

POSTGRADUATE RESEARCH MISCONDUCT POLICY (FOR STUDENTS ON UNIVERSITY OF BRIGHTON VALIDATED PROGRAMMES)

Introduction

1. The University of Suffolk is responsible for ensuring that the research it supports is carried out legally, in the public interest and in accordance with best practice. The approach is aligned with the [UUK Concordat to Support Research Integrity \(2025\)](#) and the five commitments that provide assurances that research in the UK continues to be underpinned by the highest standards of rigour and integrity.

2. The University expects all postgraduate research students to:
 - carry out their research with rigour, respect and integrity
 - be familiar and act in accordance with the conventions of academic writing, including appropriate referencing of sources and acknowledgement of assistance
 - show understanding of relevant ethical, legal and professional frameworks, obligations and standards, and be compliant with associated University policies and procedures including the Research and Knowledge Exchange Ethics Governance Framework.

3. The University is committed to promoting and supporting a culture of research integrity that discourages unacceptable behaviour by dealing seriously and sensitively with all allegations of research misconduct. To this end, the University will take action against any postgraduate research degree student falling within the scope of this policy who contravenes the University's requirements and expectations, whether inadvertently or through negligence or deliberate intent.

4. This document sets out the principles and procedures for making, managing and investigating allegations of research misconduct by postgraduate research students.

Scope

5. This policy applies to postgraduate research students at the University of Suffolk who are registered with the University of Brighton as the awarding body. This policy does not apply to postgraduate research students who are registered for awards of the University of East Anglia or the University of Essex. Such students will be subject to the relevant research misconduct policy for their awarding institution.

6. There is no time limit beyond which research misconduct will not be investigated, although prompt referral of allegations is essential. Suspected research misconduct, whether discovered before or after conferral of the award, will be investigated and dealt with in

accordance with this policy. Where research misconduct is proven after work has been formally assessed, this may lead to the withdrawal of a conferred award.

7. Depending on the nature of the offence, students may also be subject to additional action under the University of Suffolk's [Student Discipline Procedure](#) or [Fitness to Practise Procedure](#).

Principles

8. The University of Suffolk endeavours to ensure that all policies, procedures and guidance relevant to research integrity are clear, accessible and actively promoted.

9. Ultimately, it is the student's responsibility to avoid infringements of regulations and policies and to ensure that they have behaved with academic integrity. Ignorance of this policy cannot be used to excuse infringements.

10. Any allegations will be investigated appropriately, and in accordance with the highest standards of integrity, accuracy and fairness

11. Allegations of research misconduct will be treated in the strictest confidence. No student will be recorded, or referred to, as having committed a research misconduct offence until the full investigation process has been completed and the allegation proven. Investigations will be conducted in such a way as to safeguard the confidentiality of the interested parties. Where the investigation requires contact with participants or their data, their confidentiality will be maintained.

Research integrity expectations

12. The University expects postgraduate research students to follow good practice in research, in line with the principles and standards outlined by the [UK Research Integrity Office \(UKRIO\)](#) and the [UUK Concordat to Support Research Integrity](#).

13. Postgraduate research students should:

- recognise their responsibility to conduct research of high ethical standards
- complete any mandatory research ethics training
- take responsibility for ensuring that their knowledge on the frameworks, standards and obligations that apply to their work remains up to date
- be aware of the University's requirements and expectations on good practice in research, and design, conduct and report research in ways that embed integrity and ethical practice

throughout

- work with their supervisory team to ensure that they have the necessary training, resources and support to conduct their research, and
- act in good faith with regard to allegations of research misconduct, whether in making allegations or in being required to participate in an investigation, and take reasonable steps to ensure the recommendations made by research misconduct panels are implemented.

Definition of research misconduct

14. The Concordat to Support Research Integrity defines misconduct in research as “behaviours or actions that fall short of the standards of ethics, research and scholarship required to ensure that the integrity of research is upheld. It can cause harm to people and the environment, wastes resources, undermines the research record and damages the credibility of research.”

15. Research misconduct can take many forms including but not limited to:

- using other people’s ideas, intellectual property or work without their permission and/or acknowledging their input (plagiarism)
- breaching legal, ethical and professional requirements needed for research, for example those needed for human research participants, animals, or human organs or tissue used in research, or for the protection of the environment (including proceeding with research without ethical approval or not obtaining informed consent)
- proceeding with research without necessary permissions and approvals in place
- making up data or results, or other aspect of the research such as participant consent (fabrication)
- manipulating and/or selecting research processes, materials, equipment, data etc. to present a false impression or outcome (falsification)
- misrepresenting data or other information
- failing to declare or appropriately manage conflicts of interest
- any breach of data protection legislation or failure to follow accepted procedures or to exercise due care in carrying out responsibilities for the proper handling of privileged or private information on individuals or organisations collected during the research
- improper conduct in peer review (or equivalent) of research proposals, results, manuscripts or other processes
- intentional damage to, or removal of, the research-related property of another
- improper dealing with allegations of misconduct

- intentional non-compliance with the terms and conditions governing the award of external funding for research; the University's policies and procedures relating to research, including accounting requirements, ethics, and health and safety regulations; or any other legal or ethical requirements for the conduct of research.

16. For the avoidance of doubt, misconduct in research includes acts of omission as well as acts of commission.

17. Genuine mistakes, authentic academic/scientific error, reasonable differences in approach and methodology and honest disagreement, unless there is an intention to deceive, do not constitute research misconduct. These are defined by UKRIO as 'questionable research practices'. Such issues should normally be raised with the person concerned or their supervisor.

PROCESS FOR DEALING WITH SUSPECTED CASES OF RESEARCH MISCONDUCT (STAGE 1: SCHOOL / RESEARCH INSTITUTE ACTIVITY)

18. A concern about the conduct of the research undertaken by a postgraduate research student should be raised in the first instance in writing with the Associate Dean or nominee within the relevant academic school or the relevant Research Institute Director or nominee (herein referred to as the "Responsible Officer"). If for any reason it is inappropriate for the allegation to be made to the Associate Dean or the Research Institute Director or their nominees, including because of them having any connection with the student and/or the research concerned, then the allegation should instead be raised with the Executive Dean of the relevant academic school.

19. The person raising the concern is herein referred to as the "Initiator". It is the responsibility of the Initiator to clearly set out the nature of their suspicions and provide supporting evidence showing how and where the suspected infringement has taken place.

Consideration by the Responsible Officer

20. Upon receipt of any reports of suspected research misconduct, the Responsible Officer will consider the evidence provided and decide how to proceed.

21. Having reviewed the evidence, the Responsible Officer will decide that either:

- no offence has been committed
- there is insufficient evidence of an offence
- there is evidence of poor research practice that does not meet the ideal standard but does

- not reach the definition of research misconduct (see paragraph 17), or
- there is sufficient evidence of research misconduct that requires further investigation.

22. The Responsible Officer will take such actions as are required (i.e. for safety, statutory, regulatory or contractual reasons) and to secure all relevant records, materials and locations. Suspension of research or other restrictions may also be relevant in some cases. In the case of any allegation made against a student undertaking the thesis examination process, the examination will be suspended until the completion of the investigation process. Furthermore, students will not be able to submit their thesis for examination whilst being investigated under this policy, until such time as the investigation has been completed.

Action if no offence is deemed to have been committed

23. If the Responsible Officer decides that no research misconduct has taken place or that there is insufficient evidence of research misconduct, they shall confirm the outcome in writing to the Initiator. No further action will be taken with the student.

Action if poor research practice is identified

24. If the Responsible Officer decides that there is evidence of poor research practice that may be resolved informally through education or training, they shall confirm the outcome in writing to the Initiator, notify the student's supervisory team and arrange for the student to be provided with further support and guidance to avoid any similar concerns about their research practice in future. A formal written warning may be issued where deemed appropriate by the Responsible Officer, and the student may be required to resubmit draft work with minor amendments (see Appendix B for guidance on possible outcomes and penalties).

Actions if research misconduct is deemed to have been committed

25. If the Responsible Officer decides that there is sufficient evidence that an offence may have been committed, they shall proceed to a formal allegation.

26. To proceed to a formal allegation, the Responsible Officer should complete the Allegation of Research Misconduct form and collate the relevant supporting evidence. The completed Allegation of Research Misconduct form and supporting documentation should be submitted to the Office for Student Appeals, Complaints and Conduct (OSACC) for the formal allegation to be put to the student.

27. Following notification to the student of an allegation by OSACC, the Responsible Officer should ensure the student is provided with support to enable them to understand the allegation

and respond appropriately, including signposting them to the Students' Union Advice Service.

28. The Head of the Doctoral College at the University of Brighton will be notified of all formal allegations of research misconduct.

29. Where contractually required, third parties such as funding bodies must be informed of allegations of research misconduct and kept updated at all subsequent stages. Consideration should be given as to whether any other collaborators need to be informed or consulted. The Responsible Officer should bear in mind the requirements of the Data Protection Act when considering what information to release, and should seek advice from the University's Data Governance Team where required.

30. If the alleged misconduct could constitute a criminal offence, then the police should be informed at the appropriate time. The Responsible Officer should inform the Academic Registrar, who will liaise with the Pro Vice-Chancellor Research and Knowledge Exchange and the Head of the Doctoral College at the University of Brighton prior to notifying the police. If the police become involved in the matter, their advice should be sought as to whether to suspend the internal investigation while they carry out their own enquiries.

31. If the alleged misconduct concerns a matter related to the safeguarding of children, young people or vulnerable adults, the procedure outlined in the [Safeguarding Policy](#) should be followed. In these circumstances, the early advice of the Designated Safeguarding Officer should be sought before any action is taken.

PROCESS FOR DEALING WITH SUSPECTED CASES OF RESEARCH MISCONDUCT (STAGE 2: FORMAL ALLEGATION)

32. Upon receipt of the Allegation of Research Misconduct form and supporting documentation from the Responsible Officer, OSACC will undertake a review to determine whether the form is fully completed with appropriate supporting evidence included. OSACC may request additional evidence and/or clarification upon review of the allegation. Should OSACC request additional evidence to support an allegation, this should be provided in a timely manner and within the deadline issued by OSACC.

33. Where an allegation has met the above requirements, OSACC shall write to the student concerned to:

- put the allegation as defined by the Responsible Officer to the student

- request a written statement in response to the allegation and submission of any evidence they deem appropriate
- signpost support available to the student to enable them to respond, which may include support from their supervisory team and the Students' Union Advice Service
- request a reply within ten working days of the date on which the email is sent
- enclose a copy of this policy
- enclose copies of any evidence or reports.

34. Where reasonable adjustments are required, a student may be permitted to attend the Research Misconduct Panel or meet with the Delegated Chair to present evidence in person (this may be by physical attendance or remote attendance via MS Teams or other appropriate means). The decision as to whether to permit a student to attend will be made by the Chair of the Panel.

35. OSACC will review and refer cases as appropriate to the Research Misconduct Panel or delegated Chair of the Research Misconduct Panel for consideration.

36. For allegations deemed potentially less serious (for example a first instance of plagiarism or a first instance of misrepresentation of data which is judged to have been owing to error, misunderstanding or other extenuating circumstances), a Delegated Chair of a Research Misconduct Panel can consider allegations in conjunction with OSACC.

37. Upon review, if OSACC and/or the Delegated Chair find that an allegation is sufficiently serious or complex to require further examination by a Research Misconduct Panel, the case will be referred to a Panel for consideration. A meeting of the Panel will be arranged (see Appendix A for the composition and proceedings of a panel). This will normally take place no later than twenty working days after the date of the notification putting the formal allegation to the student.

38. The Panel or the Delegated Chair will seek to determine whether there is evidence that research misconduct occurred and its level of intent and seriousness. The Panel or the Delegated Chair can, if judged necessary, require the student or other members of the University to produce files, notebooks, raw data, algorithms and other records to inform the investigation.

39. The Panel or the Delegated Chair should meet the student (and the Initiator where appropriate), plus others as necessary, as part of their investigation. Both the student and the Initiator have the right to submit evidence orally and in writing. The student must be given the

opportunity to respond to the allegation and to comment on all of the evidence gathered by the Panel or Delegated Chair.

40. The student has the right to be accompanied at meetings by a supporter. A supporter is defined as a member of staff of the University of Suffolk or the relevant partner institution, or a registered student of the University, or a member of staff or sabbatical officer of the Students' Union. The role of the supporter is to act as an observer, give moral support and to assist the complainant to make their case. A supporter should not normally answer questions on behalf of the student or speak for the student. In addition, where reasonable adjustments are required, a complainant may be accompanied by a further supporter, for example a sign language communicator or a notetaker.

41. The Panel or the Delegated Chair has the authority to determine:

- a. that no offence has been committed
- b. that there is insufficient evidence of an offence
- c. that it is a case of poor research practice that may be resolved informally through education and training
- d. that an offence of misconduct in research has been committed.

42. In determining whether an offence has been committed, the judgement will be made on the balance of probability.

43. The University does not normally accept a student's medical or personal circumstances as an excuse or reason for research misconduct. However, where the Delegated Chair or Panel deems that the evidenced circumstances have severely impaired the student's capacity for rational judgement, the Delegated Chair or Panel may take account of the circumstances in determining the outcome.

44. The Delegated Chair reserves the right to refer an allegation to a full Panel for consideration if the allegation is deemed too serious to resolve by action within the decision-making powers of the Delegated Chair and/or if the investigation requires a panel hearing.

45. If the Delegated Chair or Panel finds that there is no case to answer, OSACC will inform the student accordingly, and all record of the alleged research misconduct will be removed from the student's record. The Responsible Officer, PGR Course Leader within the relevant academic school, the student administration team within Registry Services and the Head of the Doctoral College at the University of Brighton will be informed of the decision, and steps should be taken

to sustain the reputation of the student and the relevant research project.

46. If the Delegated Chair or Panel finds that it is a case of poor research practice rather than research misconduct, OSACC will inform the student accordingly and outline the actions to be taken to rectify the matter as agreed by the Delegated Chair or Panel (see Appendix B for suggested outcomes and penalties). A formal written warning may be issued where deemed appropriate by the Delegated Chair or Panel, and the student may be required to resubmit draft work with minor amendments. The Responsible Officer, PGR Course Leader within the relevant academic school, the student administration team within Registry Services and the Head of the Doctoral College at the University of Brighton will be informed of the decision. The Responsible Officer will arrange for the student to be provided with further support and guidance to avoid any similar concerns about their research practice in future, in accordance with paragraph 24.

47. If the Delegated Chair or Panel find that an offence of research misconduct has been committed, they will determine what action can be taken to rectify the matter, both in terms of the student's behaviour and correction of the research record (including notification to relevant third parties as outlined in paragraphs 51 and 52 below). Appendix B includes examples of outcomes and penalties that could be applied to the student. Other recommended actions may include steps to address any procedural matters that the investigation has brought to light, or giving consideration to the role of the student's supervisor(s) in fulfilling their responsibilities such that it may be appropriate (in rare cases if significant failing proven) to recommend training or disciplinary action be taken against the supervisor(s) and/ or preserve the academic reputation of the University. The Delegated Chair or Panel may recommend that the student is referred for consideration under the University of Suffolk [Student Discipline Procedure](#).

48. The decision of the Panel or the Delegated Chair as to whether an offence has been committed is final and will be reported to the student, the Responsible Officer, PGR Course Leader within the relevant academic school, the student administration team within Registry Services and the Head of the Doctoral College at the University of Brighton.

Notification to student

49. The decision of the Panel or the Delegated Chair will be communicated to the student in writing via OSACC within five working days of the Panel meeting or within five working days of the decision of the Delegated Chair.

50. The notification to the student will include the decision, the rationale for the decision, and the recommended action to rectify the matter, both in terms of the student's behaviour and

correction of the research record. The notification will also outline any other implications for the decision and associated next steps (including the steps outlined in paragraphs 51 and 52 below regarding notification to relevant third parties).

Notification to relevant third parties

51. If an allegation of research misconduct has been upheld, relevant third parties must be informed so that appropriate action can be taken as required. This may include funding bodies, relevant regulatory or professional bodies, relevant partner organisations, or editors of journals in which the student has published articles (for example if there have been publications that have been plagiarised from elsewhere or which include flawed, falsified or fraudulent data).

52. If the student has obtained any qualification through proven misconduct, then a recommendation should be made to the awarding body that the qualification is revoked.

APPEALS PROCEDURE

Grounds for appeal

53. A student may appeal against the verdict of research misconduct, and/or the actions and penalties imposed as a consequence of the verdict, on one or more of the following grounds:

- there is new evidence, which for good reason was not previously available to the Panel or the Delegated Chair, which might have materially affected the outcome
- there was procedural irregularity in the conduct of the Stage 2 investigation
- there is evidence of prejudice and/or bias during the conduct of the investigation
- on the balance of probabilities, the facts of the case did not justify the decision that the student had committed an offence of research misconduct
- the action(s)/penalty imposed was unreasonable with regard to all the circumstances of the case.

Submitting an appeal

54. The student must submit a completed Research Misconduct Appeal form and any supporting evidence to OSACC within ten working days of the notification of the outcome of the Stage 2 investigation. The student should contact OSACC immediately if they are unable to meet this deadline. The Academic Registrar (or nominee) will determine whether a late appeal can be accepted.

55. The Research Misconduct Appeal form is available on the University of Suffolk website. The student must state the grounds on which they wish to appeal and must include all necessary supporting evidence and documentation.

56. The Academic Registrar (or nominee) has the right to request additional written evidence from the student and/or staff and to include such additional evidence as is deemed conducive to reaching a better-informed judgement.

57. OSACC will acknowledge receipt of the appeal and undertake an initial assessment in consultation with the Academic Registrar (or nominee) to check that the appeal meets at least one of the grounds in paragraph 53 and that the form is fully completed with necessary supporting evidence and submitted within the required timeframe. If one or more of these are not met, the Academic Registrar (or nominee) may reject the appeal or ask the student for further clarification and/or additional evidence.

58. Where the appeal has been submitted outside of the timeframe as detailed in paragraph 54, it will not normally be considered without good reason for the delay. The Academic Registrar (or nominee) will determine whether a late appeal can be accepted. This decision will be final. If a late appeal is not accepted, the student will be issued with a Completion of Procedures letter normally within twenty working days of receipt of the appeal.

59. Where additional evidence and/or clarification is requested from the student, this should be submitted to OSACC by the given deadline. Should it not be received by this date, the appeal will be assessed on the evidence provided with the original submission.

60. Following the initial assessment, the Academic Registrar (or nominee) will determine whether the appeal should be considered by a Postgraduate Research Misconduct Appeal Panel or, in consultation with the Head of the Doctoral College at the University of Brighton or nominee, be rejected.

Consideration by a Research Misconduct Appeal Panel

61. Where the Academic Registrar (or nominee) determines that an appeal should be considered by a Research Misconduct Appeal Panel, a Panel will be convened with different membership to the original Research Misconduct Panel. The Panel should include a senior representative of the University of Brighton not previously involved in the case. The Panel will normally meet within twenty working days of receipt of the appeal.

62. OSACC will inform the student of the date of the Panel meeting where their appeal will be considered and the date by which they should normally expect to be advised of the Panel's decision.

63. A representative from OSACC will be in attendance to guide procedurally and to ensure consistency in decision making. OSACC will also record the Panel's decision and justification for that decision.

64. The Panel will consider all appeals based only on the documentary evidence provided. In exceptional cases, for example where reasonable adjustments are required or where the interpretation of evidence is disputed, a student may be permitted to attend the meeting to present evidence in person (this may be by physical attendance or remote attendance via MS Teams or other appropriate means). The decision as to whether to permit a student to attend will be made by the Head of Student Complaints and Conduct (OSACC) in consultation with the Chair of the Panel.

65. The student may be accompanied at such a meeting by a supporter. A supporter is defined as a member of staff of the University of Suffolk, or a registered student of the University, or a member of staff or sabbatical officer of the Students' Union. The role of a supporter is to act as an observer, give moral support and assist the student to make their case. A supporter should not normally answer questions on behalf of the student or speak for the student. In addition, where reasonable adjustments are required, a student may be accompanied by a further supporter, for example a sign language communicator or a notetaker.

66. OSACC will provide the Panel with the documentation submitted by the student and any additional evidence gathered in accordance with paragraph 56 prior to the meeting of the Panel. The Chair of the Panel may also request that additional evidence be gathered prior to the Panel meeting in order to ensure that all information needed to make an informed decision is made available to the Panel.

67. At any time during the panel meeting, the Chair of the Panel may decide to suspend a decision relating to an appeal in order to seek more evidence.

68. With limited exceptions (for example, where information cannot be disclosed because of the University's obligations under the GDPR), all written material considered by the Panel under this procedure will be accessible to the student if requested.

69. The Panel, having considered the evidence, will decide whether the appeal should be justified, partially justified, or not justified.

70. The decision of the Research Misconduct Appeal Panel is final and will be reported to the student, the Responsible Officer, the PGR Course Leader within the relevant academic school, the student administration team within Registry Services and the Head of the Doctoral College at the University of Brighton in writing. The response to the student will be through a Completion of Procedures letter and will include the decision with regard to the appeal, the reasons for the decision, and, if the appeal is justified (in part or in full), notice of any specific action to be taken by way of remedy.

Rejection of appeals

71. Where the Academic Registrar (or nominee) determines that the appeal should be rejected under paragraph 60, the appeal will be referred to the Head of the Doctoral College at the University of Brighton (or nominee) for consideration.

72. If the Head of the Doctoral College at the University of Brighton (or nominee) determines that the appeal should be considered by a Research Misconduct Appeal Panel, the appeal should proceed in accordance with paragraphs 61 to 70.

73. If the Head of the Doctoral College at the University of Brighton (or nominee) confirms that the appeal should be rejected, the student will be informed in writing of the outcome of their appeal through the issue of a Completion of Procedures (COP) letter. Students can expect to receive this letter from OSACC within twenty-five working days of receipt of the appeal.

74. If the appeal is rejected or found not justified, this decision is final and there is no further right of appeal within the University of Suffolk or the University of Brighton. Students may be able to seek an external review by the OIA (see paragraph 75).

Further right to appeal

75. Students who are dissatisfied with the outcome of their appeal against a verdict of research misconduct may be able to seek a review by the Office of the Independent Adjudicator for Higher Education (OIA) should the case be eligible under the OIA's rules (see <http://www.oiahe.org.uk/>). Details will be provided in the Completion of Procedures letter advising the student of the final outcome of their appeal.

Monitoring and evaluation

76. Cases of research misconduct will be reported annually to the Equality and Diversity and Inclusion Committee, Research and Knowledge Exchange Committee and Senate. The reports will include equality monitoring data.

APPENDIX A: MEETING OF THE RESEARCH MISCONDUCT PANEL

1. The Research Misconduct Panel shall comprise:
 - Pro Vice-Chancellor for Research and Knowledge Exchange or nominee (Chair)
 - at least two members of academic staff with relevant expertise and disciplinary knowledge who have not had any previous involvement in the case or in supporting and/or supervising the student, and do not have any other conflict of interest (one of whom should be a representative of the University of Brighton).
2. A representative from OSACC will be in attendance to guide procedurally and to ensure consistency in decision making and record the Panel's decision and justification for that decision.
3. If it is agreed that the student will attend the Research Misconduct Panel, OSACC will write to the student and the student will normally be given at least five working days' notice of the panel meeting. OSACC will inform the student, via email, of the date, time and venue (if applicable) of the meeting. The meeting will normally take place virtually via MS Teams.
4. The student may be accompanied at the meeting by a supporter. A supporter is defined as a member of staff of the University of Suffolk or one of its partner institutions, or a registered student of the University, or a member of staff or sabbatical officer of the Students' Union. The role of the supporter is to act as an observer, give moral support and to assist the student to make their case. A supporter should not normally answer questions on behalf of the student or speak for the student. In addition, where reasonable adjustments are required, a student may be accompanied by a further supporter, for example a sign language communicator or a notetaker.
5. If the student does not attend the meeting, the Panel may proceed with the consideration of the allegation in the student's absence provided the Panel is satisfied that the student has received proper and timely notification of the meeting.
6. The Chair of the Panel shall explain that the purpose of the meeting is to establish whether an offence of research misconduct has been committed. They will put the allegation to the student and make available for scrutiny any supporting evidence, the student's written or oral statement and any other relevant documentation or background information. The Panel can, if it judges necessary, require the student or other members of the University to produce files, notebooks, raw data, algorithms and other records to inform the proceedings. All documentation considered by the Panel will be shared, in advance, with the student.

7. The student will make a statement in response to the allegation, following which the members of the Panel have the right to put any questions to the student.
8. The Panel may also meet with the Initiator or other individuals relevant to the case as necessary. The Initiator has the right to submit evidence orally and in writing.
9. At any time during the meeting, the Chair of the Panel may decide to suspend proceedings in order to seek more evidence. The student will be advised of the action that will be taken and the date of the reconvened meeting.
10. If the student admits the offence at the meeting, the Chair of the Panel shall invite the student to sign a written statement to this effect.
11. At the end of the questioning, the student will be asked to leave the meeting for the Panel to deliberate and reach its decision in private.
12. The Panel shall determine its decision based on the written and oral evidence.

APPENDIX B: GUIDELINES FOR OUTCOMES, PENALTIES AND ACTIONS

The following are examples of outcomes and penalties that could be applied by a Research Misconduct Panel or Delegated Chair, following the investigation of an allegation of research misconduct against a postgraduate research student.

Poor research practice

- Referral to research ethics training
- Provision of further support and guidance to avoid any similar concerns about their research practice in future
- Formal written warning
- Requirement to resubmit the thesis drafts with minor amendments, as determined by the Panel or Delegated Chair

Minor research misconduct

- Referral to research ethics training
- Provision of further support and guidance to avoid any similar concerns about their research practice in future
- Formal written warning
- Requirement to resubmit the thesis drafts with minor amendments, as determined by the Panel or Delegated Chair

Major research misconduct

- Referral to research ethics training
- Formal written warning
- Provision of further support and guidance to avoid any similar concerns about their research practice in future
- In cases of pre-submission assessment of the thesis, requirement to resubmit the thesis drafts with amendments, as determined by the Panel or Delegated Chair
- In cases of pre-submission assessment of the thesis, requirement to resubmit the thesis with major amendments, as determined by the Panel, for consideration of a lower award (for example downgrading to an MPhil)
- Requirement for the student to be withdrawn with no qualification awarded
- Award to be rescinded (where a student has already had an award conferred)