

Academic Misconduct StAMP Checklist - For the Panel

This checklist is designed to guide a StAMP panel through the key procedural steps of a hearing, ensuring that StAMP investigations are accessible, fair and consistent.

Preparation Phase (Before the Meeting)

- The panel has been convened with all required members as follows:
 - The Chair will be the StAMP member in the school/department referring the case who determined that there was a case to answer.
 - The two other members of the panel will usually be StAMP members from the same faculty.
 - A designated member of SCA can advise the Panel on the process if required.
- All panel members have reviewed all evidence received from the department and the student.
- The panel has confirmed that no pertinent evidence is missing and that there is sufficient, relevant evidence to reach a decision.
- The student has been sent an explanation of the concerns, examples of source material, and any relevant similarity reports or other evidence, to be able to make an informed response to the panel.
- The student has been encouraged to seek advice at the earliest opportunity from supervisors and [York SU Advice & Support](#)
- The student has had the opportunity to provide a written statement (within 7 working days) to the panel alongside being invited to attend the meeting (optional).
- The student has been given the opportunity to request any reasonable adjustments that they may require if they are to attend the meeting.
- If the student is attending, they have been offered the opportunity to be accompanied by a supporter (such as an independent adviser from York SU) and have been afforded sufficient time (at least 7 calendar days) for this to be arranged. (Advance notice of bringing a supporter is required).

Meeting Phase (where the student is present)

- Introductions are led by the Panel Chair for all parties in the meeting.
- The Panel Chair ensures that everyone can hear one another, technology appears to be working etc.
- The Panel Chair highlights to the student that if they need to take a break at any point, they are able to do so.
- The Panel Chair summarises the meeting process and the specific decisions that will be made by the panel following the meeting:
 - Whether on the balance of probabilities, and without assessing any degree of intent, academic misconduct has occurred or not;

- The extent of academic misconduct (if it has occurred) and the offence(s) that have occurred;
 - The penalty that should be imposed based on the offence(s) that has occurred;
 - Whether there are any mitigating circumstances that would lead the panel to recommend that the student's case be referred to be considered by a Penalty Mitigation Panel
- The student is reminded of the [support mechanisms](#), i.e. YorkSU, Open Door, college support services etc. available at the university.
 - The Panel Chair presents the panel's understanding of the suspicions and any evidence, allowing the student to respond.
 - The panel asks clarifying questions to the student regarding the suspicions and evidence.
 - The student is given an opportunity to add any further comments or information they wish to share.
 - The student is asked to leave the room/Zoom meeting and is reminded that they will receive the outcome of the meeting within 5 working days.

Meeting Phase (where the student is NOT present)

- Introductions are led by the Panel Chair for all parties in the meeting.
- The Panel Chair ensures that everyone can hear one another, technology appears to be working etc.
- The Panel Chair summarises the meeting process and the specific decisions that will be made during the meeting.
- The Panel Chair presents the panel's understanding of the allegations and any evidence.
- The panel discusses the evidence.

Deliberation and Outcome Phase (Whether the student is present or not beforehand)

- The panel privately deliberates to decide the outcome by considering the following:
 - The panel determines, on the balance of probabilities, whether the alleged offences occurred/whether the issues were alternatively identified as constituting poor practice.
 - If the offence is confirmed, the panel determines the appropriate penalty in line with university policy.
 - The panel considers whether any mitigating circumstances, as defined by university policy (e.g., section AM3.5 of the Academic Misconduct Policy and Procedures), exist. If yes, the Panel Chair should notify the Academic Misconduct Administrators of their decision that mitigating circumstances have been raised that may require further consideration by a Penalty Mitigation Panel.
 - The panel decides on any additional actions, such as advising on complaints procedures or recording the outcome on the student's record.
- 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. The Panel should consider the advice of the SCA representative in reaching its final decision.
- The outcome of the decision should be communicated to the student by the panel Chair, using one of the templates provided by the Academic Misconduct team. The letter must signpost the [appeal procedures](#), and independent advice available from York SU, and be sent to the student within 5 working days of the Panel's decision.
- 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.
- 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 one has not already been assigned). If the Panel determines that there is no academic misconduct but that there is evidence of poor academic practice (as set out in [AM3.2.2](#)), the Panel may recommend to the examiner that they consider this when adjusting a mark (that has already been assigned for the work, if this has happened), in accordance with the department's marking guidance, assessment criteria, etc.