STRICTLY CONFIDENTIAL

This form is intended to report incidents of suspected academic misconduct arising in multiple submissions for a single assessment on a single course.

All suspected cases of academic misconduct should be discussed with the Course Organiser and reported to the relevant School Academic Misconduct Officer (SAMO) in the first instance. The SAMO will decide whether the case can be handled at School level or should be referred to the College Academic Misconduct Officer (CAMO).

Please note that if the cases are formally investigated the students will be provided with a copy of the relevant part of the report, with other students anonymised as appropriate.

1. Staff details

| Name of staff member reporting the suspected offence |  |
| Role (e.g. Course Organiser / Marker) |  |
| Course organiser (if different) |  |
| Name of SAMO |  |

| Course organiser signature | Date |
| SAMO signature | Date |

2. Assessment details

| Course affected (Credits) |  |
| Name of assessment |  |
| Proportion of course (%) |  |
| Convenor of Course Board of Examiners | Convenor informed? |
| Convenor of Progression Board of Examiners (if different) | Convenor informed? |

Required attachments: Please attach one copy of the assessment instructions, including any specific warnings about academic misconduct that was included within them or the course documentation. Please also provide a copy of tutor-supplied material that forms part of any of the affected student-submitted work. Unless stated otherwise, it will be assumed that students were expected to work individually on the assessment.

Important note: The information provided in Section 3, read in conjunction with the attachments, should allow the sections where similarities have been identified to be located quickly and unambiguously. In some cases, the description on the form may suffice; in other
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cases, it may be necessary to highlight the relevant sections of the submissions and/or source material.

3. Incident details
Record the students suspected of misconduct below, giving each an anonymising reference code (e.g., A, B, …). State the face value mark for the work as a percentage of the mark available for the assessment, and on the same scale, the estimated absolute benefit that the student has accrued from the sections of work affected by the suspected misconduct.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Ref</th>
<th>Student name</th>
<th>Matric no</th>
<th>School &amp; Degree sought (e.g. Mathematics BSc)</th>
<th>Year on Programme</th>
<th>Face value mark (%)</th>
<th>Benefit</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
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<td></td>
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<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
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</tbody>
</table>

Add extra rows as required

Required attachments: Attach one copy of each piece of affected work submitted by each student, and of each piece of source material that may have been additionally plagiarised.

State below the similarities between submissions from the above students and other source material (if any). To facilitate anonymisation of this report, please refer to individual students using the reference code from the first column in the table above.

State below the basis on which the benefit to each student was estimated

Other relevant comments from the Course Organiser

Has a preliminary meeting been held between the students and the SAMO? YES / NO

Other relevant comments from the SAMO, including reason for referral to CAMO
4. Guidance notes

Section 1
The Course Organiser should endorse any Academic Misconduct report, even if they are not
the marker of the affected work. The Course Organiser should also seek advice from their
SAMO if any aspect of the reporting procedure is unclear.

Section 2
It is helpful for investigators to have a copy of the instructions given to students, particularly
where this includes material (e.g., code templates) that is incorporated into the student
submissions, and must be discounted from any investigation. A copy of any specific
instructions or warnings about Academic Misconduct or good scholarly practice should also
be included.

Section 3
This section can be duplicated if there are multiple groups of students submitting similar
work for the same assignment.

Please ensure that the student's name appears only in the table at the top of the page, and
use an identifying code (A, B, C or similar) to refer to them in the rest of the report. The
report can then be anonymised efficiently by blanking rows of the table.

Under School & Degree sought it is sufficient to enter the name (abbreviated if necessary) of
the student's School (e.g., Informatics, SBS etc) and the level of programme they are
enrolled on (BSc, MA, MEng, MSc etc).

Under Year enter the normal year of study on the relevant degree programme. E.g., students
who entered directly into Year 2 should be entered as “2”; visiting students following the third
year of a degree programme should be entered as “3” etc.

The Face value mark is the mark that is to be awarded if it is found that there is no case to
answer. The Benefit is an estimate of the absolute contribution to the face value mark that
arises from the sections affected by the suspected Academic Misconduct. Where similarities
between students' work are detected, the benefit should be estimated as though the affected
sections have been plagiarised from an external source. Both marks should be expressed as
a percentage of the total mark for the assessment. Example: if the face value mark is 16/20,
this should be entered as 80%. If the benefit to the student of the suspected misconduct is 8
of those 16 marks awarded, this should be entered as 40% (being 8/20).

The summary of similarities should be brief but specific. Examples: “The code in
newton_raphson.py is identical in all three submissions, excluding comments”; “All three
students solve this problem with an unusual approach that was not adopted by any other
students on the course”.

In the Other relevant comments box, the Course Organiser should note if there is any aspect
of the work where group working was permitted or expected. The default assumption is that
students are expected to work individually on all assessments, in such a way as to
demonstrate their own understanding of the course material.