

ACADEMIC CONDUCT REGULATION

Code of Academic Conduct

1. We are committed to developing a culture of good academic conduct and to ensuring that all assessments are conducted fairly and equitably. Academic conduct plays an important role in your intellectual and professional development, as well as in your successful transition to graduate employment and future careers. It is also an ethical standard by which the academic community operates. It ensures that:
 - your work is your own;
 - you have acknowledged explicitly any material that has been included from other sources;
 - collaboration has been appropriately acknowledged;
 - all of your findings, conclusions or data will be presented based on appropriate and ethical practice.
2. Any attempt to gain an unfair advantage over another student in the completion of assessment, or to assist someone else to gain an unfair advantage, shall be considered as a breach of the Code of Academic Conduct and investigated as suspected academic or severe academic misconduct.

Introduction

3. In this document 'we', 'our' and 'us' refer to Sheffield Hallam University. 'You' and 'your' refer to all taught students at Sheffield Hallam University who are studying for a Sheffield Hallam academic award either at the University or at a partner organisation.
4. This Regulation applies to all undergraduate, Integrated Masters and taught postgraduate programmes offered by the University where the module or course leads to Sheffield Hallam award or credit. It does not cover alleged academic misconduct by students undertaking research degrees who are covered by separate procedures (see the [Policy and procedures for dealing with allegations of research misconduct against doctoral research students](#)).
5. The University reserves the right to make reasonable changes to this Regulation where it will assist in the proper delivery of education. These changes will normally come into effect at the beginning of an academic year. The University may introduce changes during the academic year when it reasonably considers these to be in the interests of students, or where this is required by law.
6. The purpose of this document is to outline what constitutes academic conduct and how we will identify and deal with any activity which does not conform to this expectation.
7. Assessment in any form is the means by which we evaluate your academic achievement against the learning outcomes and any other requirements of your course. It is a fundamental principle that students are assessed fairly and on equal terms. We have a duty to ensure that the highest academic standards are maintained in the conduct of assessment.

8. Academic misconduct is a serious matter. It has the potential to result in a number of sanctions, the impact of which may mean that you lose an assessment attempt and are referred in the task or module concerned. This may have serious implications on your ability to academically progress, and therefore your continued enrolment.
9. In order to emphasise the seriousness of academic misconduct, you are required to accept our enrolment conditions, which confirm that you will comply with our regulations and procedures. You are required to re-enrol on your course on an annual basis to accept your responsibilities as outlined under point 16. Upon submission of coursework, you may also be required to confirm that the submitted work is your own.
10. The University's Academic Board delegates an Academic Conduct Panel (ACP) and a Cheating Allegation Panel (CAP) with the authority to impose sanctions on students who have an allegation of academic or severe academic misconduct upheld in any form of assessment. Sanctions will be applied in accordance with those specified in point 26-28. Decisions reached by an ACP or a CAP cannot be changed by a Departmental Assessment Board.
11. You will have a right of appeal any decision reached by an ACP or CAP under the [Appeals Policy and Procedure](#). There will be no appeal stage for a decision reached following the Academic Concern meeting for poor academic practice in coursework.
12. This Regulation applies to all students equally. We do not accept disability alone as a reason for your misconduct. However we may reasonably adjust the process to take account of any disability you have disclosed, as long as you contact the Secretary in advance of the meeting to discuss your requirements.
13. While cases are under consideration, you can continue to study following the usual regulations on progression, with the understanding that your enrolment status may change if impacted by a sanction following an upheld allegation.
14. If an allegation is made after the award of a qualification, we may investigate, and could consider withdrawal of credit or an award. If appropriate, the relevant professional body may also need to be informed. Should you withdraw from the University prior to any final outcome, then the University reserves the right to continue to investigate any allegation, including the consideration of an appropriate sanction.

Maintaining Academic Conduct

15. We would advise all students to take particular care in respect of the following:
 - *Getting help from others/helping others:* we encourage all students to discuss and share ideas and information with your peers. However, you are always personally responsible for ensuring that you develop the structure and content of your work, submit it yourself and protect the security of your work. We would advise all students to refer to the [Learnhigher guidance](#) on acceptable conventions of group working prior to undertaking any such work.
 - *Use of readers/note takers:* if you require the services of readers or note takers, you are advised to use appropriately trained individuals. Further advice can be obtained from Disabled Student Support.
 - *Referencing:* you need to ensure that you correctly acknowledge any sources produced by other people that you have used to inform your assessed work. You will be provided with guidance on the correct referencing method by your Department. Referencing sessions are run through [The Bridge](#) to assist you in using referencing tools and there are many other [online resources](#) available.
 - *Proofreading:* you are encouraged to proofread your own work prior to submission. If you need to use the services of a third party you should take note of the [Guidelines on third-party](#)

[proofreading for undergraduate and postgraduate taught students](#). A third party proof reader is not permitted to edit your work, only to check for, identify and suggest corrections for errors.

Student Responsibilities

16. It is your responsibility to:

- adopt our culture of good academic conduct and encourage honesty in others;
- familiarise yourself with our procedures and any Faculty specific guidance on maintaining academic conduct. Ignorance of these procedures and guidance will not be considered an excuse for academic misconduct;
- seek advice from your Course Leader or Module Tutor if you are unsure that you have correctly followed the guidance on topics such as group work, referencing or third party proof reading;
- ensure that you are aware of the requirements outlined within the [Examination Conduct Policy](#) and adhere to all instructions issued by an invigilator within an examination venue;
- engage with any communications that we send you regarding a concern or an allegation, in particular to: respond in a timely manner to any written invitations to meetings or respond in writing to an allegation; attend any meeting to which you are invited to discuss concerns or allegations; seek independent advice (if required); be willing to discuss the concern or allegation; and bring evidence of how your work was prepared.

Definitions of Academic Misconduct

17. Acts of academic misconduct can take many forms. Indicative definitions are given below, although these are not exhaustive and not intended to constrain or determine the findings of an ACP or CAP. There may be other acts or behaviours that are taken to deceive which may result in you being penalised under this Regulation, or another Regulation such as the [Student Fitness to Practise Regulations](#) or the [Disciplinary Regulations for Students](#).

- Plagiarism:** using the ideas or work of another person (including experts and fellow or former students) and submitting them as though they are your own original work. By not referencing the source properly, paraphrasing it without acknowledgement, or by not mentioning it at all, the original material is hidden from the marker and you are effectively claiming ownership of work to which you have no right. Plagiarism may take the form of direct copying, reproducing or paraphrasing ideas, sentences, drawings, graphs or other graphical material from printed matter, internet sites or any other source and submitting them for assessment without appropriate acknowledgement. Plagiarism can also include copying another student's work without their knowledge, or submitting work as your own which has already been published in another language. The latter relates to direct verbatim copying of translated material, copying and re-arranging material, as well as taking the ideas and findings of the material without attribution. Any failure to adhere to the requirements for proofreading as outlined in the [Guidelines on third-party proofreading for undergraduate and postgraduate taught students](#) will be investigated as suspected plagiarism.
- Self-plagiarism:** submission of work that is the same as, or broadly similar to, assessments you have submitted previously for academic credit, without proper acknowledgement and the prior consent of the module leader for subsequent assessments. This may have been work submitted to this University or another institution for awarded credit. For clarity, this would not normally include work submitted for reassessment within the same module. It is not our intention to prevent you from developing an academic idea over the period of your study or within preparatory modules. Rather, it is to ensure that you do not receive credit twice for the same piece of work.
- Collusion:** the unauthorised collaboration between two or more students in the preparation and production of an assessment, which is then submitted by each of them as their own individual

work. Collusion does not occur where students involved in group work are encouraged to work together to produce a single piece of work as part of the assessment process. If collusion is suspected and following investigation it cannot be established who is responsible, all students involved will be deemed responsible. If you have been previously warned regarding the poor academic practice of sharing your work in any format with another student and you continue to adopt this practice with the same resulting outcomes, then you may also be investigated for collusion.

d) **Cheating:** unfair behaviour relating to an examination where you have breached a condition of conduct outlined in the [Examination Conduct Policy](#). This may include, but is not limited to, actions such as:

- continuing to write after the invigilator has announced the end of the examination;
- copying, or attempting to copy, from any other candidate during an examination or reading other candidates' examination scripts;
- communicating, or trying to communicate, with any other person other than an authorised invigilator or another member of staff during an examination;
- possession of any written, printed or electronic materials in the examination room unless expressly permitted by the rubric;
- disruptive behaviour in an examination;
- assuming the identity of someone else by sitting or attempting to sit an examination in the place of the student who should be sitting it. Impersonation can be applied to both the student and the impersonator.

e) **Contract cheating:** this may take the form of buying or commissioning (including seeking to commission) either a whole assessment or part of it, for example from internet sites, essay "banks" or "mills". It implies a clear intention to deceive the marker and is an extremely serious form of plagiarism. It may also take the form of any student who sells or offers to sell their own assessed work to other students.

f) **Fabrication or falsification of data:** submitting work containing data measured in the field, in the laboratory or other setting, any part of which is untrue, made up, falsified or fabricated in any way. This includes the presentation of data in reports, projects, theses etc. based on experimental work falsely purported to have been carried out by you or data obtained by unfair means.

g) **Breaches of confidentiality and/or unethical practice:** failure to follow confidentiality, anonymity, or research ethics protocols which can include:

- non-compliance with university ethics procedures;
- failure to gain ethics approval prior to undertaking research;
- conducting research in a way that could threaten national or international security;
- direct naming of an individual or organisation (where local protocols prohibit);
- inclusion of documentation that links to privileged information;
- provision of information that could lead to the identification of a service user or organisation, e.g. dates of birth, hospital record numbers, addresses, or reference to unusual circumstances which could lead to identification of individuals or organisations.

h) **Dishonest or unfair practice:** the use of any form of dishonest academic practice not specifically categorised above. This may include, but is not limited to:

- actual or attempted bribery: you must not offer or give any member of academic, technical or professional services staff money, gifts or any other advantage which is intended to induce or reward impropriety in the marking and/or processing of your assessments;

- gaining access to any unauthorised material relating to an assessment prior to the release date of such information.

18. We have identified three **categories** which determine the seriousness of the alleged academic misconduct:

- a) **Poor academic practice** may arise from a lack of understanding of the standard methods of, for example acknowledging the source of words, ideas and diagrams in your work, the appropriate levels of collaboration with another student, or the correct behaviour within an examination. It may also be applicable where the extent can be considered so slight that it does not justify further investigative proceedings or a sanction, e.g. errors made through carelessness. We acknowledge that students may need time to adjust and understand our expectations, requirements and values. As such in the first academic year of study at Sheffield Hallam such a concern would normally be treated as poor academic practice. We would not consider a case as poor academic practice where there is an indication that you intended to gain an unfair advantage by your actions, or if you have been warned previously about poor academic practice. In such an instance, we would reasonably expect you to have familiarised yourself with the academic conventions required of you.
- b) **Academic misconduct** is behaviour which if not detected, would have given you an unfair advantage in an assessment. We would normally deem an allegation to be classified as academic misconduct where there is evidence to demonstrate that you should have understood the required academic conventions, and that your actions or behaviour arose from an intention to deceive the marker. The primary difference between academic misconduct and severe academic misconduct is the extent of the alleged plagiarism or collusion. Indicative examples which we might designate as academic misconduct are:
- failure to correctly reference sources and thereby try to claim an idea as your own original work (i.e. plagiarism);
 - submitting for assessment an item of coursework which you have previously submitted for credit in another module, with very little change made to the assessment (i.e. self-plagiarism);
 - submitting coursework which is similar to another student's (i.e. collusion);
 - attempts to communicate with another candidate in an examination (i.e. cheating).
- c) We would normally deem an allegation to constitute **severe academic misconduct** where there is clear evidence of extensive or substantial attempts to gain an unfair advantage, or where there has been a previous proven case of academic misconduct or severe academic misconduct against you. Any allegations of contract cheating, impersonation, or fabrication or falsification of data will always initially be considered as a case of severe academic misconduct.

Guiding Principles

19. It is our responsibility to investigate the allegation against you. We will accept the explanation that is most likely to be true. This is known as the balance of probabilities. All cases will be investigated using the guiding principles of transparency, equity and fairness.
20. We may make use of web based systems to identify potential academic or severe academic misconduct. The originality reports provided when your work is text matched against other published sources may be used as evidence to support an allegation.
21. We will raise concerns that relate to your conduct as soon as possible so that you can take action to correct it. We aim to complete this process, including any final stage meeting, within 40 working days of the date we formally notify you of a concern or allegation. To help us achieve this you must meet any deadlines set for providing further information or documents, and attend any

scheduled meetings. There will occasionally be circumstances when we need to extend the timeframe for different stages. If this is the case, you will be informed of the reasons for the delay and the new timescales. You will be contacted every 15 working days to keep you informed of progress.

22. All correspondence will take place via email to your Sheffield Hallam email account, unless you have graduated or withdrawn from the University, in which case your personal email address (if provided) will be used.
23. Previous upheld allegations of academic or severe academic misconduct will not be considered a factor in whether an allegation should be upheld, but may be used in deciding upon a sanction once it has been established that the Code of Academic Conduct has been breached. Further breaches of the Code of Academic Conduct may be sanctioned more severely than a first upheld allegation. A second upheld allegation will only be described as such when a previous case has been considered, a formal outcome notified and (if applicable) remedial action has been completed, prior to the submission of another piece of work. Where this is not the case, such a concern or allegation should be considered to be a possible concurrent case, i.e. the submission of two assignments at the same time with no prior upheld allegations.
24. Where an allegation involves collusion between two or more students, each student will be invited to attend separate ACP meetings. No conclusion will be reached until all cases have been heard. In cases of collusion where you believe that other(s) have misappropriated your work, it is your responsibility to provide evidence to support your belief.
25. Information of upheld allegations will be kept on file in line with the University's document retention policy. Instances of academic or severe academic misconduct and any sanction applied, may be referred to in character references or notified to an accrediting body. If we are notified of an allegation by another academic institution, we may disclose information about your assessments conducted at Sheffield Hallam to them.

Sanctions

26. An ACP or CAP will consider all of the material presented with regards to the matter. If they decide to uphold the allegation they will also reach a decision regarding the most appropriate sanction. The following points may also be considered when determining the most appropriate sanction:
 - their assessment that you intended to gain an unfair advantage by your actions;
 - your previous experience of academic study in a UK higher education institution, or for a UK higher education award;
 - the extent of the misconduct in relation to the assessment in question, i.e. whether this relates to a small section or a whole assessment;
 - any independently evidenced mitigating circumstances you have presented;
 - any prior upheld allegations of a breach to the Code of Academic Conduct;
 - whether you have accepted responsibility and/or acknowledged awareness that you have breached the Code of Academic Conduct.
27. The ACP or CAP will issue a sanction from the below list. The Panels are also permitted to choose to issue an informal warning, where they feel that the matter constitutes poor academic practice rather than academic or severe academic misconduct. You may, in addition, be required to complete a mandatory online training module.

Sanction 1: Issue a formal warning
The warning letter will remain on your file. The original mark will stand.

Sanction 2: Refer in the assessment tasks concerned

You have lost an assessment attempt in the assessment task(s) concerned.

This means that:

- If this was your first attempt in the assessment task(s), you will be required to undertake a referred assessment in the reassessment period. The referral will normally be a new item of assessment and the result will be capped at the minimum pass mark.
- If the misconduct was established during a referred assessment, you may have failed the module. If your course permits, you may be able to retake the module in the next academic year for a capped mark.
- If you are not entitled to any additional assessment attempts, you may fail the module, which will result in you being required to leave the course.

Sanction 3: Refer in all assessment tasks in the module concerned

You have lost an assessment attempt in the assessment tasks concerned.

This means that:

- If this was your first attempt in the module assessment tasks, you will be required to undertake referred assessments in the reassessment period for both the assessment task concerned, and all other tasks in the module, including any you have already passed. You are advised to still take any assessments you have not yet attempted for the module. The referral will normally be new items of assessment and the results will be capped at the minimum pass mark.
- If the misconduct was established during a referred assessment, you will have failed the module. If your course permits, you may be able to retake the module in the next academic year for a mark capped at the minimum pass mark.
- If you are not entitled to any additional assessment attempts, you will fail the module, which will result in you being required to leave the course.

Sanction 4: Refer in all assessment tasks the module concerned, and a capped mark applied to all other modules in the level

You have lost an assessment attempt in the assessment tasks concerned.

This means that:

- If this was your first attempt in the module assessment tasks, you will be required to undertake referred assessments in the reassessment period for both the assessment task concerned, and all other tasks in the module, including any you have already passed. The referral will normally be new items of assessment and the results will be capped at the minimum pass mark. All other modules for the level of study will be capped at the minimum pass mark. You are advised to still take any assessments you have not yet attempted for the module.
- If the misconduct was established during a referred assessment, you will have

failed the module. If your course permits, you may be able to retake the module in the next academic year for a capped mark. All other modules for the level of study will be capped at the minimum pass mark.

- If you are not entitled to any additional assessment attempts, you will fail the module, which will result in you being required to leave the course.

Sanction 5: Fail in the module(s) concerned, with no reassessment, retake, replacement or substitution allowed

You have lost all further assessment attempts.

You will not be able to continue on your course. Your registration with the University will be terminated with immediate effect. You cannot receive the final award of your registered course; however you may be eligible for an intermediate award in line with the credits which you have achieved.

28. You should discuss any queries about the impact of the sanction on your assessments and/or progression with your Faculty Student Services team.

Additional Information

29. This Regulation forms part of the University's Regulatory Framework. Other institutional Policies and Procedures that relate to assessment include:

- [Standard Assessment Regulations](#)
- [Extenuating Circumstances Policy and Procedure](#)
- [Student Academic Appeals](#)
- [Student Complaints Procedure](#)
- [Student Fitness to Practise](#)
- [Student Disciplinary Regulation](#)

30. There may also be suitability criteria set by Professional, Statutory or Regulatory Bodies (PSRBs) for students undertaking professional courses of study. Further information regarding this will be provided within your Course Handbook.

Support and Guidance

31. Further support and guidance in relation to this Regulation is available from the Students' Union Advice Centre. Web page : www.hallamstudentsunion.com/advice_help/
Email : advicecentre@shu.ac.uk Telephone : 0114 225 4148

Version:	1.1		
Original Version Approved by and date:	Academic Board, June 2017 (AB/1/17/7)		
Date for Review:	June 2019		
Amendments since Approval:	Detail of Revision:	Date of Revision:	Revision Approved by:
	Clarification to the impact of sanction 5. Amendment to Annex A 8b) to rename informal warning as Notice to Improve.	September 2017	Assistant Registrar (Assessment, Awards and Regulations)

ANNEX A: Procedure for dealing with concerns regarding coursework

1. Depending on the severity of the case, you will either be invited to an Academic Concern meeting for poor academic practice cases or to an Academic Conduct Panel (ACP) for alleged academic or severe academic misconduct.

Academic Concern meeting

2. The purpose of this meeting is to discuss with you a concern which has been raised regarding your summative assessment (work which carries a mark and/or credit) to understand how this has happened and whether you could benefit from any additional academic guidance.
3. This meeting will be with your Course Leader (or nominee). Also in attendance will be a Secretary from Registry Services. The Module Leader or marker may also be present.
4. At least 5 working days in advance of the meeting, you will be provided by email with the reason for the meeting, a copy of any relevant report or other evidence, and details of who will be present. You should bring with you all notes used in producing the work under consideration.
5. You can bring someone with you to support you during the meeting. This may be a friend, a family member, a support worker or a member of staff from the Students' Union Advice Service. If the concern raised is in relation to the similarity of your work with another student, then the person accompanying you cannot be another student at Sheffield Hallam. The procedure is not a formal court process and, therefore, should not be adversarial or overly legalistic, therefore there is no need to have formal legal representation. This supporter will not normally speak on your behalf. You will need to provide the name of the person accompanying you no less than 2 working days before the meeting.
6. If you inform us prior to the meeting that you are unable to attend, a revised meeting date will be offered. If necessary, discussions can take place remotely (e.g. via Skype). You will not normally be given more than two opportunities to attend, irrespective of the reasons for non-attendance. If you do not attend without good cause or prior notification, a decision may be made on the basis of the information contained within the previously circulated documentation.
7. In the meeting the Course Leader will explain the reasons for suspecting poor academic practice and ask you if you can explain how you produced and submitted your work. The Course Leader may question you further on the explanation you have provided. The Secretary will take a written record of the meeting.
8. Following the meeting the Course Leader will write to you to confirm the outcome. There are three possible outcomes from this meeting:
 - a) No further action: the concern has not been substantiated, no further action will be taken, and there will be no record of the allegation kept on your file. The marker will assign a mark to the assessment in question.
 - b) Notice to Improve: if this is a matter of poor academic practice then you will be given a Notice to Improve which provides advice on how to address the concerns regarding your conduct, and the consequences of any future lapses. The Notice to Improve will remain on your student file for the duration of your studies. This will not be treated as a disciplinary matter in that no mention of this will be made in any reference requests. The marker will assign a mark to the assessment in question, which will reflect the academic merit of the work that is original content.
 - c) Escalation to ACP: if the matter constitutes more than poor academic practice, the Course Leader will liaise with Student Administration for a meeting of the ACP to be convened.
9. You will be provided a copy of the notes of the meeting for your reference within 5 working days of the meeting.

Academic Conduct Panel

10. The purpose of this meeting is for the Panel to consider the allegation and your response. It will determine, on the balance of probabilities, whether academic or severe academic misconduct has occurred. If an allegation is upheld, it will determine the appropriate sanction.
11. The ACP will consist of at least two members. This will be a 'Chair' and at least one member of academic staff. Neither of the Panel members will have had any involvement in the assessment(s) under investigation, or be your tutor.
12. Also in attendance will be a member of academic staff ("the Presenter") who will present the allegation and the evidence, and a Secretary from Registry Services. Neither will be a member of the Panel which makes the final decision.
13. At least 10 working days in advance of the meeting you will be provided in writing with the time and place of the meeting, the reason as to why your attendance is required, and a copy of any relevant report or other evidence. You will also be provided with the names and titles of those in attendance, including the Panel members.
14. You will be invited to submit a written response to the allegations. Your response should include any details of mitigating circumstances, and any supporting evidence which may be relevant to this allegation. You are required to provide any such documentation no less than 2 working days prior to the date of the meeting. The standard of independent documentary evidence required for mitigating circumstances is as specified in the [Extenuating Circumstances Policy and Procedure](#) (see: 'Evidence required for a request to repeat an assessment attempt'). When determining an appropriate sanction, the Panel can only take properly documented mitigating circumstances into consideration.
15. You can bring someone with you to support you during the meeting. This may be a friend, a family member, a support worker or a member of staff from the Students' Union Advice Service. If the allegation is of collusion, then the person accompanying you cannot be another student at Sheffield Hallam. The procedure is not a formal court process and, therefore, should not be adversarial or overly legalistic, therefore there is no need to have formal legal representation. This supporter will not normally speak on your behalf. You will need to provide the name of the person accompanying you no less than 2 working days before the meeting.
16. If you inform us prior to the meeting that you are unable to attend, a revised meeting date will be offered. If necessary, discussions can take place remotely (e.g. via Skype). You will not normally be given more than two opportunities to attend, irrespective of the reasons for non-attendance. If you do not attend without good cause or prior notification, the meeting will proceed and a decision will be made on the basis of the information contained within the previously circulated documentation.
17. At the meeting of the ACP, the Presenter will present the facts supporting the allegation, and you will be invited to present your response. The Panel members will have the opportunity to ask questions of you and the Presenter. If you wish, you may make a final statement in private, e.g. if this is related to mitigating circumstances which you wish to remain confidential to the Panel. You and the Presenter will be asked to leave the meeting so that the Panel can make a decision. The Secretary will remain in attendance to advise the Panel on regulatory matters.
18. You will be informed in writing of the outcome within 5 working days of the panel meeting, and will be provided a copy of the notes of the meeting.
19. The possible outcomes from this meeting are as follows:

- a) No further action: the Panel concludes that the allegation has not been substantiated, no further action will be taken, and there will be no record of the allegation kept on your file. The marker will assign a mark to the assessment in question.
- b) Notice to Improve: the Panel concludes that this is a matter of poor academic practice, a Notice to Improve will be issued regarding your conduct, and the consequences of any future lapses. The Notice to Improve will remain on your student file for the duration of your studies. This will not be treated as a disciplinary matter in that no mention of this will be made in any reference requests. The marker will assign a mark to the assessment in question, which will reflect the academic merit of the work that is original content.
- c) Application of a sanction: the Panel concludes that your behaviour constitutes academic or severe academic misconduct and will apply a sanction in line with points 26-28.

Collaborative provision

- 20. If you are enrolled on courses at collaborative partners where we award the credit or award, the partner organisation will liaise with a relevant member of academic staff at Sheffield Hallam to agree upon the procedure to be followed. Normally, the Academic Concern meeting will be coordinated by the partner organisation and the ACP by Sheffield Hallam.

ANNEX B: Procedures for dealing with concerns regarding examinations

1. This procedure applies to both formal examinations organised by the University Examination Service (UES), and any in-class tests which are run by Faculty's under examination conditions. It will also apply to any examinations which are held off-site either through a collaborative partner or re-assessment examinations held overseas.
2. Where cheating is suspected during an examination, the Invigilator will complete a report outlining the actions or behaviour they witnessed. This report will be countersigned by any other invigilators who were witness to the suspected cheating. The report, together with any accompanying evidence, will be sent to UES who will notify you in writing that you have been reported for suspected cheating. UES may also send a copy of the Invigilator's report to the Faculty responsible for the module under examination.
3. Upon receipt of a report of alleged cheating UES will complete the first part of the Student Allegation Form setting out the nature of the allegation. You will also be sent a link to this Regulation, a copy of the Invigilator's report, and a copy of any other supporting evidence.
4. You will need to complete the form providing a statement of your version of the events, plus details of any mitigating circumstances relevant to consideration of the allegation and return to UES within 5 working days from the date on the accompanying letter. The standard of independent documentary evidence required for mitigating circumstances is as specified in the [Extenuating Circumstances Policy and Procedure](#) (see: 'Evidence required for a request to repeat an assessment attempt'). Only take properly documented mitigating circumstances can be taken into consideration.
5. If you are suspected of having unauthorised materials in the examination, then UES will also ask the Faculty to complete a report to state whether the material found was relevant to the examination in question. Once UES receives the report from the Faculty they will ensure you are provided with a copy.
6. A Cheating Allegation Panel (CAP) will be held following an examination period. The CAP will include the Dean of Students (or nominee) and the Students' Union Education Officer (or nominee). It will consider the evidence presented and will apply a sanction in line with points 26-28.
7. The CAP will only consider written evidence. There will be no right of attendance in person for either yourself or a member of Faculty staff. The CAP therefore may agree to meet virtually to decide the outcome. If you fail to return the form within the 5 working day period, the CAP will proceed to consider the case and make a decision without your representations.
8. If you are found to have taken unauthorised materials into an examination, including being found to have an unauthorised electronic device on your person, you have cheated, irrespective of whether you intended to deceive or gain an advantage by using the materials or the device.
9. You will be notified of the outcome from the CAP in writing, and your Faculty will also be informed. A record of the upheld allegation and the sanction applied will be kept on your file.