

Common Procedure in Case of Suspected Cheating

updated 25.04.25

- Applies to both examinations (with or without permitted aids) and mandatory assignments.
- Information in a cheating case is confidential, and the case handler has a duty of confidentiality, cf. Public Administration Act § 13. Cheating cases are handled on a “need to know” basis, with as few people as possible informed.
- Course instructors/examiners must assess the submission as normal, and the student must receive a grade. No deductions are to be made based on suspicion of cheating. However, lack of independent work can be reflected in the grading. Cheating suspicion should not be the reason for the grade given.
- Group cases are evaluated individually and submitted as separate cases.

1. When Suspicion of Cheating Should Be Raised

Examination invigilators/instructors/examiners should raise suspicion in the following situations, where the student is suspected of:

- a. acting against rules for the exam or mandatory activity
- b. using or having unauthorized aids during the exam or assignment
- c. presenting others’ work as their own without proper citation or quotation
- d. submitting practical/artistic work not produced by the student
- e. submitting work not written by the student
- f. collaborating improperly with others
- g. fabricating or falsifying data
- h. accessing the exam assignment before the exam began
- i. resubmitting previous work without disclosure
- j. aiding others in cheating

AND the act is likely to provide the student with an advantage.

2. Suspicion During Written On-Campus Exams

- Invigilator fills out a “report of irregularity during exam.”
- The report is submitted to the Education Department's Secretariat for Student Cases.
- The Secretariat follows up in accordance with section 5 of the routine.

3. Suspicion During Submission of Mandatory Assignments or Home Exams

a. Instructor/Examiner suspects cheating

- The instructor/examiner assesses whether to pursue the suspicion further. The following should be considered:

General	Plagiarism/Unauthorized Collaboration
How significant is the possible advantage?	What parts of the submission are plagiarized?
What is expected of a student at this level?	Is the plagiarism from others or from self?
What training was given in exam rules and academic writing?	How was plagiarism discovered (software, tip-off, other)?
For AI use: what guidance was provided? What citation is expected?	How severe is the incident (method, results, evaluations, paraphrasing, etc.)?
For mandatory activity: what was its intended purpose?	

- The course coordinator may call the student in for clarification. Especially relevant in AI-related cases. The meeting should be documented, including the date.
 - At this stage, the student is not entitled to legal aid but may bring a representative. The meeting is for clarification before the case is referred or dropped.

→ If the suspicion is pursued, the department/faculty is informed.

In case of doubt, the Secretariat for Student Cases can be contacted.

b. Department/Faculty (study administration):

- Reviews the case.
- May call the student in for clarification if not already done.
 - Based on the meeting, the case is either referred to the Tribunal or closed.

In case of doubt, the Secretariat for Student Cases can be contacted.

Below is an overview of the documentation that must be attached.

4. Required documentation (not for AI cases):

The following documents must be included in cases of suspected cheating (not applicable to AI-related cases):

1. Written explanation from instructor/examiner
2. Plagiarism report (match percentage alone is not decisive)
3. Student's submission with marked sections
4. Source(s) suspected of being plagiarized, also marked
5. Info about citation training given
6. Exam rules (if applicable)
7. Screenshot from Studentweb showing the student confirmed the cheating rules

The following documents must be attached in cases of suspected improper use of AI tools for suspected AI misuse:

1. Brief note explaining the suspicion
2. Report with examples and rationale for suspected AI use
3. Student's submission with examples marked
4. Info on guidance given about sources
5. Exam rules (if applicable)
6. Studentweb confirmation screenshot

The case summary prepared by the Secretariat for the Tribunal for Student Affairs is based on the documents provided by the department/faculty and information from the student. It is therefore important that the case is thoroughly prepared before being submitted to the seksjon for kvalitet og utvikling i utdanningene. Markings must be clearly visible in both the student's work and the source, and the explanation must clearly state the grounds for the suspicion of cheating. Cheating cases are, like other cases submitted to the Tribunal, the responsibility of the respective faculties.

5. Referral of the Case

The department/faculty refers the case to seksjon for kvalitet og utvikling i utdanningene:

- Create a case in P360, titled "Referral of case regarding suspected cheating in [course name]"
 - Important! Use access code "exempt from public disclosure" and access group "sensitive student cases"
 - Document type: Internal memo with follow-up
- Include cover letter signed by the dean or authorized person
- The letter should include:
 1. Attachments
 2. Background

- 3. Basis for referral
- 4. Assessment
- Send via P360, not by email
 - Recipient: **Seksjon for kvalitet og utvikling i utdanningene**
- The faculty/department is a party to the case, and it is important that their statements, arguments, and assessments are clearly presented in the cover letter. The faculty may refer to the examiner's/course coordinator's assessments but must also provide their own evaluations.
- **Group cases** must be sent as separate cases for each student

6. Tribunal Secretary Takes Over

The secretary of the Tribunal will proceed with further processing of the case

- Reviews and checks all necessary documents
- May request more documents per Public Administration Act § 33
- Calls student in for an interview and writes a summary to be included
- Assesses the case based on previous similar cases; discusses with department/faculty if needed
- If not pursued: student is notified in writing; case is closed; written warning may be issued
- If pursued: student is notified in advance and asked for a written statement
- Informed of right to legal assistance and potential consequences
- Normally done 2 weeks before the Tribunal meeting
- Student is told when the case will be discussed and may attend to explain
- Student is informed of outcome and consequences (ban, annulment) via P360/digital mailbox
- If no digital mailbox, encrypted email is used
- Copy sent to a limited number of faculty/department staff as agreed
- If annulment or expulsion is decided, the decision is forwarded to FS for registration
- Appeals go to Felles klagenemnd after reassessment