



CONTENTS

AM 1	PRINCIPLES.....	3
AM 2	DEFINITION AND FORMS OF ACADEMIC MALPRACTICE.....	4
AM 2.1	DEFINITION.....	4
AM 2.2	PLAGIARISM.....	4
AM 2.3	FALSE AUTHORSHIP.....	4
AM 2.4	COLLUSION.....	5
AM 2.5	FABRICATION OR FALSIFICATION OF RESULTS.....	5
AM 2.6	CHEATING IN EXAMINATIONS AND CLASS TESTS.....	5
AM 2.7	MISREPRESENTATIONS OF HOURS IN PRACTICE AND COMPETENCIES.....	5
AM 2.8	PROOFREADING.....	5
AM 3	ROLES AND RESPONSIBILITIES.....	6
AM 3.1	DEPARTMENT ROLES AND RESPONSIBILITIES FOR TAUGHT PROVISION.....	6
AM 3.2	STUDENTS' UNION.....	6

98.24 Tm(R)-134.4 (01/3.3...~~PREPARED BY THE UNIVERSITY OF GUELPH (2013-14) REVISED BY THE UNIVERSITY OF GUELPH (2014-15) REVISED BY THE UNIVERSITY OF GUELPH (2015-16) REVISED BY THE UNIVERSITY OF GUELPH (2016-17) REVISED BY THE UNIVERSITY OF GUELPH (2017-18) REVISED BY THE UNIVERSITY OF GUELPH (2018-19) REVISED BY THE UNIVERSITY OF GUELPH (2019-20) REVISED BY THE UNIVERSITY OF GUELPH (2020-21) REVISED BY THE UNIVERSITY OF GUELPH (2021-22) REVISED BY THE UNIVERSITY OF GUELPH (2022-23) REVISED BY THE UNIVERSITY OF GUELPH (2023-24)~~

AM 6.3	THE PRESENTATION OF MATERIAL AND SUBMISSION OF THE THESIS/DISSERTATION.	15
AM 6.4	ACADEMIC MALPRACTICE IN THE SUBMISSION FOR CONFIRMATION OF PHD	16
AM 6.4	ACADEMIC MALPRACTICE IN THE THESIS OR DISSERTATION SUBMITTED FOR EXAMINATION	16
AM 7	RETROSPECTIVE DETECTION	17
AM 8	APPEALS AGAINST PENALTIES FOR ACADEMIC MALPRACTICE	18
	APPENDIX 1: STANDING ACADEMIC COMMITTEE - GENERAL PROCEDURES FOR THE CONSIDERATION OF ACADEMIC MALPRACTICE CASES	19

MARP 2023-24
ACADEMIC INTEGRITY REGULATIONS

AM 1 PRINCIPLES

AM 1.1 The University values a culture of honesty and mutual trust in its academic endeavours

AM 2 DEFINITION AND FORMS OF ACADEMIC MALPRACTICE

AM 2.1 DEFINITION

AM 2.1.1 It is an academic offence (termed academic malpractice) for a student to commit any act

AM 3.3.3 Where the procedures require, as detailed in these regulations, Academic Quality, Standards and Conduct shall be responsible for undertaking *prima facie* investigations and for forwarding cases to Standing Academic Committee as appropriate. These initial investigations will normally be undertaken by the Academic Conduct and Appeals Investigator or their nominee.

AM 3.4 STANDING ACADEMIC COMMITTEE

AM 3.4.1 The Standing Academic Committee shall investigate all cases of alleged academic malpractice referred to it by the responsible member of staff and determine if an academic offence has been committed. (A) (b) (c) (d) (e) (f) (g) (h) (i) (j) (k) (l) (m) (n) (o) (p) (q) (r) (s) (t) (u) (v) (w) (x) (y) (z) (A) (b) (c) (d) (e) (f) (g) (h) (i) (j) (k) (l) (m) (n) (o) (p) (q) (r) (s) (t) (u) (v) (w) (x) (y) (z)

- (c) The Academic Integrity Officer shall check in the LUSI Student Record System for any previous

AM 4.2.6 If the student does not accept the decision of the Academic Integrity Officer, they shall have the right to petition the Standing Academic Committee to rehear the case. At the Standing Academic Committee Hearing they shall have the right to be heard. The Academic Integrity Officer shall attend the Standing Academic Committee Hearing to present the department's case.

AM 4.3 STANDING ACADEMIC COMMITTEE STAGE

AM 4.3.1 The Standing Academic Committee will be presented to by the academic department, and the student and/or their representation will be invited to make a statement. Following consideration of the evidence, the Committee shall have the authority to impose one of the following penalties:

- (a) decide that no further action is required;
- (b) decide that the matter should be considered as a matter of poor academic practice and dealt with as described in AM 4.2.1;
- (c) to permit the student to repeat the work;
- (d) to permit the student to repeat the work, subject to receiving only the minimum pass mark appropriate to the piece of work;
- (e) to award zero or equivalent grade for the aspect of the work in question;
- (f) to award zero or equivalent grade for the whole coursework or dissertation;
- (g) to award zero or equivalent grade for the unit or course module;
- (h) to award zero or equivalent grade (as under AM 4.3.1 (g)) and, where the inclusion makes no difference to the class of award, to recommend that one class lower than the one determined by the arithmetic be awarded;
- (i) to exclude the student permanently from the University, where the offence is detected before the final assessment is completed;
- (j) not to award the degree, where the offence is detected after the final assessment has been completed.

AM 4.3.2 Where a mark of zero has been awarded as per AM 4.3.1, the exam board shall ordinarily exceptionally condone this mark provided that this does not lead to the student having more than the permitted number of condoned credits under the relevant assessment regulations. Where such condonation would lead to the maximum number of condoned credits being exceeded, the mark shall remain uncondoned, and the board of examiners shall deal with the student accordingly.

- (b) require the student to resit the examination in which they cheated and if deemed appropriate other examinations or units of assessment;
- (c) require the student to resit the examination in which they cheated and if deemed appropriate other examinations or units of assessment, subject to receiving only the minimum pass mark appropriate to the piece of work;
- (d) award a mark of 0 or equivalent grade for the examination;
- (e) award a mark of 0 or equivalent grade for the entire unit of assessment;
- (f) direct that the student be awarded a classification lower than the one derived from the mark profile (after any 0 mark or equivalent grade awarded under (c) or (d) has been included);
- (g) direct that the student be awarded no more than a Pass degree;
- (h) in addition to one of (b) to (f) temporarily exclude the student from the University;
- (i) permanently exclude the student from the University without a degree;
- (j) exceptionally not impose a specific penalty, but refer the case to the appropriate board of examiners with a full statement of findings together with suggestions for appropriate action (see AM 5.2).

AM 5.1.9 Where a mark of zero has been awarded as per AM 5.1.8, the exam board shall ordinarily exceptionally condone this mark provided that this does not lead to the student having more than the permitted number of condoned credits under the relevant assessment regulations. Where such condonation would lead to the maximum number of condoned credits being exceeded, the mark shall remain uncondoned, and the board of examiners shall deal with the student accordingly.

AM 5.2 PROCEDURES WHERE THE STANDING ACADEMIC COMMITTEE REFERS A CASE OF ACADEMIC MALPRACTICE IN AN EXAMINATION TO A BOARD OF EXAMINERS

AM 5.2.1 Any student found by the Standing Academic Committee to be guilty of an academic offence as defined under these regulations and whose case is referred to a board of examiners, shall have the right to submit to the board a written plea in mitigation but they shall not have the right to appear or to be represented by another before the board. Boards of examiners have absolute discretion to take into account, in making their decisions, such evidence as they may consider relevant to a student's academic performance and to decide whether to call for further oral or written evidence. They may also take into account, but shall not be bound by, the suggestions of the Standing Academic Committee. In considering the suggestions of the Standing Academic Committee, the decisions of boards of examiners shall be subject to ratification by the Committee of the Senate.

AM 5.3

- (e) direct that the student be awarded a classification lower than one derived from the mark profile (after any 0 mark or equivalent grade awarded under (c) or (d) has been included);
- (f) direct that the student be awarded no more than a Pass degree;
- (g) in addition to one of (b) to (f), temporarily exclude the student from the University;
- (h) permanently exclude the student from the University without a degree;
- (i) exceptionally not impose a specific penalty, but refer the case to the appropriate board of examiners with a full statement of findings together with suggestions for appropriate action (see AM 5.3.10).

AM

AM 6.1.2

AM 6.4 ACADEMIC MALPRACTICE IN THE SUBMISSION FOR CONFIRMATION OF PHD

AM 6.4.1 In the event that members of the Confirmation of PhD Panel find evidence of academic malpractice in the student's submission to the Panel, the Panel shall not make any decision but shall instead submit a written report on their findings to the Head of Academic Quality, Standards and Conduct and copied to the PGR Director and supervisor(s). Such a report shall set out the evidence that academic malpractice has taken place and may include a recommendation for re-submission to the Panel.

AM 6.4.2 The report from the Confirmation of PhD Panel shall be referred to the Standing Academic Committee by the Head of Academic Quality, Standards and Conduct. The Committee shall set up a Hearing to test the recommendation of the Panel members and the evidence of academic malpractice presented by them at which the student shall have the right to be heard accompanied by an individual unconnected to the case, if desired. The chair of the Confirmation of PhD Panel shall attend the Standing Academic Committee Hearing to present the department's case.

AM 6.4.3 The Committee shall, having considered all the evidence, have the authority to impose one of the following penalties:

- (a) that the accusation of academic malpractice is unfounded, the student's Confirmation of PhD is void, and the student shall be considered as for the first time by a new panel, at a date to be determined;
- (b) that the accusation is upheld, such that the student is deemed to have failed the requirements for Confirmation of PhD with one opportunity for revision and a second submission to the same panel, at a date to be determined;
- (c) that the accusation is upheld, such that the student is deemed to have failed the requirements for Confirmation of PhD and the student shall be permanently excluded from the University.

AM 6.3.5 A second or subsequent breach in work submitted to a Confirmation of PhD Panel will result in a decision by the Panel to refer the matter to the Standing Academic Committee with a recommended outcome.

AM 6.4 ACADEMIC MALPRACTICE IN THE THESIS OR DISSERTATION SUBMITTED FOR EXAMINATION

AM 6.4.1 This regulation shall be issued to all examiners for the awards set out above.

AM 6.4.2 In the event that the examiners find evidence of academic malpractice **during the preliminary as-6.4 (in.7 (y)2.6 (-)8 (0 T17 (y)SI)-13 (al21 (l)-8 nt-28.71 Tf-0.000 T8.826 0 Td(.)T)002 Tc**

AM 6.4.3 In the event that the ewT1 1 Tf0.004 Tc -0.0y

- AM 7.6 Failure by the student to produce the required material shall normally be treated by the Standing Academic Committee as leading to the assumption that academic malpractice had taken place.
- AM 7.7 The University has the power to revoke an award under the procedures defined in its Charter and Ordinances: [Provisions to deprive persons of degrees, diplomas, certificates and other academic distinctions](#).

AM 8 APPEALS AGAINST PENALTIES FOR ACADEMIC MALPRACTICE

- AM 8.1 A student who has been judged to have committed academic malpractice by Standing Academic Committee or other appropriate University body shall have the right to appeal against the judgement under the University's [Academic Appeals Regulations](#). A student's right to have their appeal heard by an Academic Appeal Panel is conditional upon them fulfilling the criteria for a *prima facie* case for appeal.

**APPENDIX 1: STANDING ACADEMIC COMMITTEE - GENERAL PROCEDURES
FOR THE**

8. Where a student wishes to challenge the findings of a Summary Hearing, they have the right to appeal this decision to a full Hearing of the Standing Academic Committee. This would take the form of a rehearing, and the member who heard the Summary Hearing would not sit. This would be a new first hearing, and so a further right of appeal would exist from decisions of the Standing Academic Committee as detailed in AM 8 of the regulations.
9. For a full Hearing of the Standing Academic Committee, t

15. The Committee will find the charge proven if all or all but one of its members agree, on the evidence before it, that the offence was committed.