****

**Faculty of Humanities Academic Malpractice Hearings – Guidance for Schools**

**1. Assessing Whether There Is Evidence That Academic Malpractice Has Taken Place**

1.1 All suspected cases of academic malpractice should be marked up by an academic member of staff or tutor to show the location and extent of relevant passages, and their possible original sources or other indicators of academic malpractice, and referred in the first instance to a designated academic member of staff (the School Officer) in the School.

1.2 The School Officer will assess whether or not the evidence suggests that academic malpractice may have been committed.

1.3 If the School Officer judges that the case does not constitute academic malpractice but rather poor academic practice, the matter will be referred back to the tutor or supervisor responsible for the piece of work in question, with appropriate advice as to how to proceed [e.g. advice may include – poor referencing = poor piece of work, mark accordingly, etc.]. In such instances, it is essential that the student is given appropriate feedback and guidance.

1.4 In assessing whether there is evidence of malpractice academic staff may find useful the Guidance for Teaching Staff document available via the link below

<http://documents.manchester.ac.uk/DocuInfo.aspx?DocID=2869>

**2. Cases to be referred to Faculty**

UG programmes Levels 1, 2 and CPD – Subsequent offence

UG programmes Level 3 and above – First offence

PGT programmes taught element – Subsequent offence

PGT dissertation element – First offence

**3. Completion of the Information for Academic Malpractice Hearings Form and Presentation of Documentation**

3.1 Please complete all sections of the ‘Information for Faculty Hearing Form’. Incomplete forms will be returned to the School which will result in delays in cases being heard.

3.2 Section A – Student Details

Please provide the most up to date contact details for the student concerned, including both a home and term time address.

3.3 Section B – Programme / Course Unit Details

The procedures governing malpractice cases require panels to apply a proportionate penalty, i.e. one that is not disproportionate to the offence. Therefore it is essential that panels are aware of the weighting of the assignment in contention and the credit rating of the course unit. Panels will take this into account when deciding a penalty.

3.4 Section C – Details of Alleged Malpractice

Full details should be provided of the nature and extent of the suspected malpractice and how it is thought to have occurred, e.g. copied from another student, copied from already published work, downloaded from the internet.

3.5 Under “Proportion of assessment subject to malpractice” please provide a figure to indicate how much of the piece of work appears to have been copied. This can be most easily obtained from the Similarity Index on the Turnitin Report.

3.6 Section D – School Details

*Referring Academic* – Normally the marker who identified the alleged malpractice

*Administrator* – The School Administrative Officer the Faculty should contact with any queries about the case and communicate the final decision to

*School Representative* – The academic member of staff who will be attending the hearing

3.7 Sections E, F and G Cover the Presentation of Documentation

The Turnitin Report alone is not sufficient evidence for the panel to consider. The major sources must also be provided. These should be clearly labelled as Sources 1 – X and cross-referenced to the student’s assignment.

Whilst the Turnitin Report gives a broad overview of the similarities an assignment might have to a number of sources, it does not give the required cross referencing to individual sources. In considering allegations of malpractice panels have to see the original source material, clearly underlined and cross referenced to the student assignment.

The cross referencing has to be completed by the referring academic as this is where the allegation originates from. A physical mark up of the documentation is required so the exact nature of the allegation can be understood (e.g. lack of quotation marks, inaccurate citations ). Panels need to be able to see at-a-glance what the problem with the assignment is - a link to an unmarked original source via Turnitin does not provide this.

All documentation must be provided in black and white, with relevant sections underlined (not highlighted). Documentation is run through a black and white photocopier and will not pick up colour highlighting.

Please refer to the checklist in Section F to ensure the correct documentation is submitted.

**4. Role of the School Representative at Faculty Malpractice Hearings**

4.1 The School representative must be a member of academic staff with knowledge of the potential effect on the student’s academic progress/final degree result of any proposed penalty. The School Representative will be expected to:

1. Ensure familiarity with case documentation before the Panel hearing.

2. Have knowledge of the programme or subject area.

3. Understand and be able to advise Panel on the effect any proposed penalty imposed would have on the student’s academic progress.

4.2 In order to help the Panel decide on the most suitable penalty, and the impact potential penalties may have on the student’s progression, School Representatives will be asked to complete a penalty proforma prior to the hearing. It is suggested that the School Representative completes the proforma in liaison with the relevant School Administrative Officer who will be able to advise accordingly.

4.3 Nb. The School Representative is not normally the person who made the allegation of academic malpractice (i.e. the person who initially established that there appeared to be evidence of alleged malpractice). If the person who made the allegation of academic malpractice is a member of the Panel they should not contribute to the penalty decision.

**5. Actions to be taken following a panel decision (School Administrative Officer)**

5.1 Decisions will normally be emailed to the School Administrative Officer within 5 working days of the hearing.

5.2 A copy of the letter should be placed on the student’s file. The School Administrative Officer shall ensure that the letter [P] is added to the student’s mark on the mark grids available to the School Examinations Board for the course unit concerned. This suffix will not be seen by the School Examinations Board unless a query arises as a result of a mark apparently out of line with others. The suffix shall not be shown on the official transcript for the student concerned.

5.3 If there is any confusion between the intentions of the Malpractice Panel as regards outcome/penalty, and the interpretation of this by the relevant School (Examination) Boards, or if it is not clear how the outcome can be realised within the School, the Faculty Administrative Officer who attended the hearing should be informed immediately.
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