

UNIVERSITY OF ABERDEEN

ACADEMIC QUALITY HANDBOOK

CODE OF PRACTICE ON STUDENT DISCIPLINE (ACADEMIC)

1. PURPOSE OF THIS CODE

The University is a community dedicated to the advancement and dissemination of knowledge through research, teaching and learning. Those objectives can only be achieved if the members of the University community can live and work beside each other in conditions of safety and security and with respect for the norms of academic behaviour. This Code is intended to support these objectives by providing a clear process for addressing cases of Academic Misconduct by i) currently registered students (including, undergraduate, postgraduate taught and postgraduate research students), ii) Undergraduate and Postgraduate Taught Graduates and iii) visiting postgraduate research students. In the case of Postgraduate Research Graduates, the [Policy for Dealing with Allegations of Academic Misconduct Against Graduates of the University](#) applies and not this Code. It is expected that students will have been made aware of what is meant by Academic Misconduct by their respective Schools at the start of teaching/their programme/their research degree. This Code should be read and applied in the light of the above.

Students undertaking courses, programmes and / or elements of assessment subject to the requirements of a Professional, Statutory and Regulatory Body (PSRB), may be subject to an additional regulatory framework in respect of Academic Misconduct. Where these regulations are more stringent than those stipulated within the University's own regulations, those of the PSRB will take priority. Frameworks which exist in this regard are listed in Appendix D, and will be widely publicised to the students concerned.

2. GENERAL PROVISIONS

- 2.1 The Head of School is mentioned throughout this Code as having responsibility for dealing with alleged cases of Academic Misconduct at School level. The Head of School may, however, delegate full authority under this Code to another member of academic staff.
- 2.2 For cases that are being dealt with at University level, an Investigating Officer will be selected from a list of academics approved by Senate. The Investigating Officer will be from a different School from which the allegation has been raised.
- 2.3 The standard of proof that shall be used in all cases under this Code is the balance of probabilities. This means that a Head of School, Investigating Officer or anyone else permitted to make a decision under this Code will be satisfied that an event occurred if they decide, having reviewed the evidence available, that the occurrence of the event was more likely than not.
- 2.4 The possible decisions an Investigation Officer can take when deciding if a case of alleged Academic Misconduct has taken place are that the allegation is: upheld; not upheld; or case dismissed.
- 2.5 Reference to the CGS in the Code refers to grades available under the University's Common Grading Scale.
- 2.6 Those presenting evidence regarding an allegation of academic misconduct will not be involved in deciding the outcome of the investigation.
- 2.7 Outcomes of Academic Misconduct investigations may be referred to in '[Fitness to Practise](#)'

investigation, for the programmes where this applies.

- 2.8** When considering a case relating to an Undergraduate or Postgraduate Taught Graduate the School and Investigating Officer will, after referring to the *Policy for Dealing with Allegations of Academic Misconduct Against Graduates of the University*, investigate the case following relevant procedures below, as if the Graduate was a registered student, and will also refer to Section 7.
- 2.9** For cases of research misconduct, the [Research Governance Handbook](#) should also be referred to. Where the subject of the allegation is a PGR who is both a staff member and a student, the investigation process to be followed will be determined by the Head of School. If the alleged research misconduct relates to work on their programme of study, the student process will normally be followed. If it relates to their employment, the staff process will normally be followed. In addition, any case of research misconduct involving a PGR student will need to be reported to the Scottish Funding Council within one month of the conclusion of the investigation, via the [Academic Policy and Quality Team](#).

3. ACADEMIC MISCONDUCT

- 3.1** The University of Aberdeen expects that all students (undergraduate, postgraduate taught and research postgraduate students) will undertake their studies with integrity and will submit assessments (including PGR annual progression exercises and research theses) that have been prepared by themselves. To do otherwise, to act dishonestly and cheat in any form of assessment (formative or summative), is classed as academic misconduct and will incur penalties. The university will seek to promote the importance of academic integrity and support students so that they can understand and develop the necessary skills to facilitate academic integrity.
- 3.2** The University is a signatory to the [QAA Academic Integrity Charter](#) which represents the collective commitment of the UK higher education sector to promote academic integrity and take action against academic misconduct. Academic integrity is a commitment to the fundamental values of honesty, fairness, trust, respect, and accountability in their academic endeavours. Where a student does not act with academic integrity this may demonstrate poor academic practice or academic misconduct.
- 3.3** Academic misconduct is an umbrella term which describes any action which gains, attempts to gain, or assists others in gaining or attempting to gain unfair academic advantage. This includes the intentional presentation of work for any assessment (formative or summative) which is not wholly the work of the student without appropriate acknowledgement of sources. The most common examples of academic misconduct are listed in Appendix A.

4. SCHOOL PROCEDURE IN CASES OF ACADEMIC MISCONDUCT

4.1 School-level Investigation for all forms of academic misconduct

- 4.1.1** Where there is reason to believe that Academic Misconduct may have taken place, the Head of School shall decide if it is appropriate to conduct a School-level Investigation in accordance with section 4.1.2. In cases where academic misconduct is identified during a research degree *viva voce*, consideration as to the most appropriate course of action will be given in accordance with Section 4.1.3.
- 4.1.2** The procedure to be followed by the Head of School when conducting a School-level Investigation is as follows, with further provisions applying to both School-level Investigation meetings and Discipline Hearings outlined in Appendix B:
- (a) a meeting, held on campus or online (e.g. via Microsoft Teams), should be arranged with the student no later than 10 working days after the allegation is raised, giving the student at least 5 working days' notice of the meeting, unless otherwise agreed in writing;
 - (b) the student should be contacted, in writing, outlining the reasons for the meeting, clearly stating

the allegation, and confirming that they may be accompanied by another person if they wish. At the same time the student must be provided with copies of all evidence supporting the allegation of Academic Misconduct (see Section 5). Such meetings will be held in the appropriate way, whether on-campus or online;

- (c) where relevant, the student may be questioned to determine their level of understanding of the work submitted. In some cases, an appropriate subject specialist will be invited to attend the meeting to facilitate this. The student should be informed if any additional members of staff will be invited to attend the meeting.
- (d) another member of staff shall be present at the meeting for the purpose of taking a record of the discussion, and additional staff members may be present if the Head of School requests; and
- (e) the student should be sent a copy of the meeting's outcome (using the appropriate pro forma) and record of the discussion to confirm its accuracy, no later than 5 working days after the meeting is held.

4.1.3 Identification of academic misconduct during a research degree *viva voce*:

- (a) Where concerns relating to academic misconduct, including the inappropriate or undeclared use of artificial intelligence, are raised by an external examiner in advance of or during the examination of a research degree, careful consideration must be given to the appropriate course of action. A decision must be made as to whether the concerns can be fairly and proportionately explored and addressed within the *viva voce* examination, or whether they are of such a nature that a formal investigation under section 4.1.2 must be initiated and concluded prior to the examination proceeding.
- (b) It is recognised that determining the appropriate route may be complex and context-specific. In such circumstances, the external examiner should discuss the concerns promptly with the internal examiner. Advice must then be sought from the School PGR Director to determine whether the matter can be appropriately managed within the *viva voce*, or whether the examination should be paused pending the outcome of a formal investigation.

4.2 Possible outcomes of School-level investigations

- 4.2.1 The Head of the School, having completed the School-level Investigation and considered all of the evidence submitted, may:
 - (a) decide that misconduct has not occurred and the allegation is not upheld, or
 - (b) decide that academic misconduct has occurred and the allegation is upheld.
- 4.2.2 The outcome of a School-level investigation should be communicated in writing to the student using the appropriate pro-forma within 5 working days of the meeting. The [Academic Policy and Quality Team](#) should be included in the outcome communication, for recording and reporting purposes, in the following cases:
 - (a) For undergraduate and postgraduate taught students and graduates: all upheld cases.
 - (b) For postgraduate research students: all investigated cases (upheld and not upheld), in line with 2.9.
- 4.2.3 Where academic misconduct is identified, the Head of School shall ascertain whether there are any prior allegations of academic misconduct against the same student that were upheld. This will take into account the date the outcome of a previous case was communicated to the student and its relationship to the submission date of the new piece of work, to ensure the student had enough time to learn from the previous case. Assuming the student had submitted the work under investigation after a previous finding of academic misconduct was made under this Code, the allegation shall be taken to relate to a second offence.
- 4.2.4 If the allegation of academic misconduct is upheld, and this is the first time academic misconduct has been found in the work of a student further to section 4.2.3, the Head of School shall have the following

outcomes available to dispose of the case. The outcome chosen can be based on consideration of mitigating circumstances raised by the student during the School-level Investigation or the general significance of the elements of the assessment in question:

- (a) To signpost the student to available guidance, additional training or support to avoid academic misconduct in the future (which may include referral to the Student Learning Service for advice and support), with or without any additional penalty;
- (b) To ask that work be assessed ignoring the sections where academic misconduct was found, and a mark (or outcome) be provided in the usual way, reflecting the amount of independent work of the student;
- (c) To deduct up to a maximum of 3 CGS points¹;
- (d) To allow the student to resubmit the work in question for assessment, taking into account advice given during the meeting on avoiding academic misconduct and any other support deemed appropriate for the specific case (which may include referral to the Student Learning Service for advice and support and/or signposting to additional training), as a first attempt and therefore without capping the grade (or outcome);
- (e) To allow the student to resubmit the work in question for assessment, taking into account advice given during the meeting on avoiding plagiarism/collusion and any other support deemed appropriate for the specific case (which may include referral to the Student Learning Service for advice and support) with the ultimate grade for the assessment in question being capped at a D3²;
- (f) To award a CGS of G3 for the component of assessment (for example, a written examination or piece of in-course assessment) in which extensive academic misconduct occurred. If the imposition of this penalty means that the student fails the course and a resit is permitted, the CGS mark attainable following reassessment will be restricted to a maximum of CGS D3³.

4.2.5 If the Head of School decides that academic misconduct has occurred, and this is a second offence in accordance with Section 4.2.3, the Head of School shall refer the matter for a Discipline Hearing in accordance with Section 5. The Head of School must inform the student in writing that the matter is being referred for a Discipline Hearing to be arranged under this Code.

4.2.6 The Head of School shall have the discretion to refer any case where academic misconduct is suspected for further investigation at Discipline Hearing in accordance with section 5. The Head of School must inform the student in writing that the matter is being referred for a Discipline Hearing to be arranged under this Code.

5. REFERRING A CASE FOR A DISCIPLINE HEARING

5.1 Cases must be referred in writing for a Discipline Hearing within five working days of the conclusion of the School-level Investigation. When referring a case for a Discipline Hearing, the following should normally be provided:

- A covering letter or email confirming the full details of the allegation;
- A copy of the record taken at any meeting/discussion held during the School-level Investigation;
- The original piece(s) of work clearly identifying the sections in which Academic Misconduct is alleged to have taken place;
- For Plagiarism cases:
 - a) The source of the plagiarised material should be clearly marked on the original piece(s) of work submitted to identify the corresponding section(s) and, if available, the Originality report;

¹ Please note that this outcome does not apply to postgraduate research degrees.

² Please note that this outcome does not apply to postgraduate research degrees.

³ Please note that this outcome does not apply to postgraduate research degrees.

- b) The source(s) of the plagiarised materials;
 - c) Copies of relevant Student Handbook(s), Course Handbook(s) and any other written material routinely provided to students drawing their attention to the University's definition of Plagiarism together with additional details of information and support provided to students on how to avoid Plagiarism;
 - For collusion cases: copies of relevant Student Handbook(s), Course Handbook(s) and any other written material routinely provided to students drawing their attention to the rules regarding the boundaries for collaborative working;
 - For contract cheating cases: copies of examples of the student's work, including the piece under investigation and notes/recording of the interview carried out to assess their understanding of the work submitted for assessment;
 - For any other cases, appropriate evidence or the reasons for suspecting academic misconduct, as applicable and wherever possible.
 - Written reports from individuals, Tutors or Invigilators present at the time that the alleged offence took place (if applicable).
- 5.2** Following a referral, a Discipline Hearing will be conducted in accordance with the procedures in this Code. An outcome of the investigation will normally be provided to the student within 20 working days of referral to a Discipline Hearing, and within 5 working days of the Hearing taking place.
- 5.3** When arranging a Discipline Hearing, a University Investigating Officer will be selected, in line with Section 2.2, to hear the case in accordance with this Code. A Clerk will also be present at the meeting to take a general note of discussion and to provide guidance on procedure and the application of this Code.
- 5.4** Notwithstanding 5.3, if a student has admitted to Academic Misconduct during the School-level Investigation, it may not be necessary for a Discipline Hearing to take place. In such cases, the University Investigating Officer will be able to decide the appropriate outcome, on the recommendation of the School, via circulation.
- 6. OUTCOMES FOLLOWING A DISCIPLINE HEARING**
- 6.1 General Provisions**
- 6.1.1** The procedure to be followed by the Investigating Officer at the Discipline Hearing is outlined in Appendix C.
- 6.1.2** The penalties which can be imposed by an Investigating Officer following a Discipline Hearing where an allegation of Academic Misconduct is upheld are as set out in section 6.2.
- 6.1.3** An Investigating Officer has the discretion to impose a lesser or reasonable alternative penalty than provided in this Code where it is thought appropriate to do so having reviewed all the evidence in the case and any statements or explanations provided by the student.
- 6.1.4** If the penalty imposed means that the student fails the course, the normal rules for resit examination, re-submission of assessed work or other re-assessment for that course shall apply, unless otherwise stated.
- 6.1.5** Where a reassessment diet arises before the conclusion of proceedings under the Code, the student should be allowed to submit for reassessment, but the grade should be withheld by the School until the outcome of proceedings are known and applied.
- 6.1.6** Where mentioned, expulsion means the termination of matriculated student status involving a total prohibition on attendance at or access to the University and on any participation in University activities.

A student who has been expelled will not usually be eligible for re-admittance to the University. For Student visa holders, this outcome may result in visa sponsorship withdrawal.

- 6.1.7 Where a student is expelled under this Code, if they have already satisfied the requirements for an award prior to the offence(s) being committed, they will be allowed to graduate with that award, in absentia.
- 6.1.8 In the context of an Undergraduate or Taught Postgraduate Graduate the wording within a penalty relating to expulsion is not applicable (see Section 7).
- 6.1.9 An Investigating Officer can make alterations to the process to be followed at a Discipline Hearing where it is reasonable to do so, AND the student agrees to the alterations in advance.

6.2 Possible outcomes where an allegation of academic misconduct is upheld at Discipline Hearing

- 6.2.1 Following a Discipline Hearing, the Investigating Officer, having completed the investigation and considered all of the evidence submitted, may:
 - (a) Decide that academic misconduct has not occurred and the allegation is not upheld, or
 - (b) Decide that academic misconduct has occurred and the allegation is upheld, or
 - (c) Decide that the case should be dismissed due to procedural irregularity.
- 6.2.2 Where an allegation of academic misconduct is upheld at Discipline Hearing, the possible outcomes are those listed in Section 4.2.4, in addition to:
 - (a) The student shall be awarded an overall CGS G3 for the course(s) in which academic misconduct occurred. If a resit is permitted, the CGS mark attainable following reassessment will be restricted to a maximum of CGS D3⁴.
 - (b) The student shall be expelled from the University. In this case, the outcome shall be ratified by the Principal (or their nominee).

7 UNDERGRADUATE AND POSTGRADUATE GRADUATES

- 7.1 If the penalty imposed in Section 6 means that the graduate's Degree/Diploma/Certificate award is affected the Investigating Officer will decide, in consultation with the relevant School(s) as appropriate, whether a lower award is possible, or whether the award should be rescinded. Also refer to Section 4 of the Policy for Dealing with Allegations of Academic Misconduct Against Graduates of the University.

8 RIGHTS OF APPEAL

- 8.1 A student has the right of appeal against any decision made under this Code using the University's Policy and Procedures on Student Appeals but only if there are valid grounds to appeal. Full details on this process and the grounds on which an appeal can be submitted are available on the University Website by consulting the [University's Policy and Procedures on Student Appeals](#).

⁴ Please note that this outcome does not apply to postgraduate research degrees.

APPENDIX A

Examples of Academic Misconduct

The most common types of academic misconduct are listed below, with fuller definitions and student support resources provided on the University's [Academic Integrity webpage](#). Please note that this is not an exhaustive list and any conduct reasonably considered to amount to academic misconduct, as decided by the Head of School on a case-by-case basis, may be investigated under this Code.

Plagiarism

"Plagiarism" is defined by the University as the use, without adequate acknowledgment, of the intellectual work of another person in work submitted for assessment. This definition includes the unattributed use of course materials and applies to all types of assessment, including 'open book' assessments. A student cannot be found to have committed plagiarism where it can be shown that the student has taken all reasonable care to avoid representing the work of others as their own.

"Self-plagiarism" is defined as the duplication of work for assessment by submitting coursework containing material identical, or substantially similar, to material which has already been submitted by the same student for any other assessment, including those submitted in other courses or programmes of study, unless authorised to do so (e.g. resubmission/resit).

Plagiarism in the form of academic misconduct does not include poor academic writing practice unless this encompasses the intention to deceive.

Collusion

"Collusion" is defined as collaboration between students in an assignment that has not been authorised by the course coordinator. It does not refer to authorised group work that is assessed by a single group report.

Contract cheating

"Contract cheating" is an umbrella term to denote the submission of work by a student that has been produced by someone other than that student with the intention to deceive. This can be achieved through having another person, or commercial service, produce work that is subsequently submitted for an assessment, whether that person/commercial service is paid or not.

Misuse of Artificial Intelligence

Misuse of Artificial Intelligence is defined as the unauthorised or unacknowledged use of artificial intelligence tools to generate content for work submitted for assessment, unless explicit permission / guidance has been given to use them as part of the assessment method. Using GenAI tools such as ChatGPT to generate material for work submitted for assessment, without any form of editing or acknowledgement, or by not following the assessment guidelines fully, may constitute academic misconduct.

Data and source falsification

Data or source falsification involves the intentional fabrication, falsification, alteration or misrepresentation of data, sources, results or other outputs or aspects of research, including documentation and participant consent, as if they were real, to support desired outcomes or conclusions.

Research Misconduct

In a research setting, any conduct described in the “Definition of Unacceptable Research Conduct”, as part of the [Research Governance Handbook](#), Section 4.2.1, unless already covered by the [Code of Practice on Student Discipline \(Non-Academic\)](#), would be considered Research Misconduct. This may include the fabrication, falsification, plagiarism or deception in proposing, carrying out or reporting results of research, or deliberate, dangerous or negligent deviations from accepted practices in carrying out research, for example in not adhering to ethical guidelines.

Other examples of academic misconduct may include, but are not limited to:

- Use of unauthorised material to complete an assessment (e.g. use of notes or digital devices in exam settings). This also applies to the possession of mobile phones and/or any other devices on one's person during an exam where it is suspected the device has not been switched off and has been used;
- Copying from another student when under examination conditions;
- Talking to another student when under examination conditions;
- Removing an examination book from an examination room;
- Completing invigilated assessments outside the designated invigilated venue (i.e. from home)
- Impersonating another candidate in relation to any assessment;
- Permitting another person to impersonate oneself in relation to any assessment;
- Making assessment material available for another student to use to deceive, either at this Institution or at any other education establishment.

APPENDIX B

School-level Meetings and Discipline Hearings

1 Procedure when arranging a meeting/Discipline Hearing under this Code

- 1.1 The student who is the subject of action under this Code shall be informed in writing of any allegations made against them and the date, time and location of the proposed meeting/Discipline Hearing. Such meetings will be held in the appropriate way, whether on-campus or online. For School-level meetings, notice of at least five working days shall normally be given of any meeting that requires the student's attendance. For Discipline Hearings, notice of at least five working days during teaching time (ten working days outside teaching time) shall be given, unless the prior agreement with the student has been reached.
- 1.2 The student shall be provided a copy of this Code and any other relevant Codes of Practice as part of the initial communication regarding the meeting/Discipline Hearing. The student shall also be provided with copies of all written submissions which are to be considered at the hearing.
- 1.3 The student shall be invited to respond in writing to allegations but shall not be required to do so.
- 1.4 The student shall be required to confirm that they will attend the hearing on the specified date/time and provide details of any witnesses they wish to be present at the meeting/Discipline Hearing.

2 Representation

- 2.1 The student may be accompanied or represented at any meeting/Discipline Hearing by one person of their choice, provided that details of the accompanying person are submitted in advance. The Head of School/Investigating Officer has the discretion to permit additional persons to accompany the student at any meeting/ Discipline Hearing, though the student must request this, and provide details of anyone accompanying them, in advance.
- 2.2 Where a student is alleged to have committed an offence under this Code with another individual, that individual may not accompany the student at any meeting/Discipline Hearing connected with the offence. That other individual may, however, be called as a witness at the meeting by either the Head of School/Investigating Officer or the student to which the meeting/Discipline Hearing relates.
- 2.3 The University will not provide legal or other representation for students subject to proceedings under this Code. Students can seek independent advice on the application of this Code, and obtain representation at a meeting/Discipline Hearing, from Aberdeen University Students' Association.

3 Extenuating or Mitigating Circumstances

- 3.1 If a student believes that a medical condition or other personal circumstances have affected their performance in an assessment, they must notify the relevant School(s) at the first possible opportunity. The University's [Policy and Procedures on Student Absence](#) provides further information on the procedure which must be followed.
- 3.2 Where a student has not given notice of extenuating or mitigating circumstances within the required timescale, they cannot be accepted as evidence under this Code unless permitted by the Head of School after a satisfactory explanation for the delay in providing the information is given.
- 3.3 Medical or extenuating circumstances which have not been raised prior to a Discipline Hearing will not normally be accepted as evidence. If raised for the first time after the School-level Investigation has taken

place it will be at the Investigating Officer's discretion as to whether it is necessary for the Discipline Hearing to be adjourned and the evidence referred back to the Head of School to decide whether there are grounds on which to accept the late notification. The Head of School will make this decision having regard to the expected timescale for submission of such evidence and the reason for this delay. Their decision will be final. Once this decision has been taken, if the Head of School decides the case still requires further investigation under this Code, a new Discipline Hearing shall be arranged in accordance with this Code.

4 Determination of a case in the absence of the student

- 4.1 Where a student cannot attend an initial meeting/Discipline Hearing, as an alternative, they can either ask for it to be rescheduled (one change only is permitted), select another person to represent them, or submit further representations in writing, but shall not be required to do so. Where a student elects to select another person to represent them, written notification of this must be submitted to the School and/or Registry no later than two working days prior to the date of the hearing.

Meetings are permitted via MS Teams video calling or similar. Where the cost of an overseas teleconference carries a fee, the cost shall be borne by the student whose conduct is under scrutiny.

- 4.2 Where a student cannot attend an initial interview or hearing and requests that the interview or hearing be deferred to allow them to attend in person, the student cannot subsequently use the impact which the deferral of the interview or hearing may have on their academic performance as grounds for an appeal or complaint.
- 4.3 In the event that an initial interview or hearing is deferred at the request of the student the interview or hearing must be rescheduled to take place on a date normally within 6 weeks of the date originally notified to the student. If the student is unable to attend the rescheduled interview or hearing, the case will be considered, and a decision reached in the absence of the student. Under the terms of paragraph 4.1 the student can either select another person to represent them or submit further representations in writing.
- 4.4 Where a student has not informed the School/Registry in advance that they are unable to attend a meeting/Discipline Hearing, or is a no show, and has not asked for the meeting to be rescheduled will have their case considered, and a decision reached in the absence of the student.

APPENDIX C

Procedure at a Discipline Hearing

1. The Investigating Officer will outline the procedures to be followed, after which the witness(es) may be asked to leave until called to give evidence.
2. The Investigating Officer will then outline the nature of the allegation(s) against the student and confirm with them that they understand their meaning.
3. The Investigating Officer will invite the Head of the School to make a statement on behalf of the School. The Head of School making the allegation of Academic Misconduct may, at this stage, present supporting evidence to the Investigating Officer. Supporting evidence may include oral testimony of witnesses or previously submitted written evidence.
4. The Investigating Officer will invite the student to state whether they admit or deny the allegation(s) and will then ask them to make a statement in response to the Head of School and the allegation made against them.
5. The student and/or the student's representative may, at this stage, present supporting evidence to the Investigating Officer. Evidence may include oral evidence of witnesses or written submissions.
6. The student and/or their representative will be invited to address questions through the Investigating Officer to any witness(es) on their statement(s) and on their written submissions at the time they give their evidence to the Discipline Hearing after which they shall be asked to leave until formally dismissed by the Investigating Officer or the Clerk.
7. The Investigating Officer will take the opportunity to seek clarification on any points raised.
8. The student and/or their representative will be invited to give a concluding statement.
9. When all statements have been made, all witnesses heard and all questioning completed, all persons present other than the Investigating Officer and the Clerk must leave the meeting. The Clerk remains with the Investigating Officer solely for the purpose of recording the Investigating Officer's decision and takes no part in the decision-making process.
10. The Investigating Officer will consider the evidence and reach a decision, which will be communicated to the student in writing, normally within five working days.
11. Where the Investigating Officer feels the need to obtain additional supporting evidence or clarification from another party, the normal decision-making framework may be delayed. The student will be advised of any delay and, where possible, the student will be advised of this at the end of the Discipline Hearing.
12. Having reviewed any additional evidence or clarification the Investigating Officer can decide to issue his final decision through the Clerk or can ask for the Discipline Hearing to be reconvened as soon as possible to present his or her findings and reach a final decision.

APPENDIX D

Professional, Statutory and Regulatory Body (PSRB) Frameworks

School of Medicine, Medical Sciences and Nutrition

General Medical Council

General Dental Council

Nursing and Midwifery Council

Health and Care Professions Council