

Zhejiang University-University of Edinburgh Institute Academic Misconduct Investigation Procedures

Purpose of Procedure

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

The Universities take any cases of suspected academic misconduct very seriously, and aim to ensure that all suspected cases are investigated thoroughly and dealt with appropriately.

Overview

The ZJE Institute Academic Misconduct Investigation Procedures are governed by the University of Edinburgh Student Code of Conduct.

Scope

The policy applies to all students and staff.

Contact Officer ZJE Academic Administrator

Document control

Date Approved	Date Starts:	Amendments:	Next review:
15 March 2017	September 2016	N/A	June 2017

Related policies, procedures, guidelines & regulations

ZJE Institute Academic Misconduct Report Form

University of Edinburgh Student Code of Conduct

(<http://www.docs.sasg.ed.ac.uk/AcademicServices/Discipline/StudentCodeofConduct.pdf>)

University of Edinburgh Student Code of Conduct Guidance

(<http://www.docs.sasg.ed.ac.uk/AcademicServices/Discipline/StudentCodeofConduct-Guidance.pdf>)

ZJE Regulations, Policies and Guidance referred to throughout this document are located at:
<http://zjue.intl.zju.edu.cn/en/policies-regulations>

If you require this document in an alternative format please email ZJE Institute Academic Administrator

Zhejiang University-University of Edinburgh Institute

Academic Misconduct Investigation Procedures

1. Reporting of suspected academic misconduct

1.1 Any member of staff who suspects that an academic misconduct offence has been committed in a piece of work submitted for assessment must inform the relevant Course Organiser, who will complete an Academic Misconduct Report Form. This should be submitted in the first instance to the ZJE Academic Misconduct Officer (ZAMO). The report must be accompanied by all relevant documentation. The work under investigation should be assessed as normal and awarded a face value mark prior to referral to the ZAMO. The face value mark is the mark that the work is believed to merit based solely on the content as presented, assuming no academic misconduct has taken place.

1.2 Sections 2-4 apply for the reporting of suspected academic misconduct by taught students (and research postgraduates studying taught components). Section 9 covers reporting of suspected academic misconduct by postgraduate research students.

1.3 The Academic Misconduct Report Form is available at:

<http://zjue.intl.zju.edu.cn/en/policies-regulations>

2. Investigation by the ZJE Academic Misconduct Officer (ZAMO)

2.1 The ZAMO is responsible for deciding whether there is a case to answer. The ZAMO may consult with the Deanery of Biomedical Sciences School Academic Misconduct Officer if they wish. If the ZAMO decides that there are grounds for investigation, they will:

- (a) Ascertain whether this is a first or repeat offence for the student under investigation; and
- (b) Determine whether they are able to deal with the case or whether it needs to be referred to a College Academic Misconduct Officer (College of Medicine and Veterinary Medicine, University of Edinburgh).

2.2 A ZAMO will be able to deal with the case if it meets **all of** the following criteria:

- it is a first offence; **and**
- the student is a first or second year undergraduate, or a postgraduate taught student in their first semester of study at a UK university, or a visiting student; **and**
- the ZAMO is satisfied that the case has come about through genuine lack of understanding (poor scholarship) rather than any deliberate intention to cheat; **and**
- the ZAMO believes that the case can be appropriately dealt with without recourse to a mark penalty.

2.3 No mark penalty or alteration can be applied by the ZAMO for cases outlined above in 2.2.

2.4 If the ZAMO is dealing with the case, the ZAMO will arrange a meeting with the student, together with the relevant Course Organiser and/or marker. The student may be accompanied at that meeting by a member of the University community, e.g. their Academic Advisor. If the student's Academic Advisor is the ZAMO, the ZJE Associate Dean Teaching may accompany the student. If the student is unavoidably away from the ZJE Institute for a significant period (e.g. the summer vacation), contact will be made by letter or email or Skype.

Zhejiang University-University of Edinburgh Institute Academic Misconduct Investigation Procedures

- 2.5 All cases which fail to meet the criteria set out at 2.2 above will be referred by the ZAMO to be dealt with by the College Academic Misconduct Officer (CAMO). Contact should be made via the Programme Administrator at the University Of Edinburgh Biomedical Teaching Organisation. Prior to referring the case, the ZAMO may wish to check whether any other work submitted by the student is similarly affected. The ZAMO must complete the relevant section of the ZJE Academic Misconduct Report Form and submit this and all relevant documentation to the College Academic Misconduct Administrator together with all relevant case documentation. The ZAMO should also alert the Convener of the relevant Board of Examiners at the earliest opportunity.

3. Investigation by the College Academic Misconduct Officer (CAMO), College of Medicine and Veterinary Medicine, University of Edinburgh

3.1 The CAMO is responsible for investigating all cases of suspected academic misconduct referred to them by the ZAMO and for deciding on the penalty (if any) to be applied.

3.2 Where the student fully and willingly acknowledges the offence and does not wish to have an opportunity to offer further comment, the CAMO may decide that there is no need for a formal academic misconduct interview. In such cases the CAMO may write to the student, to inform them of the penalty decision, and ask the ZAMO to advise the Convener of the Board of Examiners of the decision on the penalty where appropriate. The ZAMO should also meet with the student concerned in order to provide advice on academic best practice. This route is not appropriate where the matter under investigation is not a first offence.

3.3 Where the CAMO decides that a formal academic misconduct interview is appropriate, the interview will be conducted by a panel chaired by the CAMO, and including at least one representative School Academic Misconduct Officer from that College (not from the same School as the student) and any other relevant member of staff. The student may be accompanied by a member of the University community, e.g. their Academic Advisor. It is preferable for the student to be interviewed in person, however if they are unable to attend, the CAMO may offer an interview that is conducted virtually (e.g. via Skype/video conference). Alternatively the student may choose to be represented by a member of the University community, or the CAMO may offer the student the opportunity to make a written submission.

3.4 The Academic Advisor will be copied into the summons for interview letter but not sent the documentation.

3.5 The purpose of the interview will be to enable the interview panel to obtain further relevant information on the alleged incident and to allow the student the opportunity to put forward their response to the allegation. The panel will take this information into account when coming to a decision on any penalty to be applied.

3.6 Following the interview, the CAMO will draft a confidential report of the meeting. The student will be given the opportunity to comment on the accuracy of the draft report. The report will not normally be copied more widely (e.g. to the Academic Advisor) unless this is specifically requested by the student.

3.7 The CAMO, in consultation with the rest of the panel, will decide on the penalty, if any, to be applied (see 4.1 below). The CAMO will be responsible for the final decision. The student will be informed of the decision as soon as possible following the interview, and not normally at the time of the interview.

Zhejiang University-University of Edinburgh Institute

Academic Misconduct Investigation Procedures

3.8 Once the report is approved by the CAMO and the penalty is agreed, the CAMO will submit a written report to the ZAMO, for forwarding to the Convener of the relevant Board of Examiners. This will include details of any penalty which the Board must be required to apply in light of the academic misconduct (see section 5 below). The ZAMO will ensure that the Programme Administrator is informed of the outcome, for record keeping purposes.

4 Penalties available to the College Academic Misconduct Officer (CAMO)

4.1 In deciding a penalty, the CAMO will take into account the severity, intent and benefit to the student of the academic misconduct, and the penalty applied in similar cases. Any penalty will apply **only** to the specific work under investigation which in itself may represent only a part of the overall course assessment. A record will be kept of any penalties applied by the CAMO, but this will not appear on a student's transcript, and individual student penalty outcomes will not be passed on to external enquirers. Where there are special circumstances in relation to the affected assessment, these will not be dealt with by the CAMO or the panel; the CAMO will advise the student to request consideration of special circumstances by the appropriate Special Circumstances Committee.

4.2 The following options are available to the CAMO:

- (a) There is found to be no case to answer and no penalty is therefore to be applied;
- (b) In the case of a first offence which is a result of poor scholarly practice rather than any deliberate attempt to cheat, the CAMO may decide that a mark penalty will not be appropriate;
- (c) A penalty deducting 10 or 30 marks from the face value mark. The penalty applied should be proportional to the offence and/or the benefit to the student. Where a mark awarded has not been in terms of a percentage value, the face value mark **must** be presented as a percentage (e.g. 15/20 must be presented also as 75% such that, for example, a -30 penalty would reduce the mark to 45%).
- (d) The mark is to be reduced to zero;
- (e) In cases where students have colluded in producing a piece of work the mark awarded can be shared (not necessarily equally) between the students involved if this is considered appropriate by the CAMO;
- (f) In serious cases or where the student has committed a number of previous academic misconduct offences, the CAMO may decide to refer the case for further consideration under the University of Edinburgh Code of Student Conduct. In such cases, the CAMO investigation is equivalent to that of the Conduct Investigator for other student conduct cases, and no further investigation is required under the University of Edinburgh Code of Student Conduct. Instead the CAMO can refer the case directly to a University of Edinburgh Discipline Officer, or to the Student Discipline Committee, as appropriate. If referring to the University of Edinburgh Student Discipline Committee, the CAMO should contact the Secretary to the Student Discipline Committee to discuss the matter. Details of the University disciplinary procedures and of the penalties available to Student Discipline Officers and the Student Discipline Committee under the Code of Student Conduct are available at:

<http://www.ed.ac.uk/academic-services/staff/discipline/code-discipline>

5. Application of penalties by the Board of Examiners

Zhejiang University-University of Edinburgh Institute Academic Misconduct Investigation Procedures

5.1 The Convener of the relevant Board of Examiners will be notified in writing of the penalty which must be applied (see 3.8 above). The Board of Examiners is required to apply the penalty imposed by the College Academic Misconduct Officer (CAMO). It must not apply any additional penalty for the offence. In the event of a significant delay in arranging a meeting of the Board of Examiners, Convener's Action may be taken so that the penalty can be applied in good time. The Convener must write to the student to inform them of the mark agreed by the Board, incorporating any penalty imposed, in a timely manner. The Convener will also inform the student's Academic Advisor of any penalty applied.

5.2 In exceptional circumstances, if the Board of Examiners disagrees with the CAMO's decision on the penalty to be applied, the Convener may request that the decision be referred for review by the CAMOs of the University's other two Colleges jointly.

6. Request for a review of a College Academic Misconduct Officer (CAMO) decision

6.1 If the Board of Examiners wishes to request a review of the CAMO decision (see 5.2 above), the Convener will submit a request in writing as soon as possible to the relevant contact in University of Edinburgh Academic Services (currently Ailsa Taylor ailsa.taylor@ed.ac.uk). A brief report outlining the reasons for the Board's request for review must be submitted. The Convener should write to the student to inform them that their case has been referred for review, explaining that the final course result has therefore not yet been agreed.

6.2 University of Edinburgh Academic Services will arrange for the case to be reviewed by the CAMOs of the other two Colleges. The original investigating CAMO will be required to submit a copy of all of the case documentation which was considered by the CAMO along with copies of the report and decision letter. Each CAMO will be sent the documentation and will be asked to come to a decision separately before meeting to discuss the case; this meeting may be held by correspondence. The CAMOs may decide to invite the student to a further academic misconduct interview, for example, if further information is required, or if there are concerns about the operation of the previous interview. If a further interview is not deemed necessary, the CAMOs will come to a joint decision there and then.

6.3 University of Edinburgh Academic Services will notify the Convener of the Board of Examiners and the student in writing of the joint CAMO decision. The original investigating CAMO will be informed of the outcome of the review. The Board will be required to adhere to that decision and cannot request a further review. The Convener of the Board of Examiners should write to the student to inform them of the final course result agreed by the Board.

7. Right of appeal

7.1 CAMO decisions resulting in mark penalties are ratified by Boards of Examiners. Students have a right to appeal decisions made by Boards of Examiners, including decisions affected by the outcome of an academic misconduct investigation. Students wishing to submit such an appeal should refer to the University of Edinburgh Student Appeal Regulations and related guidance at:

<http://www.ed.ac.uk/academic-services/students/appeals>

This includes information on the specific grounds under which students may submit an academic appeal and details of the University's procedures for consideration of appeals.

Zhejiang University-University of Edinburgh Institute Academic Misconduct Investigation Procedures

7.2 Where a penalty has been applied by a University of Edinburgh Student Discipline Officer or by the University of Edinburgh Student Discipline Committee, arrangements for right of appeal are set out in the University of Edinburgh Code of Student Conduct.

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

8. Suspected academic misconduct by students who have since graduated

8.1 The University takes seriously allegations of academic misconduct occurring in any assessed coursework, including work submitted by students who have since graduated. The relevant University of Edinburgh College Academic Misconduct Officer (CAMO) will investigate cases of suspected academic misconduct in any piece of work assessed for any University award where the nature and extent of the offence may have an impact upon the award or class of award. As part of their investigation the CAMO will write to the graduate notifying them of the allegations and inviting their response.

8.2 Following investigation the following options are open to the CAMO:

- (a) If the allegation is found not to be substantiated, the CAMO will report the case and the outcome of the investigation to the Convener of the relevant Board of Examiners and to the University Secretary. No further action will be taken;
- (b) If it is concluded that account of the academic misconduct was taken at the time of the original award, the CAMO will report the case and the outcome of the investigation to the Convener of the Board of Examiners and to the University of Edinburgh Secretary and no further action will be taken;
- (c) If the allegation is found to be proven, to be substantial and to merit further action, the case will be referred for further consideration under the University of Edinburgh Code of Student Conduct. In such cases, the CAMO's investigation is equivalent to that of the University of Edinburgh Conduct Investigator for other student conduct cases, and no further investigation is required under the University of Edinburgh Code of Student Conduct. Instead the CAMO can refer the case directly to a University of Edinburgh Student Discipline Officer, or to the University of Edinburgh Student Discipline Committee, as appropriate. If referring to the Student Discipline Committee, the CAMO should contact the Secretary to the Student Discipline Committee to discuss the matter.

8.3 Graduates have the same right of appeal as that which exists for matriculated students (see section 7 above).

March 2017