

Guideline for the Prevention of Academic Misconduct during Examination

Faculty of Behavioural, Management & Social Sciences

Version: 1.6

Authors

Chairs of the examination boards BMS

Version overview

Version	Discussion within:	Date(s)
v1.1	Chamber of Chairs of the Examination Boards BMS	July – Aug, 2021
v1.2	Individual Examination Boards BMS	Sept – Oct, 2021
v1.3	Chamber of Chairs of the Examination Boards BMS	Nov – Dec, 2021
v1.4	Chamber of Program Directors BMS (in Dutch: OLD overleg)	Jan 24, 2022
v1.5	Revision Peter Stegmaier	31 August 2022
v1.6	Members Chamber of Chairs	06 October 2023

List of abbreviations

Abbreviation	Abbreviated term
BMS	Behavioural, Management and Social Sciences
EB	Examination Board
ILO	Intended Learning Outcome
OLD	Opleidingsdirecteur (in English: Programme Director)
PMT	Programme Management Team

1. INTRODUCTION

This document presents guidelines for the prevention of academic misconduct during examination (i.e., the assessment of students' knowledge, understanding and skills) within the Faculty of Behavioural, Management and Sciences (BMS). Limiting academic misconduct risks is important for multiple reasons, including: safeguarding the quality of individual tests, acknowledging examinees who act in good faith, instilling scientific integrity in students, and upholding the validity of diplomas/degrees. In line with their responsibility to safeguard assessment quality, and per request of the BMS Faculty Board, the four BMS Examination Boards (EBs) jointly drafted a guideline that bundles best practices to examiners, program management teams (PMTs), students, and individual EBs for limiting academic misconduct risks during examination.

The current academic misconduct prevention guideline departs from the idea that (i) different types of assessment are conducive to (ii) selected types of academic misconduct that can be prevented by activities which are underpinned by (iii) four pillars, and which are (iv) executed by a group of stakeholders – as discussed next.

1.1. Types of assessment

The academic misconduct prevention guideline is geared towards limiting academic misconduct risks associated with the following types of assessment:

- Written, time-limited tests that take place on-campus or remotely;
- Individual assignments (which may involve empirical data collection) such as graduation projects, internships, practical assignments or essays;
- Group assignments (which may involve empirical data collection) such as project work and reports.

1.2. Types of academic misconduct

In line with the UT student charter, the following actions are considered to be fraudulent (see Appendix A for a complete overview):

1. During the examination, a student uses (any form of) assistance, resource or device that is prohibited by the examiner or invigilator prior to the start of the study unit and/or test;
2. A student behaves in a manner that has been classified as cheating or prohibited before the start of the study unit and/or test;
3. A student engages in other kinds of cheating, including:
 - a. manipulation of research data;
 - b. falsifying of research data (e.g., by filling in questionnaires or by answering interview questions him- or herself);
 - c. 'free-riding'; i.e., not at all or hardly contributing to a group assignment.
4. Plagiarism is a particular kind of academic misconduct, occurring when the student uses someone else's work without correct referencing.

Academic misconduct is the violation of scientific integrity. The guidelines laid down in this fraud prevention guideline are specifically targeted at limiting academic misconduct risks and upholding integrity related to *examination*. Scientific integrity that is not related to examination is discussed elsewhere (e.g. Code of Ethics University of Twente) and not taken into account here.

1.3. Four 'academic misconduct prevention pillars'

Fraudulent behavior in educational settings is shown to be contingent on three conditions, that is: the opportunity, motivation and rationalization of academic misconduct (i.e., the so-called 'fraud triangle'; Ramos, 2003). This means that academic misconduct risks increase in case when assessment leaves room for academic misconduct, when students are incentivized to commit academic misconduct, and/or when fraudulent behavior is justifiable to students (Connolly et al., 2006; King et al., 2009). To address these risks, we follow the academic literature which recommends to base academic misconduct prevention on four pillars (Duggan, 2006; Park, 2003):

- 1) **Inform and Educate:** In the first place, this pillar involves educating students about good practice – as a positive effort of academic misconduct prevention. It concerns – amongst other – informing students about (the moral and epistemic rationale of) academic integrity, giving the right example as examiners/teachers, and building students' referencing and paraphrasing skills. Students learn how to work properly and thereby get good results, so they don't have to commit academic misconduct in the first place. In the second place, it involves teaching students about (academic) misconduct, sharing rules of order for testing, and informing students about the consequences of fraudulent behavior.
- 2) **Design and Organize:** This pillar involves the design and organization of assessment. A poor test design and poor test organization offers opportunities to commit academic misconduct, while well-designed and executed tests may disincentivize students to engage in fraudulent behavior. Accordingly, fraud prevention by means of a sound assessment of design/organization includes, but is not limited to, the use of guidelines on the reuse of assessment materials, invigilation, the execution of rules of order for (online) testing, cover sheet usage, and a fit between learning goals, learning activities and testing.
- 3) **Detection:** This pillar centers on the detection of fraudulent behaviors. Specifically, it focuses on the detection of plagiarism and data fabrication as well as collecting evidence that substantiates cheating during (written) tests. This serves at least two goals: (i) to disincentive students to commit academic misconduct and (ii) to support the examination board in investigating suspicion of academic misconduct (see Pillar 4)
- 4) **Sanctioning:** The final pillar involves the investigation of suspicion of academic misconduct and – if academic misconduct has been proven – the sanctioning of fraudulent behavior. The sanctioning of academic misconduct is the exclusive responsibility of the examination board(s). Examiners are responsible for notifying the examination board about a suspicion of academic misconduct and for submitting evidence that enables the examination board to investigate the potential academic misconduct case.

1.4. Actors involved in academic misconduct prevention

The prevention of academic misconduct is a joint responsibility of multiple stakeholders. These stakeholders include, but are not excluded to, the following actors that carry the below-mentioned responsibilities:

- Students – e.g., familiarizing themselves with rules, acting with integrity during tests, and notifying examiners of possible impediments to proper examination;
- Examiners – e.g., informing students, designing/organizing tests, reporting suspicion of academic misconduct;
- Program management teams – e.g., informing and educating students, drafting/implementing guidelines on the organization of assessment;
- Information specialists and librarians – e.g., offering tools to detect academic misconduct, offering education on plagiarism and the responsible use of AI tools;

- Educational specialists – e.g., screening of test design/organization, evaluating the fit between assessment activities and learning goals/activities;
- Faculty board – e.g., offering organizational and financial support for organizing tests and detecting academic misconduct;
- Examination boards – e.g., informing students and degree programmes, drafting rules of order, and sanctioning academic misconduct.
- The Exam Office – e.g., implementing academic misconduct prevention rules during written exams.

In line with the above, the remainder of the academic misconduct prevention guideline suggests measures to prevent academic misconduct per assessment type and the actors involved.

2. PREVENTION OF ACADEMIC MISCONDUCT IN WRITTEN TESTS

Prevention of academic misconduct in on-campus (analogue and digital) tests

Type of academic misconduct	Measures to prevent academic misconduct	Responsible actor(s)
academic misconduct – in general	Ensure fit between ILOs, learning activities and examination	- PMT - Examiner
	Inform students about rules of order for testing	- EB sets rules, publishes them online - PMTs: at start of academic year - Examiners: two weeks prior to test
	Inform students about consequences of academic misconduct	- EB (via website)
	Reporting suspicion of academic misconduct	- Examiner: makes report - EB: report template + decision tree
	Sanctioning of academic misconduct	- EB
	Oral test after written test: establish test-retest reliability	- Examiner
	Use of cover sheet, including integrity statement and compliance with rules of order for testing	- EB publishes template cover sheet - Examiner uses adapted cover sheet
	Education of examiners on academic misconduct regulation and handling	- PMTs - CELT (e.g., UTQ) - EBs
Cheating – using prohibited support (e.g., materials and resources)	Check for prohibited devices (e.g., smart watches, earphones, phones)	- Examiner/invigilator
	Check for prohibited analogue material (e.g., notes)	- Examiner/invigilator
	Keep time limit of exams within 90 minutes to omit the need for toilet breaks	- Examiner - PMT
	Use different exam versions to discourage copying from other students	- Examiner
	Make sure to set students far enough apart to discourage communication and copying	- Exam Office
	Check allowed brought in materials for notes	- Examiner/invigilator
Cheating – identity fraud/ghost writing	ID check	- Examiner/invigilator
	Sign up check	- Examiner/Exam Office: sign up list - Examiner/invigilator checks signed up students
Fraud – theft of exam material	Check whether students hand/handed in all materials and notes	- Examiner/invigilator
	Check for prohibited devices during exam and inspection	- Examiner/invigilator
	Check exam results for unexpected results and plagiarism	- Examiner
	Minimize recycling of (recent) exam materials	- Examiner
	Regularly update item bank and exam materials	- Examiner
	Sign up check	- Examiner/Exam Office: sign up list - Examiner/invigilator checks signed up students

Prevention of academic misconduct in remote, online tests

In general, audit committees recommend that online distance exams be used sparingly for assessing learning goals at the level of knowledge and understanding (by means of multiple-choice questions) as well as tests that require mathematical notation.

Type of academic misconduct	Measures to prevent academic misconduct	Responsible actor
Academic misconduct – in general	Ensure fit between ILOs, learning activities and examination	- PMT - Examiner
	Inform students about rules of order for testing	- EB sets rules, publishes them online - PMTs: at start of academic year - Examiners: two weeks prior to test
	Inform students about consequences of academic misconduct	- EB (via website)
	Reporting suspicion of academic misconduct	- Examiner: makes report - EB: report template & decision tree
	Sanctioning academic misconduct	- Exam Board
	Oral test after written test: establish test-retest reliability	- Examiner
	Use of cover sheet, including integrity statement and compliance with rules of order for testing	- EB drafts cover sheet - Examiner uses adapted cover sheet
Cheating – using prohibited materials/ resources and support/communicating with others	To use open book format	- Examiner
	To use open/essay questions at level of application, synthesis and/or evaluation (not knowledge and understanding)	- Examiner
	To set strict, but fair time limit	- Examiner
	To develop different versions of the test and questions in random order	- Examiner
	Online proctoring (including screen capture)	- EB drafts rules - Examiner/invigilator
	Default use of lock-down browser technology	- E-assessment team
	Plagiarism check	- E-assessment supplies software - As long as Remindo or other software packages do not support the UT-standard plagiarism check, examiners must check students' written test papers themselves in Turnitin. - Examiner checks plagiarism score
Cheating – ghost writing/ identify fraud	Identity check	- Examiner/invigilator: ID check - Exam Office: list with names & photos of students
	(To inform students about) comparison of handwriting with that of previous tests (for hand-written math tests)	- Examiner - Exam Office previous tests

3. PREVENTION OF ACADEMIC MISCONDUCT IN INDIVIDUAL ASSIGNMENTS (INCL. GRADUATION PROJECT)

Type of academic misconduct	Measures to prevent academic misconduct	Responsible actor
Academic misconduct – in general	Ensure fit between ILOs, learning activities and examination	- PMT - Examiner
	Inform students about consequences of academic misconduct	- EB (via website)
	Reporting suspicion of academic misconduct	- Examiner: makes report - EB: report template & decision tree
	Sanctioning academic misconduct	- EB
	Study units or propaedeutic units within regular study units on academic integrity, responsible use of AI, referencing, and paraphrasing	- Examiners - PMT - Librarians
Plagiarism – presenting work of others without attribution	Plagiarism scan	- Examiner
	Informing students upon the start of an educational programme about plagiarism and responsible use of AI; repeating information and providing in depth examples upon the start of thesis	- Examiner - PMT, thesis track coordinators
	Giving right example (e.g., reference on PPT slides; showing personal best practices)	- Examiner
	Formative feedback	- Examiner
Plagiarism – ghost writing / contract cheating	Create the test in such a way that another person who has not taken the study unit can hardly write it.	- Examiner
	Intermediary feedback meetings	- Examiner - PMT
	Keeping up to date and preparing reports to keep examination boards and programmes abreast of new developments (e.g., on Youtube, websites, etc.)	- Education specialists - ICT - Library
Plagiarism - referring to literature that one has not read oneself	Informing students that they are expected to read the literature they cite	- Thesis coordinators - PMT
	Checking references at random and asking the student to explain during meetings	- Examiner
	Including plagiarism check as a mandatory component of graduation forms or other evaluation forms.	- PMT
	For smaller assignments – reflecting this in the grade if it occurs in a final assignment.	- PMT - Examiner
Plagiarism – resubmitting work of other students	To include rule in program-specific appendix to EER	- PMT
	Informing students that old student work is included in the scan	- Examiner, PMT: make sure work is submitted via Canvas or other means & checked, & included in plagiarism databases
	Plagiarism scan	- Examiner

		- Education & IT (software selected needs to meet our requirements or provider be changed)
	Keeping a database of old student work	- PMT - Exam Office
	Making sure that assignments are submitted via Canvas or in another way whereby they can be checked (not via email).	- Examiner - PMT
Data manipulation	Data check	- Examiner
	Formative feedback	- Examiner
	Plagiarism scan to see where data has previously been used and looked differently	- Examiner - Education & IT (software selected needs to meet our requirements or provider be changed)
Data fabrication	Data check by examiner + (for research with human subjects: ethics review process)	- Student: submits data to examiner - Examiner: checks data - PMT: safeguard process of data check (e.g., green light form)
	Providing resources for storing data; including data checks as part of thesis carousels	- The BMS Data Lab – allowing students to store research data - PMT
	Imposing adequate dissuasive sanctions to signal that this is a serious offence	- EB

4. PREVENTION OF ACADEMIC MISCONDUCT IN GROUP ASSIGNMENTS

The following measures must take place before the exams, or better: before the green light meetings. With regard to course work, random checks should be made early on for smaller assignments and, if necessary, retraining should be provided; final assessment course work should always be checked.

Type of academic misconduct	Measures to prevent academic misconduct	Responsible actors
Plagiarism – presenting work of others without attribution	Plagiarism scan with software or/and with the textual knowledge of the teachers	- Examiner
	Giving right example (e.g., reference on teachers' PPT slides)	- Examiner
	Courses or propaedeutic units within regular courses on academic integrity, responsible use of AI, referencing, and paraphrasing	- Examiner, - PMT - Librarians
Plagiarism – ghost writing / contract cheating	Intermediary feedback meetings;	- Examiner
	Plagiarism scan where necessary to see where literature has been used that has not necessarily been taught or is otherwise obvious as an additional indication	- Examiner - Education & IT (software selected needs to meet our requirements or provider be changed)
Plagiarism - referring to literature that one has not read oneself	Feedback meetings with students to see whether and how far they actually know the literature they have used;	- Examiner
	Plagiarism scan to see where literature has been used that has not necessarily been taught or is otherwise obvious as an additional indication	- Examiner - Education & IT (software selected needs to meet our requirements or provider be changed)
Plagiarism – resubmitting earlier course work of the one and the same students	Include a dedicated rule in program-specific appendix to EER	- PMT
	Plagiarism scan	- Examiner - Education & IT (software selected needs to meet our requirements or provider be changed)
	Policy on reuse of assessment materials by examiners	- PMT
Cheating – free-riding	Informing examiner in time; easy responsiveness of the teacher necessary	- Students - Examiners
	Warning to free-riding student	- Examiners
	Attrition of cheating student from group	- PMT
	Team contracts	- Examiner/PMT: make it binding rule in a course/programme - Students: to sign
Data manipulation	Data check; feedback meetings with students to see whether and how far they actually know the data they have used; plagiarism scan to see where data has previously been used and looked differently	- Examiners
Data fabrication	Data check; feedback meetings with students to see whether and how far they actually know the data they have used; plagiarism scan to see where data has previously been used and looked differently	- Student: submits data to examiner - Examiner: checks data - PMT: safeguard process of data check (e.g., green light form)

REFERENCES

Connolly, J., Lentz, P., & Morrison, J. (2006). Using the business fraud triangle to predict academic dishonesty among business students. *Academy of Educational Leadership Journal*, 10(1), 37-54.

Duggan, F. (2006). Plagiarism: prevention, practice and policy, *Assessment & Evaluation in Higher Education*, 31, 151-154

King, C. G., Guyette Jr, R. W., & Piotrowski, C. (2009). Online exams and cheating: An empirical analysis of business students' views. *Journal of Educators Online*, 6(1), 1-11.

Park, C. (2003). In other (people's) words: plagiarism by university students-literature and lessons, *Assessment & Evaluation in Higher Education*, 28, 471-488.

Ramos, M. (2003). Auditors' responsibility for fraud detection. *Journal of Accountancy*, 195(1), 28-35.

[Guide for examiners during exams 2023-2024](#) (from the Rules and Guidelines Examination Boards BMS)

This document includes the following chapters of the R&G:

- 7.02 Rules of order for testing
- 7.03 Regulations in case of calamities during written tests
- Section 7 Regulations regarding order, calamities and academic misconduct (based on the student charter)

[Decision tree for academic misconduct preventing and reporting](#)