available which could not reasonably have been brought to the attention of the relevant Panel at the time of its investigation;
- iv. There was bias or reasonable perception of bias during the academic misconduct process;
- v. The penalty imposed by the StAMP Investigatory Panel or Disciplinary Panel was disproportionate or not permitted under this Policy or [Regulation 7](#), as the case may be.

Students may not appeal against matters of academic judgement in relation to academic misconduct - see section [AM1.3.2](#) for further information.

AM5.2 Appeals by the SCA representative

An SCA representative on a StAMP Investigatory Panel should intervene to ensure that the Panel is acting within the principles and provisions of this policy. If the SCA representative feels that the Panel has made an inappropriate decision regardless of the representative's advice, they may refer the case to the Special Cases team by way of appeal. An appeal hearing should always take place if recommended by the SCA representative advising the StAMP investigatory panel on an investigation.

AM6. General advice and training for students

AM6.1 Establishing understanding

AM6.1.1 Induction, compulsory Academic Integrity Tutorial and handbook entries

It is compulsory for all students to complete the Academic Integrity Tutorial on the Yorkshare VLE (virtual learning environment) in order to progress to the next stage of their programme or to receive their award, whichever occurs first. It is recommended that students are required to complete this tutorial successfully during the first semester of their programme of study, particularly those on postgraduate programmes. Students must complete the Academic Integrity Tutorial for each programme of study they undertake (e.g. if an undergraduate student progresses to a masters programme they will be required to complete the tutorial afresh to satisfy the award requirements of the masters programme).

The Academic Integrity Tutorial advises all new students of the various forms of academic misconduct and warns them of the consequences of committing an offence. It is written in clear and accessible language and cross references to the University [Referencing Style Guides](#) with examples of appropriate referencing and this requirement must be clearly noted in the students' handbook in addition to any school/department specific guidance if distinct from the information contained in the Academic Integrity Tutorial.

It is good practice to remind students of the expectations regarding academic integrity, and any specific instructions e.g. in relation to group-work, help from family members or what materials can be taken into a closed examination, when they are approaching assessments, so as to leave no room for doubt about their familiarity with the University's requirements.

AM6.1.2 Induction of postgraduate taught students

Taught postgraduate students may undertake significant components of assessment relatively early in their programme. Programme organisers and supervisors must ensure that students are made aware of the nature of academic misconduct in all its forms prior to any assessment or preparation by the student of work for assessment. Programme organisers and supervisors should pay particular attention to the needs of students who may be studying in the UK for the first time.

AM6.1.3 Conventions of academic writing

Schools/departments must advise students of the rationale and procedures for the full and accurate acknowledgment of sources in their academic writing (essays, projects, etc.).

Students must be informed of the level of acknowledgment appropriate to particular forms of assessment and of the conventions of academic writing, for example, the appropriate use of quotation marks, footnotes and bibliographies, and the dangers of 'near-paraphrasing'.

AM6.1.4 Specific guidance to students by discipline

Programme and module organisers should ensure that students receive subject-, or discipline-, specific advice that may not be covered in generic University academic integrity guides e.g. copying code, equations, stylistic aspects of performance.

Where relevant, students must be warned that some common workplace practices (e.g. 'cutting and pasting' unacknowledged material into technical specifications or briefing documents) constitute plagiarism in the context of academic assessment. Similarly, students should be made aware that sharing conventions on social media are different to those in academic work.

AM6.2 Specific instructions to students in relation to working in groups

Schools/departments should ensure that students undertaking group work receive clear guidance on the boundary between legitimate collaboration and misconduct involving collusion. Academic staff are responsible for ensuring that they clearly define what legitimate collaborative learning is in the context of any module specific forms of collaboration and group working in support of the learning outcomes of their module. This should be reinforced regularly throughout the module.

AM6.3 Online programmes

Schools/departments offering online programmes should ensure that issues of academic misconduct are brought to the attention of students studying on these programmes at an early stage, with regular reminders provided over the course of the programme. It is recommended that the usual school/departmental procedures for delivering information about academic misconduct issues are reviewed regularly in the light of the particular features of this type of study.

AM6.4 Practical and research projects

Students engaged in practical, laboratory work and/or empirical research projects should be required to maintain appropriate, verifiable records of progress (e.g. a bound lab book), which a party other than the student can verify. These records should be able to be made available at any point for verification.

Schools/departments are required to determine what constitutes verifiable, sustainable and authentic data in their particular discipline.

AM6.5 Use of unauthorised third-party support, particularly custom assignment writing services

Students should be aware of the seriousness with which the University views the use of unauthorised third-party support with their assignments including use of generative AI. It should be highlighted that from a learning perspective, unauthorised support may hinder students' learning progress and that they might become increasingly dependent on help. Using unauthorised support is taken extremely seriously by the University and could result in expulsion. In particular it should be stressed that the use of *custom assignment writing services* is especially hazardous as these services prey on vulnerable students to make poor ethical choices and the guarantees of the sites cannot be trusted. Equally, students should be warned about the risk that use of generative AI as part of their research and learning may constitute false authorship in assessments linked to that research and learning.

Students should be made aware of the [Policy on Acceptable Assistance with Assessments, and the student guidance on using AI and translation tools](#) and should be strongly encouraged to access and think about the [guidance on use of AI available on the University webpages](#).

AM7. General advice to schools/departments and examiners

AM7.1 Establishing understanding

AM7.1.1 Induction

Schools/departments are required to advise all relevant staff about the various forms of academic misconduct that are offences under the University of York policy, procedures and guidelines. Responsibilities of module tutors, assessment designers and examiners must be made clear.

There should be clear advice on the forms of academic misconduct, written in clear and accessible language and with examples appropriate to the school/department, available to all staff.

AM7.1.2 Conventions of academic writing and marking

Schools/departments are required to advise, guide and support all relevant staff involved in teaching and assessment in the conventions of academic writing in operation in the school/department. This should cover the rationale and format of the full and accurate acknowledgment of sources in their academic writing (essays, projects, etc.). Programme organisers should not assume that incoming staff are aware of the academic writing and referencing conventions in use or their responsibilities in respect to the handling of academic misconduct.

AM7.2 Probationary modules

Full details of the support and development of students who are found to have plagiarised and/or colluded in probationary modules should be supplied to academic-misconduct@york.ac.uk.

AM7.3 Grade descriptors/assessment criteria

It is good practice to ensure that grade descriptors contain clear statements regarding academic integrity measures, especially in relation to referencing of sources. Schools/departments can, if they prefer, add a general statement appended to their grade descriptors that indicates to students that notwithstanding the general qualities of the work, a mark may be awarded outside of the grade band for poor or insufficient acknowledgement of sources. A statement to this effect is also included in the University Policy on Assessment, Examiners, Marking and Feedback on the [University Assessments Policy](#) webpage.

AM7.4 Detection

It is important that examiners are vigilant for academic misconduct in all forms of assessment. Examiners are encouraged to carry out random checks on assessed work using internet search engines (such as Advanced Google Search or Google Books) or to employ text matching software such as Turnitin (see guidance on Yorkshire for the appropriate use of Turnitin). This advice applies equally to formative and summative work.

Schools/departments must ensure that all members of staff involved in teaching and examination of assessments are aware of the risks of AI use in formal assessments and that they are mindful of the risks that work submitted by students may have been inappropriately generated by AI software.

Online AI detectors must not be used by staff to detect suspected use of AI. Suspicions of and subsequent referrals to investigation for the inappropriate use of AI, must be based on the judgement that on the 'balance of probabilities' AI has been used.

AM7.5 Appropriate support for students in open assessments

Schools/departments should discuss and agree conventions for the type and extent of formative comments made on students' work, especially where that same piece of work will subsequently be submitted for summative assessment. Staff should be aware that where they have made extensive improving comments and/or amendments directly to the text of formative work this can represent an unfair advantage to students in directly improving their submission. These agreed conventions should be regularly revisited and staff reminded of the school/departmental conventions re formative feedback and the boundary between feedback and direct improvements that can be incorporated by students in summative work, as opposed to developmental comments on the work.

AM7.6 Feedback from StAMP members to their school/department

The intention of the StAMP system is to encourage intra- and inter-departmental sharing of good practice, expertise and pedagogical approaches to the development of high standards of academic integrity. StAMP representatives are encouraged to report back on at least an annual basis to their Board of Studies comparing the types of cases their own school/department refers to Investigatory Panels to other schools/departments in their faculty i.e. not revealing the names of individual students but noting if there are discernible patterns emerging, and recommending changes in practice that would help avoid the common errors and reportable offences.

AM7.7 Assessment Design to mitigate risks of misconduct

Schools/departments can mitigate the risks of misconduct through measures to; use a variety of assessment types; regularly revise assignment questions; and identify students in need or support. An overall effort to improve assessment design can help not only to improve the integrity of the assessment process but also to improve student engagement and attainment. If schools/departments wish to discuss assessment design, they can contact the Academic Practice Team.

AM Appendix 1: Documenting and considering evidence of false authorship

The identification of false authorship starts with an academic judgement. One of the difficulties of identifying this offence is that it will require solid evidence that an act of commission and incorporation has taken place. While at first the suspicion may appear as a gut feeling, the examiner must provide specific evidence of their suspicion of false authorship, this may include a combination of the following features:

- **Identifiable markers:** In certain cases the student may not remove features which identify another author in the assignment, such as the name of a company.
- **Document properties:** Check properties of the document/file for any unusual names, dates, editing times.
- **Level of assignment:** A suspiciously good assignment which stands out from the cohort or from previous work submitted by the student (harder to tell with anonymous assignments).
- **Language level:** High level of language usage in writing which stands out in a cohort/level of study.
- **Unusual/inappropriate references:** Reference to texts/resources which have not been covered in the course, or are unrelated/inappropriate for the assignment.
- **Omission of core texts or methods:** The omission of core texts from the reference list or methods used which were not taught on the module.
- **Off topic:** An intelligent attempt at the assignment but off topic and with references to a wide range of unrelated work or methods which are tenuously linked to the assignment.
- **Unusual referencing style or formatting:** Use of the wrong referencing style or unusual formatting of the assignment.
- **Turnitin Originality Check :** Turnitin originality check does not help in identifying assignments which contain *false authorship*.
- **AI detection software:** AI detection software may not accurately detect false authorship, please contact SCA@york.ac.uk for the latest guidance on AI detection and **do not** run student work through freely available AI detectors online.

AM Appendix 2: Procedure for Academic Misconduct in Low-credit assessment

1. **Undergraduate Stage 0 and 1 modules, and probationary modules:** Any minor academic misconduct on these modules is considered probationary and therefore should be dealt with by the school/department and treated as a learning opportunity for the students (unless the school/department has opted out of the module being considered probationary). Academic misconduct can result from misunderstanding the requirements of academic integrity with respect to assessed work, and should be addressed by in-depth feedback on the precise aspects that were found to be problematic – although a mark penalty may also be appropriate, depending on the severity of the offence.
2. **Undergraduate Stage 2 and above:** Minor academic misconduct in low-credit assessments may be dealt with by the school/department. A school/departmental record of the decision must be kept and students must be informed of their right to the case being considered by StAMP Investigatory Panel in accordance with the full procedure.
3. **Considering academic misconduct in Low-credit assessments:** Departments must follow the following procedure for considering academic misconduct of low-credit assessment:
 - a. examiner informally raises the offence with the module leader or suitable alternative (such as practical course organiser).
 - b. Module leader (or alternative) and examiner agree on whether academic misconduct has been committed and of what level (see [AM3.2](#));
 - c. **No misconduct:** examiner provides appropriate feedback about the aspects of the work that were viewed as problematic, with the aim of helping the student to better understand the requirements of academic integrity and good academic practice.
 - d. **Second offence check:** If academic misconduct is confirmed, the module leader checks school/departmental record to see whether this is a second offence - if so, the case must be dealt with by a full StAMP process. Second and subsequent offences will have great consequences and this should be highlighted to students.
 - e. **Minor Misconduct Offences:** If it is the student's first offence, the examiner and module leader will agree an appropriate penalty with advice from a StAMP member. This must be consistent with those listed in the penalty tables in the Academic Misconduct Policy ([Section 3](#)).
 - f. **Serious Misconduct Offences:** Any cases in which there is an allegation of a significant level of cheating, fabrication or false authorship should be dealt with by a full StAMP process.
 - g. School/departmental StAMP member informed of the decision, offers further advice if necessary.
 - h. School/departmental Administrator records the outcome of cases under the student's examination number in a confidential folder.
 - i. The school/departmental record is reviewed annually in coordination with SCA to ensure equity of approach in minor cases.

Informing the student: The student can be notified informally by the examiner in the course of discussion.

In all cases, however, a formal email to the student and administrator must follow that includes information about:

- **Right to full StAMP consideration of case:** If low-credit assessments are dealt with by the school/department, students retain the right to have the case reconsidered by means of a full StAMP procedure. It is important that students are clearly informed of this. Any subsequent appeal of the StAMP's determination will be dealt with via the regular appeals process.
- **Right to advice and support:** Students must be as informed of their right to advice and support (e.g. from their supervisor, York SU advice services) in the same way as students who experience the full StAMP process.

Document Control

Responsible Service:	Academic Quality and Development Team
Responsible Manager:	Policy Manager Academic Quality and Development
External regulatory and/or legal requirement addressed:	Office for Students (2022) Securing student success: Regulatory framework for higher education in England. QAA (2020) Academic Integrity Charter for UK Higher Education.
Equality Impact Assessment:	N/A
Approval date:	11/09/2025
Effective from:	11/09/2025
Date of next review:	31/07/2026

Amendments log

Original	Amendment	Approved by	Approval date
<p>AM2.1.3 School/departmental assessment administrators</p> <p>...</p> <p>The assessment administrators are responsible for de-anonymising reported cases and updated Case Documents with the student's details, allocating them to school/departmental StAMP members when initially referred, for referring cases where it has been decided that there is a case to answer to the Academic Misconduct Team and for implementing the outcome of cases (such as imposing marks caps on work) and for withholding marks on assessments where there is an ongoing case of academic misconduct.</p>	<p>AM2.1.3 School/departmental assessment administrators</p> <p>...</p> <p>The assessment administrators are responsible for de-anonymising reported cases and updated Case Documents with the student's details, allocating them to school/departmental StAMP members when initially referred, for referring cases where it has been decided that there is a case to answer to the Academic Misconduct Team and for implementing the outcome of cases (such as imposing marks caps on work).</p>	<p>SCA - noting amendment as a correction of an administrative error (the non-transfer of a change made to the 24/25 policy).</p>	<p>21/11/2025</p>
<p>AM2.2.1.b.v</p> <p>Where marking has been completed for a module that includes an assessment under suspicion of academic misconduct, marks must be withheld until the academic misconduct case is finally decided.</p>	<p>AM2.2.1.b.v</p> <p>Where marking has been completed for a module that includes an assessment under suspicion of academic misconduct, marks must not be withheld, but must be released as a provisional mark in accordance with section 3.3 of the Progression and Award Rules.</p>	<p>SCA - noting amendment as a correction of an administrative error (the non-transfer of a change made to the 24/25 policy).</p>	<p>21/11/2025</p>

