



Hull York Medical School

Code of Practice on Academic Misconduct

Approval Process:	
Committee	Outcome/Date of approval
HYMS Board of Studies	11 th June 2019
HYMS Joint Senate Committee (HJSC)	25 th July 2019 with Chair's Action taken on 6 th August 2019
To be implemented from:	6 th August 2019
Next due for review:	Prior to 2020-21
Responsibility to update:	Head of Quality and Standards

Publication:	
Location	Date
Website	2 nd September 2019

To obtain this document in an alternative format or if you have any queries regarding any aspect of this Code, please contact: governance@hyms.ac.uk

Definition of terms

The following terms will apply throughout this Code of Practice:

Academic Cases Committee:	The Committee with responsibility for the consideration of cases of academic misconduct. Receives escalated concerns from the Case Management Group and, where necessary, can request initiation of a Case Management Group Investigation.
Case Management Group:	An experienced core group of senior staff responsible for considering all student cases brought to its attention by Phase Leads/Programme Directors and/or Hull York Medical School Student Support Office. This group will determine what action and/or escalation is most appropriate for individual students based on all of the information that is available at that time. If required this group will initiate an investigation into any concerns about a student's health, conduct, progress, fitness to study or fitness to practise medicine.
Day:	Means a calendar day.
Investigating Officer:	This can be any member of Hull York Medical School staff, including academic, senior administrator, member of Student Fitness to Practise Committee or honorary appointments within the NHS. The investigating officer should not be the student's current tutor, mentor or supervisor. All investigating officers follow the Hull York Medical School Guidance Notes for Investigating Officers. Details of this guidance can be found at: https://www.hyms.ac.uk/staff-and-students/regulations-policies-and-codes-of-practice
Programme:	Means any academic activity, and/or clinical placement or experience, undertaken by a student for the purpose of achieving the award of credits, a certificate, diploma or degree, or for the purpose of achieving progression within training and meeting requirements for registration as a doctor with the General Medical Council, as prescribed in the relevant regulations.
Supporter:	Means a friend, fellow student, Students' Union representative ¹ or member of Hull York Medical School staff who may assist the student with their case. Legal representation is not permitted.

1.1. _____

¹Reference to Students' Union throughout this Code means Hull University Union (HUU), York University Students' Union (YUSU) or the Graduate Students' Association (GSA) – all of which are available as a source of support and advice dependent on the student's programme of registration.

Abbreviations

CMG	Case Management Group
HYMS	Hull York Medical School
HJSC	HYMS Joint Senate Committee
NHS	National Health Service
ROA	Record of Achievement
UKFPO	United Kingdom Foundation Programme Office

Please note:

Advice on plagiarism and the proper use of sources is provided by Hull York Medical School and the Universities through several mechanisms including direct instruction where appropriate, in course handbooks and via internet resources.

Students will be considered liable for the use of plagiarised material whether or not they intended to behave dishonestly.

Students are required to successfully complete the online Academic Integrity Tutorial as early into their studies as possible and this should be before the first summative assessment.

Contents

1. Introduction	5
2. Scope of the Code.....	5
3. Forms of Academic Misconduct.....	5
4. Categories of Academic Misconduct	7
5. General Principles.....	8
6. Determination of Academic Misconduct Allegations	10
7. Case Management Group Referral to Investigating Officer.....	11
8. Procedure for investigation Academic Misconduct Allegations	11
9. Outcomes and Penalties following investigation	11
10. Academic Misconduct Panels.....	11
11. Outcomes and Penalties following Academic Misconduct Panel Hearings	13
12. Fitness to Practise and other disciplinary action	14
13. Privacy, Confidentiality and Data Protection	15
14. Appeals.....	15
15. Monitoring	15

Appendix One: Guide to categorising the severity of misconduct allegations

1. Introduction

- 1.1. Academic integrity is fundamental to the reputation of individual scholars, students and to academic institutions. Hull York Medical School is committed both to developing high standards of academic practice among its students and to safeguarding the standards of academic awards by detecting and acting upon cases of academic misconduct.

2. Scope of the Code

- 2.1. This Code of Practice sets out the expectations of Hull York Medical School students and Hull York Medical School itself, and the processes by which academic integrity is upheld. It deals with the way in which Hull York Medical School identifies how students meet the requirements of their programme in terms of academic integrity, and how plagiarism and other forms of academic misconduct are identified and investigated. These programme requirements are further specified in the regulations, Codes of Practice and guidance for each individual programme.

- 2.2. There are additional expectations of personal integrity in terms of professional behaviour of those studying for a medical degree, and in terms of collecting analysing and reporting research data for those studying for a research degree. These and the corresponding investigatory processes are laid out in the:

- Hull York Medical School Code of Practice on Student Fitness to Practise (<https://www.hyms.ac.uk/assets/docs/codes-of-practice/code-of-practice-on-fitness-to-practise-medicine.pdf>)
- Hull York Medical School Code of Practice on Student Research Misconduct (<https://www.hyms.ac.uk/assets/docs/codes-of-practice/code-of-practice-on-student-research-misconduct.pdf>)

3. Forms of Academic Misconduct

- 3.1. This section explains what constitutes academic misconduct. There is a separate Hull York Medical School Code of Practice on Student Research Misconduct (<https://www.hyms.ac.uk/assets/docs/codes-of-practice/code-of-practice-on-student-research-misconduct.pdf>).

- 3.2. In relation to assessed work, students at Hull York Medical School must not commit any offence as outlined below at any stage of their course:

Assessment Offences

- 3.2.1. **Plagiarism:** using the ideas or work of another person (including experts and fellow or former students) and submitting them as though they are original work.

By not referencing the source properly, paraphrasing it without acknowledging it, or by not mentioning it at all, the true origin of the material is hidden from the marker.

Plagiarism may take the form of direct copying, reproducing or paraphrasing ideas, sentences, drawings, graphs, 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 which has already been published in another language. The latter relates to copying of translated material, copying and re-arranging material, as well as taking ideas and findings of the material without attribution.

3.2.2. Any unattributed use of material is plagiarism:

3.2.2.1. whether from articles, books, computer programs, data, essays, papers, reports, presentations, or any other material originated by another person;

3.2.2.2. whether obtained from written, printed or electronic sources, including via the internet or any other computer-based or networked system;

3.2.2.3. whether the medium of reproduction is literary (essays and reports), graphical (designs, diagrams, graphics), electronic (computer programs) or mathematical (proofs).

3.2.3. **Self-Plagiarism:** submission of work that is the same as, or broadly similar to, assessments previously awarded academic credit, without proper acknowledgement. This may include work submitted and awarded credit at this University or another institution.

3.2.4. **Collusion between students taking the same assessment:** is the process whereby two or more students work together – without official approval – and share ideas, solutions or material in work which is then submitted by each of them individually as their own work.

3.2.5. **(a) Breach and/or (b) Cheating:** either possessing or using materials prohibited in the examination venue and/or breaching any of rules of closed assessments. This may include but is not limited to actions such as:

3.2.5.1. Continuing to write after the invigilator has announced the end of the examination;

3.2.5.2. Copying, or attempting to copy, from any other candidate during the examination;

3.2.5.3. Communication of any kind with any other person other than an authorised invigilator or other authorised member of staff during an examination;

3.2.5.4. Possession of, or access to any unauthorised written, printed or electronic materials in the examination room;

3.2.5.5. Involvement in impersonation of another during an examination or other assessment event.

3.2.6. **Commission and incorporation/Contract Cheating:** to seek to gain advantage by incorporating material in work submitted for assessment that has been improved by, or commissioned, purchased or obtained from, a third party e.g. family members, friends, essay mills or other students.

3.2.7. **Fabrication or falsification of data:** submitting work for assessment or publication 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 or data obtained by unfair means. This also includes using false statements or presenting false evidence in support of a request to withdraw from an examination, obtain an assessment extension, or explain any form of absence.

Disciplinary Offences

- 3.2.8. **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, b) to appear as another student in an assessment(s).
- 3.2.9. **Deception:** presenting fabricated or misleading evidence to gain advantage in assessment arrangements (e.g. exceptional circumstances affecting assessment) or in making research proposals.
- 3.2.10. **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 use of information which was acquired confidentially, failure to acknowledge work conducted in collaboration, fraud or misuse of research funds or equipment.
- 3.2.11. **Academic misconduct involving staff members:** any offence, as defined above, involving staff members who are also students.
- 3.2.12. **Academic misconduct alleged subsequent to the conferment of an award:** any offence, as defined above, alleged or discovered after the award of a degree.

4. Categories of Academic Misconduct

- 4.1. Hull York Medical School recognise three categories which determine the seriousness of Academic Misconduct allegations.

Poor Academic Practice

- 4.2. This may arise from a lack of understanding of the standard methods of acknowledging the source of words, ideas or diagrams in a piece of work or the appropriate levels of collaboration or the correct behaviour within an exam. It may also be applicable where the extent does not justify further investigative proceedings or a penalty, for example, for errors made through carelessness.

Academic Misconduct

- 4.3. This is behaviour which, if not detected, would give a student an unfair advantage in an assessment. The main difference between academic misconduct and severe academic misconduct is the extent of the alleged misconduct. Indicative examples of what constitute academic misconduct are:
 - 4.3.1. Failure to correctly reference sources and claim an idea as original work (i.e. plagiarism);
 - 4.3.2. Submitting for assessment an item which has been previously submitted for credit in another module with little change made to the assessment (i.e. self-plagiarism);
 - 4.3.3. Submitting coursework in collaboration with another student (i.e.

collusion);

- 4.3.4. Attempts to communicate with another candidate during an examination (i.e. cheating).

Severe Academic Misconduct

- 4.4. 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 a student. Any proven allegations of commission and incorporation/contract cheating; impersonation; fabrication or falsification of data will always initially be considered as a case of severe academic misconduct.

5. General Principles

Standard of Proof

- 5.1. It is sufficient to establish cases of academic misconduct 'on the balance of probabilities', rather than 'beyond all reasonable doubt'. This means that the Academic Misconduct Panels need only determine that it is likely that misconduct occurred, rather than require indisputable evidence that misconduct has occurred.

Student Responsibilities

- 5.2. Learning in an academic environment requires mutual trust and responsibility from everyone involved. Underlying this is acceptance of a common set of values, often referred to as academic integrity. The elements of academic integrity include:

- 5.2.1. **Honesty:** Students must be open and honest about the work they are being assessed on. This includes following the accepted referencing conventions to acknowledge when a piece of work uses or quotes the work of others.
- 5.2.2. **Responsibility:** Students have responsibilities to meet the requirements of their course and to engage fully with the learning opportunities provided, including meeting specified deadlines and attendance requirements.
- 5.2.3. **Fairness:** Students must not use unfair means to gain an advantage. Hull York Medical School will ensure its academic processes and procedures are fair, and enable all students to be considered fairly.
- 5.2.4. **Respect:** Effective learning is that conducted in an environment of mutual respect between students and staff. Students should know that their efforts, even if imperfect, will be respected by staff. Staff should know that students will respect them and learn from honest, constructive criticism.
- 5.2.5. **Trust:** These elements of academic integrity combine to ensure there is general trust in the educational provision by Hull York Medical School and the standards demonstrated by students. It is important that degrees awarded by Hull York Medical School are trusted internally and externally as representing a mark of a student's academic and professional achievement.

- 5.3. Students shall be considered responsible for the academic integrity of all work they submit for assessment, including group assessments. If insufficiently acknowledged material is discovered in open assessments by examiners, the

question of whether the student has behaved (or intended to behave) dishonestly or unethically must not be a factor in the decision to initiate the Academic Misconduct Procedures. Expressions of a lack of intent are not a valid justification for misconduct. The principle that students are responsible for their actions also applies to the reporting of any illicit material brought into closed examinations by students.

Proofreading

- 5.4. The aim of assessment is to establish the level of understanding, skills and performance of the individual student enrolled on the programme rather than measuring the extent of the student's social and/or familial networks' level of understanding, skills and performance.
- 5.5. Proofreading should only be done in accordance with the Guidance on Proofreading, which can be found here: <https://www.hyms.ac.uk/staff-and-students/regulations-policies-and-codes-of-practice>
- 5.6. Students are responsible for making the Guidance on Proofreading available, and the rules against commissioning 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/or agreed by the Board of Studies, are not considered to be inappropriate support.

Failure to detect previous Academic Misconduct

- 5.7. Where academic misconduct is alleged or suspected, a student may not use as a defence the failure of any member of academic staff to detect academic misconduct at an earlier point in time in their studies.
- 5.8. When an allegation is raised about a given piece of work, any previous assessed work which has been returned to the student with marks and feedback may not be returned to or referred for investigation. Penalties will not be applied to previously assessed work. The Academic Cases Committee may, however, review previous work outside of the Academic Misconduct Panel procedures to determine if any pedagogic or formative feedback can be given to the student and considered by the Programme Director based on patterns of behaviour across multiple pieces of work.

Second Offences and concurrent investigations

- 5.9. A second offence means an offence discovered after procedures for the first offence have been completed. Two offences of the same type as described above in 3.2 need to be committed for the penalties for second offences to apply.

Self-plagiarism and re-use of previously assessed work

- 5.10. Self-plagiarism is deemed to be an academic offence where reuse of assessed material is specifically prohibited within and/or between assessment components, modules or programmes. Hull York Medical School designs programmes that aim to set assessment tasks that encourage and require new material. Students should be advised that the re-use of academic work in new assessment components is, at best, poor practice and that re-used work should be acknowledged. Where re-use of work is allowed, guidance on referencing this work is provided in Programme and Module Handbooks.

Misconduct in formative work

- 5.11. Formative assessment is primarily designed to give feedback on progress and inform development but does not contribute to a module mark or progression decision on non-modular programmes. 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.

Misconduct in re-assessment tasks

- 5.12. Where a student commits academic misconduct and subsequently fails a progression hurdle, a resit opportunity for the module or modules, or assessment component in non-modular programmes 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. If a student is found to have committed misconduct in a reassessment and thereby fails the progression hurdle, no further reassessment opportunity should be given, except with the explicit permission of the Academic Cases Committee.

Misconduct by students repeating a year of study

- 5.13. Repeating students are welcome to use their previously submitted work for their own learning and reference, in the same way they would use third-party information, but they may not re-submit work for assessment. Such self-plagiarism will be regarded with the same severity as plagiarism in general in submitted work.

6. Determination of Academic Misconduct Allegations

- 6.1. Where markers, examiners, invigilators or other individuals suspect academic misconduct to have occurred, they should identify the form of misconduct suspected (see section 3 above) and categorise the severity of the allegation (see section 4 above).
- 6.2. In cases where poor academic practice is identified within summatively-assessed work, that does not warrant further investigation, the examination process should be completed and an indication that poor academic practice was identified should be clearly made within the feedback to the student, with reference to appropriate sources of guidance. At this stage, no penalty may be imposed.
- 6.3. In cases where the allegation is categorised as either academic misconduct or severe academic misconduct, a concern should be submitted to the CMG within 28 days of the assessment event along with the work, the assignment brief and any relevant supporting evidence. If the work is anonymous, CMG should remove anonymity protection at this point.
- 6.4. The role of CMG in relation to all allegations of academic misconduct received is to ensure consistent determination and application of Regulations, Codes and Policies under which each case should be resolved across all Hull York Medical School programmes.
- 6.5. The CMG will determine whether to refer a case for investigation and dismiss any allegation that is considered to be frivolous, wholly untrue or, where poor academic practice is determined, incorrectly categorised.
- 6.6. In all cases of academic misconduct or severe academic misconduct, the CMG will refer the case to an Investigating Officer to assemble evidence to confirm the factual accuracy of the allegation. The investigating officer should not be a current tutor, mentor, or supervisor of the student under investigation. The

Investigating Officer's report will be submitted to the CMG for its consideration.

7. Case Management Group Referral to Investigating Officer

7.1. Where a case is referred to an Investigating Officer, the CMG will notify the student of:

7.1.1. The details of the allegations against them;

7.1.2. The identity of the Investigating Officer;

7.1.3. Any suspension or limitation placed upon the continuation of studies and/or clinical attachment during the period of the investigation.

8. Procedure for investigation Academic Misconduct Allegations

8.1. The Investigating Officer may interview the student, and other relevant individuals as appropriate, and may require that these individuals submit written comments. At such an interview, the student may bring a supporter who may be a friend, fellow student, Students' Union, Graduate Students' Association (GSA) representative or member of Hull York Medical School staff. The Investigating Officer should use an independent note-taker to prepare a written record of the meeting.

8.2. Normally, within seven days of receipt of the written report from the Investigating Officer, the CMG will consider the report as detailed in section 9 below.

9. Outcomes and Penalties following investigation

9.1. If the Investigating Officer determines that the allegation is untrue or poor academic practice, the CMG can dismiss the allegation. CMG can provide advice to the Programme Director or relevant colleagues on categorisation of allegations and strategies for improving poor academic practice.

9.2. If the recommendation of the Investigating Officer is that there is evidence of academic misconduct, or severe academic misconduct, then the CMG will escalate the matter to the Academic Cases Committee. CMG will also determine whether it is appropriate to make a Student Fitness to Practise disclosure.

9.3. In cases where the alleged academic misconduct or severe academic misconduct relates to a piece of research carried out by a postgraduate student, the Chair of the Postgraduate Programme Board and the Chair of the Case Management Group will determine whether the allegation is to be investigated under this Code or under the Hull York Medical School Code of Practice on Student Research Misconduct.

10. Academic Misconduct Panels

10.1. Following a formal investigation, if the Investigating Officer finds evidence of academic misconduct or severe academic misconduct, the student may be requested to appear before a panel established by the Academic Cases

Committee.

- 10.2. Students may also request that their case be considered by an Academic Misconduct Panel.
- 10.3. The panel should comprise no fewer than three members and no more than five members of Hull York Medical School or University staff, including a member of the Academic Cases Committee as Chair. No Panel member shall be a current tutor, mentor, or supervisor of the student under consideration. The Chair is responsible for ensuring all panel members have been fully briefed on current regulations and guidance relevant to the student's programme of studies and the allegation being considered.
- 10.4. Before the Hearing, the Chair of the Panel will:
 - 10.4.1. Set a date for the formal hearing of the case by a Panel. This must be at least 21 days later to allow the student at least 15 days to prepare a case and submit any supporting information for that case in advance of the Hearing for circulation to members of the Panel.
 - 10.4.2. Appoint a secretary for the Hearing who will be responsible for taking formal minutes and ensuring their safe keeping.
 - 10.4.3. Inform the student of any change to conditions in relation to suspension or limitation placed at the beginning of the formal investigation.
 - 10.4.4. Ensure that all documents circulated to members of the panel relating to the case are also circulated to the student.
 - 10.4.5. Ensure that any Hull York Medical School staff who may have relevant information to the case, and any other person(s) who may be able to provide expert advice on specific aspects of the case, are invited to attend.
- 10.5. To conduct the meeting, the Chair of the Panel will:
 - 10.5.1. Bear responsibility to ensure that the proceedings are fair; this includes proceedings where the student is not in attendance.
 - 10.5.2. Conduct introductions of panel members and all other persons present, and explain the functions and powers of the panel
 - 10.5.3. Confirm that all documents circulated to members of the panel have also been circulated to the student.
 - 10.5.4. Invite the student, the investigating officer, and all witnesses to join the meeting. The student may be accompanied by a supporter who may speak at the discretion of the Chair. The supporter may be a friend, fellow student, Students' Union, Graduate Students' Association (GSA) representative or member of Hull York Medical School staff
 - 10.5.5. Ensure that if the student is not in attendance, the Panel satisfies itself that all reasonable attempts have been made to inform the student of the panel meeting, that the student has been given adequate opportunity to attend and that, as far as can reasonably be ascertained, the student has declined to attend. Once the Panel has been satisfied on these points, the

meeting may proceed in the student's absence.

10.5.6. Point out that if at any time during the panel meeting, the prospect of mutual agreement on the occurrence of misconduct between the panel and the student emerges and is appropriate, the consent of the student will be sought to end the hearing and deliver an outcome.

10.5.7. Invite the investigating officer, and any other staff required to attend, to make statements, allowing members of the panel to ask questions after each statement. The chair will allow reciprocal questioning by the various parties.

10.5.8. Invite the student, and if applicable, the student's supporter, to make a statement in their own words, and allow members of the panel to ask questions of the student.

10.5.9. Once satisfied that all parties have had a full opportunity to make statements and ask questions, invite all but the members of the panel to withdraw but remain in waiting.

10.5.10. Chair to lead discussion of the case, if necessary seeking clarification by recall of all parties.

10.5.11. Advise all parties when they can disperse.

10.5.12. Confirm the recommendation of the panel, along with any findings of fact, to the student in writing as soon as reasonably practicable and normally within seven days of the decision being reached.

10.5.13. Prepare a formal report to Hull York Medical School Board of Studies of the outcome. This may also require disclosure /referral to the Hull York Medical School Student Fitness to Practise Committee.

10.5.14. The report may also be passed to other relevant Hull York Medical School committees for consideration and possible action in the appropriate area of responsibility.

11. Outcomes and Penalties following Academic Misconduct Panel Hearings

11.1. Direct action

A panel established by the Academic Cases Committee has the authority to agree or enforce the sanctions detailed below:-

11.1.1. No further action

11.1.2. **Issue a formal warning:** Warning letter will remain on the student record. The original mark awarded will stand.

11.2. Reports/recommendations

A panel established by the Academic Cases Committee may make reports and/or recommendations to the relevant Board of Examiners or equivalent.

11.2.1. **Mark of 0 awarded in the assessment task at first attempt with the right to reassessment:** If the Academic Misconduct was for a first attempt at the assessment; the student will have the right to undertake a second attempt in the reassessment period. The result of this reassessment attempt for this element will be capped at the pass mark. The student will also be issued with a Warning letter.

11.2.2. **Mark of 0 in the module:** If the Academic Misconduct was for a first attempt at the module, the student will be required to undertake reassessments in all assessment components of the module. The result of these reassessment attempts will be capped at the pass mark. The student will also be issued with a Warning letter.

11.2.3. **Mark of 0 in the module with no right to reassessment:** This will result in a failed module which may affect the student's ability to progress on their programme of study. The student will also be issued with a Warning letter.

11.2.4. **Termination of Study:** This should only occur where there is evidence of sustained attempts at Academic Misconduct, or Severe Academic Misconduct.

11.2.5. **Fitness to Practise Referral:** See Section 12

11.3. Board of Examiners Recommendations

11.3.1. Any work, or part of a piece of work, submitted by a student at Hull York Medical School which is found to have been plagiarised or otherwise resulted from academic misconduct will be subject to a score of zero. It is for the relevant Board of Examiners or equivalent to determine, based on advice from the panel, whether any section of the piece of work unaffected by the identified academic misconduct meets requirements for approving progression through a course or award of a qualification and if so what grade of achievement may be awarded.

11.3.2. If the piece of work is found not to meet requirements for progression or award, the Board of Examiners or equivalent must recommend to Board of Studies whether the student has available the possibility of repeating the affected assessment and any conditions for doing so. If no repeat is to be permitted the Board of Examiners or equivalent must recommend to the Board of Studies that the student is unable to meet the requirements of the course and that their course of studies should be terminated. In such cases the Board of Examiners and Board of Studies will have the right to request all of same information that is available and accessible to the Case Management Group to ensure the consistency and transparency of decision-making.

12. Fitness to Practise and other disciplinary action

12.1. 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 Medical School's Fitness to Practise or Disciplinary procedures should also be consulted and invoked where necessary.

- 12.2. For Hull York Medical School students registered for the MBBS or MSc in Physician's Associate Studies degrees, a panel established by the Academic Cases Committee may make a disclosure to the Student Fitness to Practise Committee in respect of the implications of the identified academic misconduct for the student's professional behaviour.
- 12.3. For Hull York Medical School students who are current registered health professionals, or who are studying outside Hull York Medical School for a regulated health profession, a panel established by the Academic Cases Committee may make a disclosure to the student's training providers, employers or professional regulatory organisations.

13. Privacy, Confidentiality and Data Protection

- 13.1. Any case will be treated with the highest level of confidentiality that can be maintained. Hull York Medical School, the Universities of Hull and York and any other relevant body will only disclose confidential information to members of staff who are directly involved in the administration of the case and as necessary to allow an open and fair investigation and for the outcome of the investigation to be reported appropriately. This is in order both to protect the privacy of the student and to protect members of staff from unsubstantiated public allegations.
- 13.2. Depending on the nature of the case, the information gathered may include third party data, opinion and information which was provided in confidence. This information needs to be handled consistently and fairly and in accordance with common data protection principles making it clear to all parties that the sharing of this information is agreed for the purposes of reaching an informed and fair decision.
- 13.3. Hull York Medical School may on occasion be required to share information related to a student's case with third parties, for example, on Transfer of Information paperwork and UKFPO references.

14. Appeals

- 14.1. When the Hull York Medical School Board of Studies has confirmed the outcome of an Academic Misconduct Panel Hearing the student concerned may appeal against any decision and/or penalty in accordance with the terms of the Hull York Medical School Code of Practice on Academic and Fitness to Practise Appeals: <http://www.hyms.ac.uk/about-us/regulations-policies-and-codes-of-practice>

15. Monitoring

- 15.1. The Academic Cases Committee shall provide an annual report of the following information to the Board of Studies relating to the previous academic session, taking into account the programme, mode, Year, gender, disability, ethnic origin and any outstanding issues:

- 15.1.1. The number of allegations rejected
- 15.1.2. The number of Academic Misconduct Panels held
- 15.1.3. The number, form and category of allegations upheld
- 15.1.4. The number of penalties issued.

15.2. A summary report of cases will be provided to HYMS Joint Senate Committee.

Appendix A

Guide to categorising the severity of misconduct allegations

Poor Academic Practice	Academic Misconduct	Severe Academic Misconduct
<p>This may arise from a lack of understanding of the standard methods of acknowledging the source of words, ideas or diagrams in a piece of work or the appropriate levels of collaboration or the correct behaviour within an exam. It may also be applicable where the extent does not justify further investigative proceedings or a penalty, for example, for errors made through carelessness.</p> <p>Eg. With regard to plagiarism Where there is the occasional referencing error (i.e. where the same minor error is not frequently repeated or a pattern of mistakes cannot be seen), the marker notes this in the feedback and is specific about the error and can decide whether to reduce the mark or not using their academic judgement and policy/grade descriptors.</p>	<p>This is behaviour which, if not detected, would give a student an unfair advantage in an assessment. The main difference between academic misconduct and severe academic misconduct is the extent of the alleged misconduct.</p> <p>Eg, With regard to Plagiarism Failure to correctly reference sources and claim an idea as original work.</p> <p>Where there is evidence of more wide spread or systematic misunderstanding, or of badly executed paraphrasing or acknowledgement of sources, or of another misconduct offence then this should be brought to the attention of the CMG together with evidence of the errors/misrepresentation that is causing concern</p> <p>Eg. With regard to Self-plagiarism Submitting for assessment an item which has been previously submitted for credit in another module with little change made to the assessment</p>	<p>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 a student. Any proven allegations of commission and incorporation/contract cheating; impersonation; fabrication or falsification of data will always initially be considered as a case of severe academic misconduct.</p>

	<p>Eg. With regard to collusion Submitting coursework in collaboration with another student</p> <p>Eg. With regard to Breach of examination conditions Attempts to communicate with another candidate during an examination</p>	
--	---	--