

Section **17D**

Nottingham Trent University

Quality Handbook

Part E: Regulations

**Section 17D: Procedure for
Investigating Alleged
Research Misconduct**

Section 17D

Contents

1.	Introduction.....	2
2.	General Principles.....	3
3.	The Procedure.....	4
4.	Findings and Recommendations and Notification.....	9
5.	Reporting, communication and record keeping.....	9
6.	Appeal procedure.....	9
7.	Responsible Officer.....	11

Section 17D

1. Introduction

- 1.1 The integrity of academic research is extremely important to the University. Misconduct damages the integrity of research and can bring both the doctoral candidate and the University into disrepute and, in extreme circumstances, can cause harm to those involved in research. This procedure has been established to provide a procedural framework for investigating and dealing with allegations of misconduct concerning research conducted under the auspices of the University.
- 1.2 Staff responsible for doctoral candidates conducting research (Directors of Studies and Supervisors) have a duty to ensure that those new to research and the University receive appropriate training in ethical, legal and other conventions concerning the conduct of research.
- 1.3 This procedure applies to all doctoral candidates undertaking a research degree or studying on a Professional Doctorate course at the University and includes visiting doctoral candidates and graduates of the University, and sets out a framework for the investigation and resolution of allegations of research misconduct.
- 1.4 Where a doctoral candidate is undertaking a Nottingham Trent University Research Degree at another institution, those doctoral candidates do not have the right to approach the University until all local procedures have been exhausted. The University's role, following exhaustion of the local procedures, will be to review an appeal which will include a review, by the University, to ensure that the other institution has followed its own procedures.
- 1.5 Research misconduct is taken to include, in particular, but is not limited to:
 - a. piracy, defined as the deliberate exploitation of ideas from others without proper acknowledgement;
 - b. plagiarism, defined as representation of another person's thoughts, words, artefacts or software, or any combination of these, as though they were the researcher's own;
 - c. fraud, defined as deliberate deception (which may include the invention or fabrication of data) or other misuse of research funds or research equipment;
 - d. deliberately attempting to deceive when making a research proposal;
 - e. failure to obtain appropriate permission to conduct research with ethical implications;
 - f. failure to follow protocols contained in ethical consent, and unethical behaviour in the conduct of research;
 - g. failure to meet relevant legal requirements or to follow any protocols set out in the guidelines of appropriate recognised professional, academic, scientific and governmental bodies;
 - h. unauthorised use of information acquired confidentially;
 - i. failure to follow any procedures or health and safety protocols that avoid unreasonable risk or harm to humans, animals or the environment;
 - j. the misuse of research findings in a way that may result in harm to individuals, populations, animals or the environment;

Section 17D

- k. failure to declare a conflict of interest which may significantly compromise, or appear to significantly compromise, the research integrity of the individual concerned and the accuracy of any research findings;
- l. inciting others to commit research misconduct;
- m. failure to declare (where known) that an external collaborative partner has been found to have committed research misconduct in the past or is currently being investigated following an allegation of research misconduct;
- n. facilitating misconduct in research by collusion in, or concealment of, such action;
- o. submitting an accusation of research misconduct based on vexatious or malicious motives;
- p. misrepresentation, defined as a deliberate attempt to misrepresent falsely or unfairly the ideas or work of others, whether or not for personal gain or enhancement.
- q. failure to seek and obtain, where required, favourable opinion from a recognised research ethics committee and to carry out the research in line with the proposal reviewed by the committee.

2. General Principles

Fairness

- 2.1 Misconduct in research is a serious matter and any investigation into alleged misconduct in research must be carried out objectively and with due sensitivity. Investigations into allegations will be undertaken as expeditiously as possible.
- 2.2 Where the Respondent (the person against whom the allegation has been made) is under investigation by a regulatory body for research and/or other appropriate organisation (such as the police) regarding an offence which is also deemed by the University to be in breach of this procedure, this will not preclude the University from taking action under this procedure in respect of the same matter if it is thought appropriate or necessary to do so. Where it is deemed, by the University, appropriate to undertake an investigation under this procedure, this procedure shall be followed with additional liaison with the regulatory body or other appropriate organisation.
- 2.3 The Respondent will be given the full details of any allegation(s) in writing and shall be provided with reasonable opportunity to respond to such allegation(s) and to provide evidence in his/her defence.
- 2.4 Any party to this procedure may seek advice and assistance from any person of their choosing and may be accompanied when interviewed at any stage of the procedure. Where the Respondent and/or Complainant are doctoral candidates, they are strongly advised to contact the Students' Union Advice Centre which can offer free and confidential advice and which is independent of the University.
- 2.5 The principle of no-detriment shall apply to the investigation into allegations. Neither the Complainant nor the Respondent should suffer solely as a result of the allegations having been made. However, appropriate action will be taken against any person against whom an allegation of research misconduct has been upheld in

Section 17D

accordance with this procedure. In addition, action may be taken against any Complainant who is found to have made a malicious or reckless allegation.

Confidentiality

- 2.6 As far as practicable, the investigation of any allegation shall be carried out in accordance with the principle of confidentiality in order to protect the Complainant, the Respondent and others involved in the procedure. The principle of confidentiality will be maintained provided that this does not compromise the full and fair investigation of an allegation of research misconduct, any requirements of health and safety or any issue related to the safety of the participants in any research.
- 2.7 The identity of the Respondent and the Complainant will not be made known to any third party unless:
 - a. it is deemed necessary for the purpose of carrying out a full and fair investigation;
 - b. it is deemed, by the University, that the allegation is so serious that relevant legal or regulatory bodies should be informed so as to prevent risk or harm to staff, participants or other persons involved in the research;
 - c. in the event that the University is required to declare such details according to the terms of a contract or research grant; or
 - d. at the discretion of the Research Misconduct Panel.
- 2.8 Whilst allegations are being investigated under this procedure, the Respondent, Complainant, witnesses or any other persons involved in this procedure will not make any statements about the allegations to any third party unless such statements are formally approved by the University.

Integrity and balance

- 2.9 The University will ensure that any investigation is impartial and extensive enough to reach a reasoned judgement on the matter(s) raised.
- 2.10 In the interests of openness and transparency the University shall be entitled to invite external persons to participate/assist in any Screening or Formal Investigation conducted under this Procedure.
- 2.11 The Screening stage of the procedure is intended to determine whether allegations are mistaken, frivolous, vexatious and/or malicious. Only allegations judged to be sufficiently serious and of sufficient substance will proceed to Formal Investigation.
- 2.12 Formal Investigation will establish, on the balance of probabilities (the likelihood that the misconduct did or did not take place following the review of the evidence put forward), the truth of any allegation.

3. The Procedure

The Allegation

- 3.1 It is important to report alleged or suspected misconduct in research as it can have wide-ranging and damaging consequences, harming the integrity of research,

Section 17D

bringing both the individuals and the University into disrepute and, in extreme circumstances, causing harm to those involved in research. Those making an allegation will not be penalised, provided that it is done without malice and in good faith, reasonably believing it to be true.

- 3.2 Where a Complainant wishes to make an allegation of misconduct in research, they should do so, in the first instance, in writing, providing as much detail regarding the allegation (including any supporting evidence) as possible, including confirmation of the individual(s) against whom the allegation is being made, to the Executive Dean of the School. Where an allegation is received by the Executive Dean of School and they believe that they have a conflict of interest with regard to the allegation, they will refer the allegation to the Associate Dean of Research for the School and notify the Complainant accordingly.
- 3.3 Allegations which are anonymous will only be considered at the discretion of the Executive Dean of School taking into account the seriousness of the concerns, the credibility of concerns and the likelihood of confirming the concerns from alternative and credible sources.
- 3.4 Where the Executive Dean of School is the Complainant or the Respondent or it is believed that the Executive Dean of School is personally associated with the work to which an allegation relates, the Complainant should make an allegation of misconduct in research in writing, providing as much detail regarding the allegation (including any supporting evidence) as possible, including confirmation of the individual(s) against whom the allegation is being made, to the Associate Dean for Research for the School.
- 3.5 The Executive Dean of School will write to the Respondent informing them that an allegation of research misconduct has been made against them and that the allegation will be passed to a Named Person to establish whether or not there is a prima facie case for Formal Investigation. The Respondent is not required to provide any statement or defence at this but the Named Person may, if they wish, contact the Respondent for further information.

Stage 1: Screening

- 3.6 Having written to the Respondent, the Executive Dean of School will nominate a member of staff to be Named Person (the Named Person must be a senior academic with experience of supervising doctoral candidates and must not have any direct ties with the Respondent or Complainant) who will consider the evidence that has been made available to them (by the Executive Dean of School), including the allegation(s) and any supporting evidence provided by the Complainant and may, at their own discretion, consult additional experts in the relevant discipline subject or request any further evidence that they deem necessary (files, notebooks, other records). At this stage the Named Person may wish to speak to the Complainant and/or the Respondent to assist in their understanding of the allegation.
- 3.7 The Doctoral School will provide suitable administrative and other support to assist the Named Person.
- 3.8 The Named Person shall determine whether there is sufficient evidence of research misconduct to warrant a Formal Investigation into the allegation(s).

Section 17D

- 3.9 The Named Person will complete their review within 20 working days from the date of the letter to the Respondent informing them of the allegation(s) against them. Where the Named Person determines that a delay to the timescale is required the Complainant and the Respondent will be informed of this delay in writing and will be provided with an estimated revised date of completion.
- 3.10 At the conclusion of the review, the Named Person will determine whether the allegation of misconduct in research:
- a. is unfounded because it is mistaken or is otherwise without substance and will be dismissed; or
 - b. is unfounded because it is frivolous, vexatious and/or malicious and will be dismissed (where this is the case, the Named Person will refer the matter to the Pro Vice-Chancellor (Research and Innovation) who will consider any further steps required); or
 - c. warrants direct referral to another relevant University process or procedure or to an external organisation (this may be relevant where there are concerns relating to Fitness to Practice); or
 - d. has some substance but due to the lack of intent to deceive will be addressed through education and training or another non-disciplinary approach rather than through the next stage of this Procedure; or
 - e. is sufficiently serious and has sufficient substance to warrant a Formal Investigation of the allegation(s).
- 3.11 The Named Person will set out their findings in a report to the Pro Vice-Chancellor (Research and Innovation), Executive Dean of School, Respondent and Complainant. The Respondent and Complainant may provide comment on the factual accuracy of the report only where the report includes errors of fact. Such comments must be addressed to the Named Person and received within 10 working days of the date of the Report. The Named Person will judge the validity of such comments before making any required amendments to the report.
- 3.12 Where the Named Person concludes that an allegation has sufficient substance to warrant a Formal Investigation the Pro Vice-Chancellor (Research and Innovation) will implement a Formal Investigation in accordance with Stage Two of this Procedure.

Stage 2: Formal Investigation

- 3.13 The Pro Vice-Chancellor (Research and Innovation) shall appoint a University Research Misconduct Group (URMG). The purpose of the URMG is to review all the evidence collected during the Named Person's investigation following the original allegation(s) and investigate further as required.
- 3.14 The URMG shall consist of at least three impartial members of the University Research Degrees Committee (URDC) and will normally include:
- a. a senior member of University staff appointed by the Pro Vice-Chancellor (Research and Innovation) (who shall act as Chair);
 - b. a senior member of University staff who is not from the School to which the Respondent or Complainant to an allegation belong or in which the misconduct in research is alleged to have occurred;

Section 17D

- c. a further academic member of staff appointed from the URDC by the Pro Vice-Chancellor (Research and Innovation). Where appropriate, this member will be a specialist in the academic discipline in which the misconduct in research is alleged to have taken place.
- 3.15 The Pro Vice-Chancellor (Research and Innovation) may choose to appoint a member from outside the University where it is deemed appropriate. Each member of the URMG will provide confirmation that their involvement in the URMG presents no conflict of interest. Where there is a conflict of interest, the Pro Vice-Chancellor (Research and Innovation) will remove that member and appoint a new member.
- 3.16 The URMG will be appointed within 20 working days of the Named Person issuing its final report to the Pro Vice-Chancellor (Research and Innovation).
- 3.17 The Chair of the URMG, after 3 working days of their appointment, shall inform the Respondent and the Complainant that a Formal Investigation in the allegation(s) is to take place.
- 3.18 The Chair of the URMG will be responsible for the conduct of the URMG under this procedure. The URMG will determine its own procedure in the conduct of the investigation. In undertaking the Formal Investigation, the URMG is not required to work to a prescribed timetable but should conduct the Formal Investigation as quickly as possible without compromising the principles set out in this procedure. The Chair will report the progress made by the URMG to the Pro Vice-Chancellor (Research and Innovation) on a monthly basis who will, in turn, provide appropriate information on the progress of the Formal Investigation to the Complainant and the Respondent.
- 3.19 The URMG must interview the Respondent and the Complainant as part of its investigation, both of whom shall have the right to be accompanied to such interviews by another person if they so wish. The Respondent and the Complainant will also be given the opportunity to provide written representations to the URMG. Such representations must be received by the URMG within 10 working days after attendance at that interview.
- 3.20 In the event that the Respondent and / or the Complainant fails, without good reason, to attend an investigatory interview requested by the URMG, the URMG shall be entitled to continue with and conclude the investigation.
- 3.21 The URMG shall be free to seek confidential advice from persons with relevant expertise both within the University and outside it.
- 3.22 Whilst the URMG will strive to avoid delay, the time required to complete the Formal Investigation will be influenced by a number of factors including the nature of the allegation of misconduct in research and the volume and nature of evidence to be gathered and reviewed.
- 3.23 The Doctoral School will provide suitable administrative and other support to assist the URMG.
- 3.24 At the conclusion of the Formal Investigation, the URMG will conclude, giving the reasons for its decision and recording any differing views, whether the allegation of misconduct in research is:
- a. upheld in full; or
 - b. upheld in part; or

Section 17D

- c. not upheld and will be dismissed.
- 3.25 When concluding whether an allegation is upheld in full or in part or is not upheld, the standard of proof used is that of “on the balance of probabilities.”
- 3.26 Reasons for concluding that the allegation(s) is not upheld can include, but is not limited to:
- a. the allegation(s) is mistaken, frivolous, vexatious or malicious;
 - b. lack of intent to deceive or the allegation(s) is relatively minor nature and will therefore be addressed through education and training or other non-disciplinary approach.
- 3.27 The URMG shall provide a draft Formal Investigation Report of its findings to the Pro Vice-Chancellor (Research and Innovation) who will forward the Report to the Respondent and the Complainant for comment on the factual accuracy of the report. Where the Report contains any error or omission of fact or the comments provided by the Complainant or the Respondent, which are accepted by the URMG as having a material bearing on the facts, the Report will be modified by the Chair of the URMG. The Chair will judge the validity of any comments received and seek the agreement of the URMG before making amendments to the Report.
- 3.28 The URMG will then produce the final Report which:
- a. summarises the conduct of the investigation;
 - b. states whether the allegation(s) of misconduct in research has been upheld in whole or in part, giving the reasons for its decision and recording any differing views as well as its recommendations;
 - c. makes recommendations in relation to any other misconduct identified during the investigation;
 - d. addresses any procedural matters that the investigation has brought to light within the University.
- 3.29 Where an allegation of research misconduct is deemed to be upheld in relation to a doctoral candidate undertaking Phase 1 of the Professional Doctorate Course, the appendix sets out the penalty framework.
- 3.30 The URMG may also conclude and make recommendations that the allegation(s) should be referred to another relevant University process; note whether any action will be required to correct the record of research; note whether any external organisations should be informed of the findings of the Formal Investigation (and if so which organisations should be informed); and note whether any other matters should be investigated.
- 3.31 The Chair of the URMG will forward the final Report, together with any documentation used in the Formal Investigation, to the Pro Vice-Chancellor (Research and Innovation) and Executive Dean of School to consider the URMG’s conclusions/recommendations and decide what action should be taken. If it is deemed appropriate by the URMG, the Director of Human Resources will be made aware of the outcome. At this stage the URMG will be disbanded.

Section 17D

4. Findings and Recommendations and Notification

- 4.1 The Pro Vice-Chancellor (Research and Innovation) and Executive Dean of School (with the Director of HR where appropriate) shall provide their recommendations on the action to be taken to the URDC who shall review the Report and its findings and recommendations and agree with the action or make a further decision on the implementation of the recommendations. The outcome shall be reported back to the Pro Vice-Chancellor (Research and Innovation) and the Chair of the URMG. The URDC may, at any time, consult with appropriate colleagues or liaise with relevant Committees before making a decision on the course of action to be taken against the Respondent (if appropriate).
- 4.2 Within 10 working days of the URDC meeting, the Chair of the URDC shall notify the Respondent in writing of the URDC's decision on the Recommendations from the Report, together with a copy of the final Report and details of the appeal process. The notification will be sent by recorded delivery / secure email.
- 4.3 Respondents are advised that in cases where evidence of an allegation(s) of misconduct in research (as defined in paragraph 1.5 above) is upheld in full or in part, the University may, in some cases, be required to report the matter to relevant professional bodies. If this is the case, the Respondent will be advised of this in the notification at 4.2 above.
- 4.4 Where the allegation(s) has not been upheld, the Pro Vice-Chancellor (Research and Innovation) shall take such steps as may be necessary to preserve the good reputation of the Respondent. Where a case has received any publicity, the Respondent shall be offered the possibility of having an official statement released by the University to the press or other relevant parties (or both). Where the URMG find that the Complainant's allegation(s) was malicious or reckless and the Complainant is a member of staff, the Pro Vice-Chancellor (Research and Innovation) may recommend action is initiated under the University's disciplinary process. Where the URMG find that the Complainant's allegation(s) was malicious or reckless and the Complainant is a doctoral candidate at the University, the Pro Vice-Chancellor (Research and Innovation) may recommend action is initiated under the PGR Student Code of Behaviour. In so referring the matter, the Chair of the URMG shall provide information as necessary to facilitate that disciplinary process.

5. Reporting, communication and record keeping

- 5.1 The NTU Doctoral School shall assume responsibility for keeping accurate records of the activities, deliberations and reporting of the process within an archive of the case upon completion of the investigation. This documentation will be kept for a period in line with the University's retention schedule.

6. Appeal procedure

- 6.1 The Respondent has the right to appeal the findings of the URMG within 10 working days from the date of the letter received from the Chair of the URDC. Any appeal submitted by the Respondent must be done so on the following grounds only:

Section 17D

- a. where the Respondent has material information which was not previously available for consideration by the URMG;
 - b. where the Respondent believes that a material administrative or procedural error has occurred in the operation of this Procedure; or
 - c. where the Respondent believes that the recommended penalty is excessive and disproportionate.
- 6.2 The Respondent must submit an appeal in writing to the Pro Vice-Chancellor (Research and Innovation) within the timescale set out at 6.1 above stating the grounds upon which the appeal is being made and detailing the reasons for the appeal.
- 6.3 If the appeal is being made on the ground that the Respondent has material information which was not previously available for consideration by the URMG, the Respondent must submit that material or evidence to the Pro Vice-Chancellor (Research and Innovation) as part of the written appeal.
- 6.4 The Pro Vice-Chancellor (Research and Innovation) shall consider whether the appeal has been made on one or more of the permitted grounds and if so, whether the evidence or arguments put forward by the Respondent in support of their request for an appeal have sufficient merit to justify invoking the formal appeal procedure.
- 6.5 Where the Pro Vice-Chancellor (Research and Innovation) decides that the appeal is not within any of the permitted grounds for an appeal or that the evidence or arguments put forward by the Respondent are not sufficient to justify invoking the formal appeal procedure, the Respondent shall be informed in writing that the appeal has been rejected on that basis and that the original Report and Recommendations remain unchanged. Such a decision by Pro Vice-Chancellor (Research and Innovation) is final and there is no further right of appeal within the University's Procedures.
- 6.6 Where the Pro Vice-Chancellor (Research and Innovation) decides that an appeal does satisfy one or more of the permitted grounds and justifies invoking the appeal procedure, the Pro Vice-Chancellor (Research and Innovation) shall refer the matter to a University Research Misconduct Appeal Body (the Appeal Body) for consideration.
- 6.7 The Appeal Body shall consist of at least three members who have had no involvement in any of the earlier stages, comprising:
- a. A senior member of University staff appointed by Pro Vice-Chancellor (Research and Innovation) (who shall act as Chair);
 - b. A senior member of University staff who is not from the School in which the Respondent or Complainant to an allegation study or in which the misconduct in research is alleged to have occurred; and
 - c. A further academic member of staff appointed from the URDC by the Pro Vice-Chancellor (Research and Innovation). Where appropriate, this member will be a specialist in the academic discipline in which the misconduct in research is alleged to have taken place.
- 6.8 The Pro Vice-Chancellor (Research and Innovation) may also choose to appoint an additional member from outside the University where it is deemed appropriate.

Section 17D

Each member of the Appeal Body will provide confirmation that their involvement in the Appeal Body presents no conflict of interest. Where a member informs the Appeal Body that they have a conflict of interest, the Pro Vice-Chancellor (Research and Innovation) will replace that member and appoint a new member.

- 6.9 The Doctoral School will provide suitable administrative and other support to assist the Appeal Body.
- 6.10 The Respondent shall be given at least 10 working days' written notice of the appeal hearing and shall be provided with a further copy of the Report and recommendations resulting from that Report. The Respondent is entitled to attend the appeal hearing and shall have the right to be accompanied by another person if they so wish.
- 6.11 If the Respondent is unable to attend the appeal hearing due to illness or other extenuating circumstances, they must inform the Chair as soon as possible.
- 6.12 The Chair of the Appeal Body will be responsible for the conduct of the appeal hearing under this Procedure. The Appeal Body will determine its own procedure in the conduct of the investigation. However, it must be noted that the Appeal Body is not required to undertake a re-run of the Formal Investigation but will undertake a review of the Report and resulting recommendation(s). The Chair shall have discretion to allow the introduction of new evidence during the appeal hearing.
- 6.13 The Appeal Body will produce an Appeal Report which shall set out their findings and any subsequent recommendations resulting from those findings. The Appeal Report shall be provided to the Pro Vice-Chancellor (Research and Innovation) and the Chair of the URDC. The URDC shall consider the Appeal Report at either its next meeting or an extraordinary meeting (where appropriate) and inform the Respondent of their decision in writing (Completion of Procedures Letter) within 10 working days of the date of that meeting.
- 6.14 The decision by the URDC (via the Appeal Body) is final and there is no further right of appeal within the University's Procedures. The Completion of Procedures Letter issued at 6.13 above shall inform the Respondent that the University's procedures have been concluded and will be in a form prescribed by the Office of the Independent Adjudicator (OIA).

7. Responsible Officer

- 7.1 The Pro Vice-Chancellor (Research and Innovation) is responsible for the implementation, development and review of this Procedure and any related procedures.

Section 17D

APPENDIX

Penalty framework for Phase 1 of Professional Doctorate Courses

	Characteristics of case	Recommended penalty	Category
3	This is the first time the doctoral candidate has committed academic irregularity ⁱ . The extent of academic irregularity is a relatively 'small' proportion or is of 'limited significance'.	The grade for the assessment ⁱⁱ is pass, with a formal written warning to the doctoral candidate about the academic irregularity which will be held on the doctoral candidate's record. If the learning outcomes have not been met, the assessment is referred.	Recorded as ProfDoc Category 3 in the report to SRDC
2	<p>This is the first time the doctoral candidate has committed academic irregularity. The extent of academic irregularity is 'substantial'.</p> <p>This is the second time the doctoral candidate has committed an academic irregularity. The extent of both cases are relatively 'small' or of 'limited significance'.</p> <p>The first case of academic irregularity and involves 'unreasonable' conduct.</p>	<p>The grade for the assessment is fail, with a formal written warning to the doctoral candidate about the academic irregularity which will be held on the doctoral candidate's record. However, for extreme cases of irregularity, the SRDC could recommend a more severe penalty for approval by Pro Vice-Chancellor (Research and Innovation), Executive Dean of School, and URDC.</p> <p>Where it is the second time the doctoral candidate has committed an irregularity which is relatively 'small' or of 'limited significance', the SRDC will decide on the appropriate penalty depending on the extent and complexity of the case.</p> <p>If necessary, the assessment is referred to provide the doctoral candidate with an opportunity to meet the learning outcomes. The assessment grade remains fail.ⁱⁱⁱ</p>	Recorded as ProfDoc Category 2 in the report to SRDC
1	<p>This is the second case of 'substantial' academic irregularity.</p> <p>This is the third time the doctoral candidate has committed academic irregularity and the extent of</p>	The grade for the assessment is fail, and the doctoral candidate's studies will be terminated. A maximum of an appropriate interim award will be given.	Recorded as ProfDoc Category 1 in the report to SRDC

Section 17D

	all cases has been 'small' or of 'limited significance'.	
--	--	--

ⁱ The severity of academic irregularity penalties increases in line with the number of cases on a doctoral candidate's record. However, at Level 1 when a case of academic irregularity occurs before the outcome of a first case is known to the doctoral candidate, it shall be considered part of the same case. This allowance may not be applied for unreasonable conduct.

ⁱⁱ An element sets out the type of assessment method used to assess an aspect of the module's outcomes and is detailed on the module.

ⁱⁱⁱ Though the transcript may show the element grade or module grade as having been 'failed' the credit points can still be awarded.

Policy owner

Pro Vice-Chancellor (Research and Innovation) & NTU Doctoral School (co-written by NTU Legal Services)

Change history

Version:	Approval date:	Implementation date:	Nature of significant revisions:
Sep 2013	2013	01.09.16	Clarifications on the different stages of the procedure.
Sep 2017	14.03.17 (URDC) 06.06.17 (URC)	01.10.17	Clarifications on the responsible bodies involved in stages 1 and 2 of the procedure The irregularities penalty framework for Phase 1 of the ProfD course added as an appendix
Sept 2018	12.09.18	01.10.18	None
Sept 2019	11.09.19	01.10.19	None
Sept 2020	16.09.20	01.10.20	Appendix 1 (ProfD penalty framework) updated to reference the School Research Degrees Committee instead of the Progression Board
Sept 2020	19.10.20	19.10.20	References to "student(s)" updated to "doctoral candidate(s)" to reflect other research degree Sections/Supplements
Sept 2020	10.05.21	10.05.21	Reference to Student Code of Behaviour updated (para 4.4)
Sept 2021	07.09.21	01.10.21	Failure to seek and obtain favourable opinion from a recognised research ethics committee, and to carry out the research in line with the proposal reviewed by the committee, added as an example of research misconduct
Sept 2022	22.09.22	01.10.22	None
Sept 2023	14.09.23	01.10.23	None

Equality Analysis

Version:	EA date:	Completed by:
Sept 2015	09.02.16	CADQ