

THE UNIVERSITY OF LEEDS

GRADUATE BOARD

Postgraduate Researcher (PGR) Academic Misconduct Procedure

Procedures for investigating academic misconduct in University assessments by PGRs

Related resources

- [Academic Integrity information and guidance for PGRs](#)
- [Taught Student Academic Misconduct Procedures](#)
- [Generative AI guidance for PGRs](#)
- [PGR Proofreading Policy and Guidance](#)

Contents

Introduction 2

 Declaration of Academic Integrity for PGRs (completed in GRAD) 2

 What is covered by this procedure 3

 What is not covered by this Procedure 4

Procedure for investigation and determination of cases 5

 Stage 1: Local Investigation 5

 Reporting and assembly of the case..... 5

 School meeting 7

 Review of School Level Penalties..... 9

 Stage 2: The Committee on Applications (the Committee) 10

 Stage 3: Dean of the Leeds Doctoral College Review 10

 Final stage: Office of the Independent Adjudicator for Higher Education 11

Penalties for Academic Misconduct for PGRs 12

 General Principles 12

 Factors to consider when determining a penalty..... 12

 Mitigating Circumstances 13

 Application of Penalties 13

 Range of Penalties available to the School 13

 Penalties available to the Committee on Applications..... 15

General Provisions 16

Introduction

1. The University's definition and explanation of Academic Integrity is included on the [Website](#). It is important that PGRs familiarise themselves with the University's expectations of Academic Integrity.
2. All work submitted for assessment is expected to be your own work in accordance with the University regulations on assessment and University expectations of Academic Integrity. Where you have worked with others, or where you are presenting other people's work as part of an assessment, you must fully acknowledge this as part of the declaration of academic integrity.

Declaration of Academic Integrity for PGRs (completed in GRAD)

I confirm that the submitted transfer/thesis is my own work, that I have not presented anyone else's work as my own and that full and appropriate acknowledgement has been given where reference has been made to the work of others.

I have read and understood the University's published rules on plagiarism as contained in the [Postgraduate Researcher Handbook](#) and at and also any rules specified at School or Faculty level. I understand that if I commit plagiarism I can be expelled from the University and that it is my responsibility to be aware of the University's regulations on plagiarism and their importance.

I consent to the University making available to third parties (who may be based outside the European Economic Area) any of my work in any form for standards and monitoring purposes including verifying the absence of plagiarised material. I agree that third parties may retain copies of my work for these purposes on the understanding that the third party will not disclose my identity.

3. Where you are suspected of submitting work for assessment (transfer or thesis) in breach of University regulations you may be investigated and penalised for academic misconduct. The Procedure applies to all summative assessments. Where offences are identified in formative assessments (First Formal Progress Report or Annual Progress Reviews) Schools should provide feedback to PGRs on the University expectations of Academic Integrity and provide support for good study practice
4. Academic Misconduct offences undermine the value of the University's academic awards. The penalties for academic misconduct reflect the seriousness of the offences. Within the range of penalties, PGRs may find that they receive a penalty which has an impact on their final award from the University, or they may be temporarily suspended or permanently excluded from the University community if found to have committed an academic misconduct offence.

5. The Procedure forms part of the Student Contract between students/ PGRs and the University. The Procedure provides a clear statement of academic misconduct offences and a transparent process for investigation and determination of academic misconduct cases.
6. All University academic misconduct case investigations are investigative rather than adversarial. Allegations and investigations shall be private to the PGR under investigation, members of the University who are directly concerned with the investigation and consideration of the offence, and the PGR's Head of Parent School. Findings of any offence and penalty given will form part of a student record.
7. When an offence is alleged under the Procedure, you are encouraged to seek independent advice and support from LUU Student Advice advice@luu.leeds.ac.uk.
8. The range and details of the penalties are outlined later in the document. When plagiarism is detected or suspected the University reserves the right to scrutinise and take action in respect of other work submitted by the PGR even if this has already been assessed and the marks published.

What is covered by this procedure

9. This Procedure applies to the assessment of research elements of all postgraduate research degree programmes of the University, including:
 - a) the transfer submission and transfer viva;
 - b) the thesis submission and viva examination.
10. The following are offences under this procedure

- a) **Plagiarism:** Students/PGRs shall not intentionally or otherwise present someone else's work, in whole or in part, as their own. Work means any intellectual output, and typically includes text, data, images, sound or performance.

This could also include assistance with the transfer or thesis which breaches the Postgraduate Research Proof-Reading Policy and Guidance.

- b) **Examination misconduct:** covers breaches of the University guidance governing the conduct of PGR transfer or thesis viva examination.

This could include:

- Consulting unauthorised items or third-party material during the viva
- Attendance of, or consulting with, an unauthorised third-party at the viva
- Theft or Misrepresentation of identity (which includes requesting others to undertake an assessment)

- c) **Grievous Academic Misconduct.** Student/ PGRs shall not intentionally or otherwise submit work in whole or in part that is stolen, obtained by deceit or fraud, bought from a commercial or non-commercial source, including online, requested or commissioned from a third party, or where the content has been manipulated to avoid detection.¹ This category will normally include substantial misuse of generative artificial intelligence software where this is not permitted in the PGR guidelines for use of Gen AI tools in research and assessment.

What is not covered by this Procedure

11. A separate Academic Misconduct Procedure applies to all taught elements of programmes of study at the University, including undergraduate programmes, taught postgraduate study and taught elements of research degrees.
12. Where allegations of plagiarism are identified in formative assessments² or in drafts of work as part of the routine supervisory contact during the candidature³ Schools will normally provide feedback to PGRs on the University expectations of Academic Integrity and provide training and support. Concerns must be reported to the Director of PGR Studies (or Head of School) and the [Progress Support Process](#) should be considered.
13. Re-use of earlier work in the following scenarios is acceptable and would not constitute an academic misconduct offence (e.g. 'Self-plagiarism'):
 - a. Work presented for an earlier degree/qualification where this has been declared and approved in accordance with the [regulations to Ordinance X](#);
 - b. Work presented as part of the transfer submission or Annual Progress Review which is then used in the thesis submission;
 - c. Work which is published and is then presented and declared in the thesis⁴
14. Some allegations may need to be referred to the separate Protocol for investigating and resolving allegations of misconduct in academic research. Please see the guidance on the [website](#). Advice can be sought from the Secretariat and Doctoral College Operations on a case by case basis.

¹ Offences include activities which may be commonly described as 'contract cheating' or purchase of work from 'essay mills', and subscription use of online tutors and online homework sites.

² for example the First Formal Progress Report or an Annual Progress Review

³ For example draft chapters submitted to the Supervisor for comment

⁴ In accordance with the [Guidelines on the Use of Solely or Jointly-Authored Publications within a Thesis Submission](#)

Procedure for investigation and determination of cases

15. Schools are responsible for investigation of cases at the transfer and thesis stage. Schools may issue warnings or apply penalties short of exclusion, in certain circumstances
16. The Committee on Applications will hear cases (after investigation at School level):
 - where the central accusation is denied by the PGR
 - where the offence merits a penalty outside the School's remit
 - where it is a second offence
 - where the offence is grievous

Stage 1: Local Investigation

Reporting and assembly of the case

17. It is expected that the transfer panel/examiners will raise any concerns about academic integrity and potential offences with the Director of PGR Studies for review. The Head of School, Director of PGR Studies and Graduate School should be informed immediately. Where the Head of School or Director of PGR Studies is one of the assessors/examiners or the Supervisor, the Head of Graduate School should be informed. The investigation will normally be led by the Director of PGR Studies as the nominee of the Head of School. If the Director of PGR Studies is also the Supervisor or assessor/examiner the Head of School will nominate an alternative to lead the investigation.
18. The oral examination/academic assessment of the work will be postponed pending the outcome of the academic misconduct investigation. Depending on the timing – and where a date for the transfer or final viva is imminent – it may be necessary for the School to arrange for the PGR to be informally advised that concerns have been raised so that the viva can be postponed.
19. **Allegations of plagiarism or grievous academic misconduct** will be reviewed by the School. After scrutiny at School level, and if concerns remain about the submission, the Head of School (or nominee) must arrange for the case to be investigated following this Procedure.
20. **Allegations of misconduct in a transfer or thesis viva examination** will be reviewed by the School. The School will consult with the transfer panel or examiners, and other parties present at the examination as appropriate (Independent Chair (if appointed), Supervisor (if in attendance)). After scrutiny at School level, and if concerns remain the Head of School (or nominee) must arrange for the case to be investigated following this Procedure.

21. **Allegations of breaches of the third-party proof reading policy and guidance** will be reviewed by the School. The School may request sight of any work made available by the PGR to a proof-reader, and a copy of any work marked-up by a proof-reader with evidence of the annotations and changes suggested or made by the proof-reader. After scrutiny at School level, and if concerns remain the Head of School (or nominee) must arrange for the case to be investigated following this Procedure.
22. The School will assemble the case and supporting documentation. Identifying, obtaining and marking up sources and material for consideration as part of the investigation may be undertaken by the member of staff who identified the original concerns, the Director of PGR Studies, Head of Graduate School, Academic Integrity lead for the School or other appropriate academic as nominated by the Head of School.
- For allegations of plagiarism, documentation which will normally be required includes (a) full details of the allegation; (b) a marked-up copy of the transfer report/thesis; (c) marked-up copies of sources; (d) Turnitin Similarity report; (e) Academic Integrity Declaration which accompanied the submission (GRAD).
 - For allegations relating to breaches of the PGR Proof-reading policy and guidance, documentation which will normally be required includes (a) full details of the allegation; (b) the evidence being relied on by the School, including drafts of work and copies of work marked-up or annotated by a proof-reader; (c) Academic Integrity Declaration which accompanied the submission (GRAD).
 - For allegations of misconduct in an examination, documentation which will normally be required includes (a) full details of the allegation; (b) a report from the School including the results of consultations with the Panel/Examiners and other parties; (c) the evidence being relied on by the School; (d) Academic Integrity Declaration which accompanied the submission (GRAD).
23. The School will establish if there have been any other offences in order to determine whether the allegation under investigation would constitute a first offence. A second offence relates to a second piece of work submitted for assessment during the same candidature. If appropriate, the School will determine whether any further currently or previously submitted work by the PGR is subject to an academic misconduct investigation⁵.
24. The matter must then be reported by the Director of PGR Studies to the PGR Policy and Compliance Manager in Doctoral College Operations with the information set out in 22 above.

⁵ This could include work for assessed taught modules which form part of the programme of study.

School meeting

25. Doctoral College Operations will inform the PGR of the allegations made and will give the PGR not less than 3 working days' notice in writing of:

- (a) the allegation(s);
- (b) the details of the piece(s) of work that will be discussed;
- (c) the evidence being relied on by the School, (see 22) which the PGR will retain after the meeting;
- (d) the date of the investigation meeting with the School.

26. The School meeting will:

- a) normally comprise the Head of School or nominee and at least two other members of School⁶ staff, who are independent of the PGR and their candidature⁷.
- b) be minuted by a member of the Doctoral College (or School) attending the meeting;
- c) address all the allegations faced by the PGR;
- d) allow the PGR an opportunity to explain how they created the work submitted
- e) ask the PGR whether the offence is admitted or denied
- f) determine on the evidence whether an offence has occurred on a balance of probabilities (i.e. more likely than not);
- g) and permit the PGR an opportunity to justify the work and to offer any mitigation at the time of the assessment;
- h) permit the PGR to be accompanied by a supporter
- i) may be conducted in person or online at the discretion of the School
- j) if necessary and appropriate, elect to hear separately from other interested parties for example the Supervisor(s), Director of PGR Studies or other appropriate personnel.

27. PGRs are encouraged to attend the School meeting with a supporter under the terms of paragraphs 56-59.

28. Where the PGR is absent from the meeting without good cause they will be presumed to have admitted the allegations. 'Good Cause' is at the discretion of the School but it is expected that there is independent evidence from a third party explaining

⁶ Exceptional arrangements may be approved by the Head of School (or nominee) for some CDTs (or where other exceptional arrangements have been approved) where the PGR's supervisor(s) are from outside the parent School. In such cases a Panel member from the home School of the Supervisor(s) might be appointed to the Panel. In all cases at least one member of staff from the PGR's parent School must be appointed to the Panel. The parent School will retain responsibility for the investigation of cases regardless of the home School of the PGR's supervisor(s).

⁷ Members of the supervisory team, transfer panel or internal examiner should not be appointed to the Panel

why the PGR cannot attend at the date and time of the meeting. The School will progress the case as an admitted offence.

29. Where the PGR admits the allegation(s) the School will decide whether it can give a penalty or whether it is necessary to forward the case to the Committee for a penalty to be given.
30. Where the PGR denies the allegation(s), after the PGR has withdrawn from the meeting, the School will make a preliminary determination as to whether the PGR has committed an offence of assessment misconduct. The meeting will record the reasons and its findings as the conclusion of the minutes. If the meeting considers that the PGR has committed an offence, the case must always be referred to the Committee on Applications for final determination.
31. Where a penalty is to be given by the School, the School should decide upon the penalty, inform the PGR⁸. A copy of the minutes of the meeting, including the School's findings, conclusions and determination - together with a letter giving the penalty, should be sent to the PGR no later than 10 working days after the meeting.
32. If the meeting finds that the allegation of academic misconduct has not been proven the School will within 10 working days of the meeting, write to the PGR letting them know. The case will then be at an end and no records will be retained. The work submitted for assessment will be marked in accordance with normal arrangements and without penalty.
33. Where the case is to be forwarded to the Committee on Applications (the Committee) the School shall, within 10 working days of the School meeting, send to the PGR:
 - a) a letter informing them that the case is being sent to the Committee; and
 - b) a copy of the minutes including the School's reasons, findings and conclusions.
34. Where the case is to be forwarded to the Committee the School shall, within 10 working days of the meeting, send to the Student Cases Team
 - a) a completed pro forma;
 - b) a copy of the letter inviting the PGR to the meeting with the School;
 - c) the documentation referred to in paragraph 22 (as provided to the PGR);
 - d) a copy of the letter informing the PGR the case is being sent to the Committee;
 - e) the minutes of the School meeting (as provided to the PGR) and copies of all additional correspondence;
 - f) the assessed work relevant to the allegation.
 - g) copies of the PGR handbook and any other relevant published information, including the Code of Practice for research degree candidatures.

⁸ All cases resolved at School or Faculty level will be entered into the PGR's record and notified to the Office.

35. Within 10 working days of the date of the letter notifying the PGR that the case is being sent to the Committee the PGR shall send to the Student Cases Team:
- a) confirmation as to whether the allegation is admitted or denied; and
 - b) any statement in defence of the allegation or in mitigation.
36. The PGR must ensure that no evidence or information is held over in the expectation that it can be presented later. If it is and it is judged that it could reasonably have been brought forward, it will be discounted. Where the statement is received after the deadline it will be accepted only at the discretion of the Committee

Review of School Level Penalties

37. A PGR may appeal to the Committee about a penalty imposed by the School. The Committee on Applications will review the penalty on the following grounds:
- a) The School's decision was unreasonable in the light of the evidence supplied;
 - b) The procedure for the School investigation was deficient in a way that materially prejudiced the case;
 - c) New evidence has emerged that was not available when the School Investigation Meeting was held and there is a good reason why it was not brought to the School's attention earlier.
38. The Committee on Applications will only review cases where there is information and evidence provided with the appeal to support grounds. Disagreement with the outcome is not in itself a ground for review.
39. Such appeals must be made in writing to the Student Cases Team not later than 10 working days after the Investigating School's decision has been issued.
40. The student will not appear before the Committee unless the Committee so decides and the Committee's decision will be final. The Committee will consider whether:
- the School has followed the Procedure for investigation;
 - the imposition of a penalty was reasonable;
 - the School has followed the Procedure for investigation;
 - the imposition of a penalty was reasonable;
41. The Committee will not reopen the investigation or determine a different penalty. If the School is found not to have acted reasonably it will be asked to reconsider the case.

Stage 2: The Committee on Applications (the Committee)

42. The Committee has delegated authority of the University Senate to investigate and determine academic misconduct offences on its behalf and to impose penalties.
43. The Committee may proceed as it determines, subject to the following:
- (a) the PGR must have an opportunity to attend: if the PGR does not attend without good cause (see 28) the case will be considered and determined in their absence.
 - (b) the PGR may be accompanied by a single supporter of their choice who may or may not be a member of the University (but that supporter cannot act as an advocate for the PGR and cannot appear if the PGR is not present in person) also see paragraphs 56-59.
 - (c) the PGR may put their case and the Committee may ask the PGR to answer questions.
 - (d) the papers for the case that are available to the Committee shall be available to the PGR.
 - (e) The Committee may ask questions of the Head of the School concerned, or nominee.
 - (f) the PGR and the School representative shall appear separately before the Committee.
 - (g) the Committee will not enter into any discussion of any penalty with anyone who is not a member of the Committee.
 - (h) The Committee hears cases in good faith and will accept statements and answers accordingly. However, the Committee will not ignore abuses of its trust or deceptions and reserves the right to take further or separate action where such abuses are found to have been perpetrated.
 - (i) No one on the Committee will be from the PGR's parent School.
 - (j) Meetings may take place in person or online at the discretion of the Committee. The Committee will also determine if PGRs may attend online.
44. The Committee will decide whether there is sufficient evidence to substantiate the allegations made on the balance of probabilities, i.e. that what is alleged is more likely than not to have happened. The Committee will also determine a penalty
45. A PGR will not receive a final decision on the day of the hearing. A PGR will normally receive a final decision in writing, by post or by e-mail, including the reasons for the decision within 10 working days after the Committee's meeting has ended.

Stage 3: Dean of the Leeds Doctoral College Review

Review of Committee on Applications Penalties

46. The PGR may appeal to the Dean of the Leeds Doctoral College against either the findings of the Committee or the penalty that it has imposed. Such appeals must be made in writing to the Student Cases Team not later than 10 working days after the date of issue of the Committee's decision.

47. The Dean of the Leeds Doctoral College (or nominee) will review the decision on the following grounds only:
- (a) The decision of the Committee on Applications was unreasonable in the light of the evidence supplied.
 - (b) The procedure for the Committee on Applications' meeting was deficient in a way which materially prejudiced the case.
 - (c) New evidence has emerged which was not available when the Committee met and there is a good reason why it was not brought to the Committee on Applications' attention during the meeting to discuss the case.
48. The Dean of the Leeds Doctoral College (or nominee) will only review cases where there is information and evidence provided with the appeal to support grounds. Disagreement with the outcome is not in itself a ground for review
49. The Head of Student Cases will evaluate the request for the review to ensure that it has been made in time and falls within the grounds for review set out in paragraph 47. Upon completion of this evaluation, the Head of Student Cases or nominee will acknowledge the request for review in writing. If the decision is not to proceed, an explanation will be provided and a Completion of Procedures letter will be issued.
50. The Dean of the Leeds Doctoral College (or nominee) will review the written material submitted to the Committee, a written statement of the outcome of the investigation and the request for a review.
51. The Dean of the Leeds Doctoral College (or nominee) will issue their decision as soon as possible and normally **within 20 working days** of receipt of the request for final review. The Dean of the Leeds Doctoral College may: uphold the Committee outcome; vary the Committee outcome; or refer the matter back to the Committee for reconsideration. A Completion of Procedures letter will be issued.

Final stage: Office of the Independent Adjudicator for Higher Education

52. If a PGR is dissatisfied, they may complain to the OIA. The OIA will require evidence that a PGR has exhausted the University's procedures, and that the University has **issued a Completion of Procedures letter. To make a complaint a PGR must send** the Completion of Procedures letter to the OIA within 12 months of the date of the letter, together with a completed copy of its complaint form, which the OIA will use to assess whether a case is eligible for review under its rules. Further and specific details about the OIA can be obtained from its website: www.oiahe.org.uk.

Penalties for Academic Misconduct for PGRs

General Principles

- a) The University is committed to supporting Students to develop the understanding and skills needed to maintain the academic integrity of their work. At the same time this commitment must be balanced against the need to protect the academic standards of the University and issue penalties for academic misconduct offences where these standards may be jeopardised.
- b) The University is committed to thorough investigation of all allegations and careful discussion with Students about the circumstances of an offence before penalties are applied.
- c) The University will not tolerate cheating or deception of any kind in work submitted for assessment at any level of study. The University also notes that since April 2022 it is now a criminal offence in England to provide or arrange for another person to provide assessment services for financial gain to students enrolled at a University in England. Students who commission third party services relating to assessment may therefore be engaging in criminal activity. The University will not tolerate this activity among its members at any level of study.
- d) Penalties will be severe for repeat offences.
- e) Penalties will also be issued for Students who deny offences that are proven.
- f) If the School finds that the allegation of academic misconduct has not been proven the School the work submitted for assessment will be marked in accordance with normal arrangements and without penalty.

Factors to consider when determining a penalty

Where plagiarism has occurred, the submission will count as one of the attempts permitted under [Ordinance X \(and the associated Regulations\)](#) and individual Programme of Study entry) [/Code of Practice for Research Degree Candidatures](#), both of which only permit resubmission of the transfer or thesis on one occasion. No more attempts will be permitted than the Ordinance and Regulations/Code of Practice for Research Degree Candidatures provide for a PGR who has not committed academic misconduct. Factors to consider when determining a penalty and/or whether to refer a case to the Committee on Applications include:

- The severity of the offence⁹
- The PGR's explanation and response to the allegation
- Any mitigation
- Assessment regulations (numbers of submissions permitted)
- The context of the offence in relation to the student's development of academic integrity skills
- First or second offence and any previous Warning and Penalty applied

⁹ Serious offences would also include those covered by 10 (c)

Mitigating Circumstances

The application of penalties by the School or the Committee will be made in the awareness of any mitigating circumstances that the PGR chooses to disclose in advance of the penalty being set. Mitigation may lessen the penalty but it does not excuse an offence. In addition, it is expected that the PGR would have submitted mitigation in accordance with the Suspensions and Extensions policy and guidance. Evidence of mitigating circumstances is expected in all cases.

Application of Penalties

Penalties may be applied at School Level where:

- it is a first offence; and
- the offence was admitted; and
- the view of the School is that it does not represent a serious offence

The Committee on Applications will hear cases and consider penalties (after investigation by the School) where:

- the central accusation is denied by the PGR; or
- the offence merits a penalty outside the School's remit; or
- it is a second offence; or
- the offence is grievous¹⁰

Range of Penalties available to the School

In all cases the PGR will be required to repeat the PGR Academic Integrity Essentials and Advanced Tutorials.

Penalties applicable to 'plagiarism' would also be applicable to confirmed cases of a breach of the PGR Proof-reading policy and guidance.

For plagiarism in a first submission: Redact and examine

- Proceed to viva as a first attempt at assessment.
- The transfer panel/examiners will be instructed to discount any part of the transfer report or thesis submission which has been found to be plagiarised and assess only the remaining work.
- The assessment will follow normal processes and proceed to viva, with the recommended outcome on the redacted work being an academic judgement for the

¹⁰ See definition under 10 (c). For PGR this would be taken to include submitting work for assessment that has been wholly or substantially created with the use of generative artificial intelligence software where this is not permitted by the PGR guidelines on use of Generative AI. These offences may also include submitting work for assessment that have been partially created with the use of generative artificial intelligence software where this is not permitted by the PGR guidelines on the use of Generative AI.

Examiners/Transfer Panel in accordance with assessment regulations. All recommendations will be open to the Examiners/Transfer Panel, who may recommend referral/deferral for resubmission in accordance with the number of attempts permitted under assessment regulations;

- For a thesis submission, and in the event of a recommendation for award, the redacted sections will need to be removed or rewritten as part of any corrections to the thesis, for final approval by the internal examiner. Should possible plagiarism be identified in the corrected thesis it will be investigated in accordance with the Procedure. If an offence is confirmed the case will be referred to the Committee on Applications, in accordance with normal procedure as a second offence.

For plagiarism in a first submission: Revise and resubmit

- The PGR may be required to revise and resubmit their transfer report or thesis as a final attempt at assessment (thereby forgoing the option of a referral/deferral for resubmission).
- Normally a period equivalent to that of the normal referral/deferral period will be permitted.
- Following resubmission, a viva must be held.
- The examiners/transfer panel may not recommend referral/deferral for resubmission and a final outcome must be recommended following the viva.
- Any concerns with plagiarism in the resubmitted work will first be investigated in accordance with the procedure and, if confirmed, the case will be referred to the Committee on Applications as a second offence.

For plagiarism in a resubmission: Redact and examine

- The assessment process will proceed as a final attempt.
- The examiners/transfer panel will be instructed to discount any part of the thesis submission or transfer report which has been found to be plagiarised and assess only the remaining work.
- The panel may not recommend referral/deferral for resubmission and a final outcome on the resubmitted work must be recommended.
- A second viva may be held if the panel deem this necessary, in accordance with assessment regulations.
- For a thesis resubmission, and in the event of a recommendation for award, the redacted sections will need to be removed or rewritten as part of any corrections to the thesis, for final approval by the internal examiner. Should possible plagiarism be identified in the corrected thesis it will be investigated in accordance with the Procedure. If an offence is confirmed the case will be referred to the Committee on Applications, in accordance with normal procedure as a second offence.

For examination misconduct: Written warning

Options will depend on whether the original viva was completed or paused. As set out in the [Policy and guidance for online research degree transfer and final examination streaming policy](#) if concerns arise at an early stage and cannot be resolved, the examiners should postpone the viva pending investigation. If concerns arise close to the end of the viva, or seem to be resolved, the examiners might choose to complete the viva and come to a provisional recommendation pending any post-viva investigation.

- Option 1: Where the viva was completed, and it is felt by the School that misconduct occurred but was not significant, a written warning should be given, and the recommendation of the panel or the examiners should then be submitted to the Doctoral College and will follow normal process; OR
- Option 2: Where the viva was paused, and it is felt by the School that misconduct occurred but was not significant a written warning should be given, and arrangements should be made to reschedule the viva; OR
- Option 3: Where it is felt by the School that significant misconduct has occurred, the case should be referred to the Committee on Applications.

For misuse of Generative AI: Written warning

Where PGRs are found to have use generative artificial intelligence software as permitted by the PGR guidelines on the use of Generative AI but it has not been correctly acknowledged or referenced, Schools may issue a written warning. The acknowledgements page must be corrected and arrangements made for the examination to proceed following normal process.

Cases must be referred to the Committee on Applications where it is found that a PGR has submitted work for assessment that has been wholly or substantially created with the use of generative artificial intelligence software where this is not permitted by the PGR guidelines on use of Generative AI.

Penalties available to the Committee on Applications

The normal penalty for a second or serious offence of plagiarism would be permanent exclusion from the University. Only in the event of substantial mitigation would a lesser penalty be considered.

For plagiarism or misuse of Generative AI: Penalties short of exclusion

Any penalty short of exclusion (including those listed in the section above), with reference to the number of attempts/time limits for submission as prescribed in Ordinance X and the Code of Practice for Research Degree Candidatures. This includes:

- Redact and Examine;
- Revised and Resubmit;
- Repeat the PGR Academic Integrity Essentials and Advanced Tutorials.

For examination misconduct: Re-take the viva

Any penalty listed in the section above. The PGR may be required to re-take the viva in a format as designated by the University, which may require attendance for an in-person viva

Permanent exclusion from the University

The PGR will be permanently excluded from the University with no award. The findings may be conveyed to any relevant professional body, grant-awarding bodies, the editors of any journals which have published work by the person against whom the allegation has been upheld and to any individual who has received references from the University. In the event of an allegation(s) being proved after a PGR has graduated, any degree or award that is held by the PGR may be revoked.

General Provisions

Ownership of the Procedure

53. The administration of the Procedure is undertaken by Doctoral College Operations. The Procedure is owned and approved by Graduate Board.

Results, transcripts and awards

54. A PGR cannot be issued with a transcript or have a degree conferred or an award presented while an allegation(s) remains unresolved. The PGR's name will not appear on pass lists while an allegation is under consideration.

Retaining papers

55. PGRs are responsible for retaining copies of their case papers, correspondence and other records.

Supporter

56. PGRs are expected to respond to the allegations and submit all correspondence personally and they cannot delegate these responsibilities to a third party. This does not affect the PGR's right to a supporter. All substantive correspondence will be addressed directly to the PGR personally, but may be copied by a School or the Student Cases Team to a third party or to the supporter on request.
57. A supporter can be anyone of the PGR's choosing (e.g. family member, friend, fellow PGR/student (although they cannot have any involvement in the allegation)), but the supporter can neither act as an advocate for the PGR nor attend if the PGR is not present.
58. It is the responsibility of the PGR to invite the supporter to attend any meeting and notify the supporter of the time and place of the meeting. The PGR is responsible for providing any documentation they wish their supporter to receive.
59. The PGR is responsible for the conduct of their supporter and the University will not pay any costs of a supporter, including legal or other professional fees that a PGR may have chosen to incur. PGRs are encouraged to access independent support from Leeds University Union (LUU) Help and Support. Students may be asked to nominate a new supporter if their supporter does not conduct themselves in accordance with the University expectations of dignity and mutual respect.

Procedural irregularity

60. If the PGR believes that a procedural irregularity has occurred at any point in the Procedure, this must be drawn to the attention of the Student Cases Team immediately and by way of an email headed 'Procedural Irregularity'. Notice of such irregularities embedded in the response or other correspondence or papers will not be accepted. In response the Student Cases Team will either offer an explanation or appropriate action will be taken to ensure that the Procedure is followed. If the PGR remains dissatisfied with the explanation or the action taken the University Student

Complaints Procedure may be invoked either by the PGR or, if the PGR so declines, by the Student Cases Team in order to secure a resolution of the disputed explanation or action. Pending this resolution, the case will be halted.

61. If a procedural irregularity is raised at or immediately prior to the hearing of the Committee on Applications it will be set aside by the Committee if it is judged that it could have been raised in time for appropriate corrective action to be taken.

Revocation of degrees

62. In the event of an allegation(s) being proved after a PGR has graduated, any degree or award of the University that is held by the PGR may be revoked by the Committee.

Correspondence

63. All correspondence in relation to an allegation will be to the PGR's University email account. It is a PGR's responsibility to ensure access to their University email account throughout a period of investigation and regularly check their emails.

Anonymous allegations and 'whistleblowing'

64. The University may review anonymous concerns or reports of academic misconduct, but the reporting party should be aware that any potential action will be limited if we are not able to substantiate the concerns that have been raised. The School may request evidence from the reporting party to support any claims made. Any action taken to investigate or substantiate anonymous reports is at the discretion of the School.

Your data

65. The University holds and retains information about an investigation in accordance with the University Student Privacy Notice. For more information see www.leeds.ac.uk/privacynotice. Personal information about third parties should not be submitted to the University as part of a PGR/student case at any stage unless necessary. If third party information is included it must be accompanied by consent for the University to process the data.

Dignity and Mutual Respect

66. The Procedure will be conducted in accordance with the University Policy on Dignity and Mutual Respect. All parties are expected to comply. The University reserves the right to take disciplinary action under the General University Disciplinary Regulations in the event that there is considered to be unacceptable behaviour (e.g. abusive language towards staff processing the investigation in any form, email, telephone or person).

Where to get help and support

67. The Student Cases Team can be contacted at E-mail: studentcases@leeds.ac.uk.
68. Contact details for the LUU Help and Support team (which is located on the ground floor of the Union building) are set out below. Their website can be found at

www.leedsuniversityunion.org.uk/helpandadvice E-mail: advice@luu.leeds.ac.uk Tel: 0113 380 1290

69. General information about the Procedure can be obtained from the Secretariat at: http://www.leeds.ac.uk/secretariat/student_cases.html . The Student Cases Team will be pleased to give procedural advice but will not comment on or offer advice upon any part of the case itself.

70. Doctoral College Progression and Examinations Team can be contacted by Email at rp_examinations@adm.leeds.ac.uk

Document Version History

Graduate Board

August 2024

Version 2.0

Maintained by: Doctoral College Operations