

Research Degree Regulations Schedule B

**Procedures relating to academic
malpractice by postgraduate researchers**

01 October 2021 – 30 September 2022



**Edge Hill
University**

Research Degree Regulations Schedule B

Contents

- 1. Preamble 3
- 2. Definition of Malpractice..... 3
- 3. Procedure for dealing with academic malpractice in research degrees 2
- 4. Establishing a case..... 2
- 5. Malpractice panel of inquiry 3
- 6. Authorised penalties and guidance on sanctions..... 5
- Endmatter..... 7

1. Preamble

- 1.1. This document is an appendix to the *Research Degree Regulations* concerned with the investigation of academic malpractice in relation to research carried out for the award of MRes, PhD, professional doctorate or PhD by publication.
- 1.2. The Schedule is informed by the University's procedure relating to academic malpractice for taught degrees but differs in key areas to reflect the distinct nature of a research degree. This Schedule is also informed by the University's *Code of Practice for Research* and *Code of Practice for the Investigation of Research Misconduct Conduct*, which stipulates the behaviours and approaches required to conduct excellent research with integrity.

2. Definition of Malpractice

- 2.1. Malpractice may be broadly defined as an attempt to gain an advantage by the use of unfair and/or unacceptable methods. It is, however, important to note that the definitions and descriptions in this Schedule are indicative, not exhaustive, and the University reserves the right, where appropriate, to deem that malpractice has occurred in instances that are not explicitly defined in this document.

2.2. Types of malpractice:

- **fabrication**: this includes the creation of false data or other aspects of research, including documentation and participant consent
- **falsification**: this includes the inappropriate manipulation and/or selection of data, imagery and/or consents
- **plagiarism**: this includes the general misappropriation or use of others' ideas, intellectual property or work (written or otherwise), without acknowledgement or permission. It may take the form of:
 - verbatim copying or insertion of another person's work (published or unpublished and including material freely available in electronic form) without appropriate acknowledgement
 - the close paraphrasing of another person's work by simply changing a few words or altering the order of presentation, without appropriate acknowledgement
 - unacknowledged quotation of phrases from another person's work

- the deliberate and detailed presentation of another person's concept as one's own
- **misrepresentation, including:**
 - misrepresentation of data, for example suppression of relevant findings and/or data, or knowingly, recklessly or by gross negligence, presenting a flawed interpretation of data
 - undisclosed duplication of publication, including undisclosed duplicate submission of manuscripts for publication
 - misrepresentation of interests, including failure to declare material interests either of the researcher or of the funders of the research
 - misrepresentation of qualifications and/or experience, including claiming or implying qualifications or experience which are not held
 - misrepresentation of involvement, such as inappropriate claims to authorship and/or attribution of work where there has been no significant contribution, or the denial of authorship where an author has made a significant contribution
- **failure to adhere to the University's Framework for Research Ethics**, including breach of duty of care, which involves deliberately, recklessly or by gross negligence:
 - disclosing improperly the identity of individuals or groups involved in research without their consent, or other breach of confidentiality
 - placing any of those involved in research in danger, whether as subjects, participants or associated individuals, without their prior consent, and without appropriate safeguards even with consent; this includes reputational danger where that can be anticipated
 - not taking all reasonable care to ensure that the risks and dangers, the broad objectives and the sponsors of the research are known to participants or their legal representatives, to ensure appropriate informed consent is obtained properly, explicitly and transparently
 - not observing legal and reasonable ethical requirements or obligations of care for animal subjects, human organs or tissue used in research, or for the protection of the environment or cultural objects

- improper conduct in peer review of research proposals or results (including manuscripts submitted for publication); this includes failure to disclose conflicts of interest; inadequate disclosure of clearly limited competence; misappropriation of the content of material; and breach of confidentiality or abuse of material provided in confidence for peer review purposes.

3. Procedure for dealing with academic malpractice in research degrees

3.1. The procedure consists of various stages which will be conducted in as timely a manner as possible but with sufficient time to allow a rigorous investigation, namely:

- establishing whether there is a case to answer;
- establishing a panel of inquiry, drawn from a standing panel;
- investigation by the panel;
- a meeting of the panel with the Postgraduate Researcher (PGR) and a member of the professoriate charged by the Graduate School with responsibility for establishing whether there is a case to answer.

4. Establishing a case

4.1. Malpractice need not only be suspected by an examiner. When someone (examiner, supervisor, other member of University staff, etc.) suspects that an infringement has occurred, they will advise the Graduate School, which will request a formal report on the nature of the malpractice.

4.2. The report will be submitted to the Chair of the Graduate School Board of Studies (GSBoS). They will appoint a member of the professoriate who is outside the department in which the PGR is based and is not a member of the supervisory team, to review the case to determine whether there appears to be a case to answer, i.e. that a case to answer has been 'established'.

4.3. Where it is determined that there is a case to answer, the Chair of the Graduate School Board of Studies, will convene a panel of inquiry. The panel will comprise a chair (a dean or professor of the University)

and two research active members of staff nominated by the Chair of the Graduate School Board of Studies drawn from a standing panel. No member of the panel will have had any previous involvement with the PGR nor will they be drawn from the subject area in which the PGR's research is based. The secretary to the panel will be an appropriate Graduate School administrator, who will oversee the running of the panel. No other Graduate School team member is required for the panel.

- 4.4. The member of the professoriate who has established there is a case to answer will present the case to the panel of inquiry.
- 4.5. The panel will receive all the material available to the Board in order to complete its deliberations.

5. Malpractice panel of inquiry

- 5.1. Once a panel has been convened, the Chair of the Graduate School Board of Studies will write to the PGR to inform her/him that there are suspicions of malpractice and that they will be invited to attend a panel of inquiry.
- 5.2. The panel will meet as soon as possible and not later than six weeks from the date an allegation is formally submitted.
- 5.3. The letter will include a copy of the regulations pertaining to academic malpractice in relation to research degrees. The PGR will have at least five days' notice of the meeting.
- 5.4. The Chair of the Graduate School Board of Studies will make all reasonable efforts to provide the PGR with a copy of the original work in which the PGR is alleged to have committed academic malpractice and of any evidence in support of the case prior to the hearing. This may, however, not always be possible due to the volume of documentation or the nature of the alleged malpractice. Where it is not practicable to post case materials in advance, PGRs wishing to view such materials in advance of the hearing must contact the secretary to the panel to arrange a viewing. Contact details for the secretary will be made available on the initial letter from the Chair of the Graduate School Board of Studies. Note that the opportunity to view the material in advance shall not delay the panel meeting and it is the responsibility of the PGR to ensure that they make themselves available in advance of the hearing should they wish to view this documentation. No documentation can be removed from the

University premises during this viewing and a member of staff, who will normally be the secretary to the panel, will be in attendance at all times as an observer only.

5.5. The letter from the Chair of the Graduate School Board of Studies will inform the PGR of their right to be accompanied by a 'friend.'¹ In exceptional cases the Chair of the Graduate School Board of Studies may agree to a person who is not a member of the Edge Hill community being in attendance to support the PGR.

5.6. If the PGR does not attend, and does not request the panel be adjourned, the meeting will go ahead in her/his absence. Equally, if the PGR does not give a reasonable explanation for non-attendance or in the view of the Chair of the Graduate School Board of Studies the PGR unreasonably attempts to delay or further delay proceedings, the meeting may go ahead in the PGR's absence providing this is authorised directly by the Chair of the Graduate School Board of Studies.

5.7. The terms of reference for the Panel of Inquiry are:

- to investigate the allegation of malpractice, having regard to the evidence presented to it by the representative of the Graduate School and the PGR;
- to determine whether malpractice has occurred and, if so, the extent and severity of the malpractice;
- in cases of proven malpractice, to determine its recommendations to the Graduate School Board of Studies (see section 6.1);
- to inform the PGR and the Graduate School Board of Studies of its recommendations.

5.8. The Panel will normally conduct its hearing as follows:

- panel's private deliberation²
- the chair will call for the PGR, 'friend' and the member of the professoriate presenting the case to enter the room

¹ See Appendix 31 (of the general Academic Regulations): Role of a Student's Friend in Academic Conduct Procedures for full guidelines.

² This does not include the Graduate School representative (member of the professoriate who established the case).

- chair's introduction:
 - welcome and introduction of persons present
 - outline of the panel's remit
 - outline of procedure for the hearing
- the chair will call for the member of the professoriate who established that there is a case to answer to present the case and invite any persons present to ask relevant questions
- the chair will invite the PGR to respond and invite any persons present to ask relevant questions
- when the chair is satisfied that all relevant information has been provided, the chair will explain to the PGR that the panel will deliberate and the outcome will be communicated to the PGR by the Chair of the Graduate School Board of Studies , in writing, within ten working days of the hearing
- the PGR, 'friend' and the member of the professoriate who presented the case will leave the meeting
- panel's private deliberation: the decision of the panel, including that regarding the seriousness of the offence will be a matter of academic judgement

6. Authorised penalties and guidance on sanctions

6.1. The following recommendations are available to the panel:

- The accusation is unfounded, and the PGR should be permitted to continue to examination without penalty, or, in cases where examination has already taken place, an alternative recommendation should be made by the examination panel to the Graduate School Board of Studies;
- The accusation is upheld and the PGR should be failed with an opportunity for retraining and resubmission under the re-examination regulations (section N18). (Note this recommendation is not available if the PGR is already registered for re-examination);
- The accusation is upheld and the PGR should be failed outright with

a recommendation for exclusion.

- 6.2. The Chair of the Graduate School Board of Studies will confirm the position of the PGR at the earliest opportunity within ten working days of the hearing.
- 6.3. Where evidence of academic malpractice becomes available subsequent to an award having been made or recommended by the examiners, the malpractice regulations will be invoked, and the original decision may be set aside (see also section A2.5 of the Academic Regulations).
- 6.4. PGRs who are deemed to have committed malpractice have a right of appeal under the Academic Appeals Procedures of the University (see Academic Regulations Appendices).

Endmatter

Title	Research Degree Regulations, Schedule A
Policy Owner	Dr Leon Culbertson, Dean of the Graduate School
Approved by	Academic Board
Date of Approval	July 2021
Date for Review	July 2022