

<b>Policy Title</b>	<b>Academic Misconduct Policy</b>
<b>Version</b>	<b>No 4</b>
<b>Effective Date:</b>	<b>January 19<sup>th</sup>, 2024</b>
<b>Approved by:</b>	Academic Council
<b>Scope:</b>	University wide
<b>Purpose:</b>	To provide students with a policy on academic integrity

### **1. Academic Integrity**

- 1.1 British Management University considers academic integrity to be essential for students' intellectual development. Incidents of academic dishonesty can hinder the free exchange of ideas and seriously damage the reputation of the institution.
- 1.2 The University requires all students, faculty and staff to accept responsibility to pursue academic research and learning in an honest and ethical manner. All behaviour that leads to academic dishonesty is strictly forbidden.

### **2. Zero Tolerance Policy**

- 2.1 The University has a "zero tolerance" policy for all forms of academic dishonesty. Zero tolerance applies to all types of formative and summative assessments, which includes, but is not limited to homework tasks, quizzes, courseworks, presentations, midterm exams, and final exams.
- 2.2 Zero tolerance also applies to admission tests.
- 2.3 Zero tolerance applies to faculty members as well as to students. It is expected that faculty members lead by example.

### **3. Scope**

- 3.1 This policy applies to all students enrolled on undergraduate and taught postgraduate programmes at British Management University. It covers academic misconduct in any form of assessment including written examinations, assessed coursework (in whatever form the coursework might take) and oral/practical assessments.

### **4. Principles**

- 4.1 Academic integrity is the basis for ethical decision-making and behaviour in an academic context. This is reflected in norms of acceptable academic practice and is informed by the values of honesty, trust, responsibility, fairness, respect and courage.
- 4.2 The University endeavours to ensure that all policies, procedures and guidance relevant to academic integrity are clear, accessible and actively promoted.
- 4.3 The University will work with students to strive towards early achievement of academic integrity. We recognise that students who are new to higher education will need some time to achieve this goal. For these early stages this policy reflects the intention to address poor academic practice through pedagogical, formative approaches.
- 4.4 The University will support students so that they can take responsibility in the process of familiarisation with the rules governing assessment including conduct in examinations and the correct academic conventions for referencing and acknowledging the work of others.
- 4.5 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.
- 4.6 The University will act on all identified infringements of this policy whether inadvertently or through negligence or deliberate intent.
- 4.7 The University expects that all work submitted for assessment by students is the student's own work, without falsification of any kind.

4.8 Allegations of academic misconduct will be treated in the strictest confidence. No student will be recorded, or referred to, as having committed an academic misconduct offence until the full process has been completed and the allegation proven.

## **5. Good Academic Practice**

5.1 Key aspects of good academic practice include:

- acknowledging the ideas of others through appropriate referencing and citation;
- meeting expectations about ethical behaviour;
- fulfilling confidentiality requirements in particular subjects;
- understanding the permitted boundaries between individual and group contributions.

5.2 Students are expected to offer their own analysis and presentation of information gleaned from research, even when group exercises are carried out. Insofar as students rely on sources, they should reference these in accordance with the appropriate convention in their discipline.

## **6. Definition of Poor Academic Practice**

6.1 Poor academic practice can be defined as poor scholarship resulting from an individual's lack of knowledge, understanding and practice of the skills required to be academically literate.

6.2 For the purposes of this policy the understanding of poor academic practice is based on the following considerations:

- A student in their early stages of HE (Foundation and Degree Year 2) may not have gained the knowledge and skills to demonstrate standards of good academic practice.
- Instances of unintended plagiarism, or collusion, as defined below, that occur at the early stages of a student's studies can normally be considered as poor academic practice.
- A student who shows intent to meet good academic practice, but fails in its execution, can be considered to show poor academic practice.
- A student who shows limited intent to meet good academic practice in spite of having had adequate prior teaching, or as a repeat instance, can be deemed to show academic misconduct.

6.3 Addressing cases of poor academic practice requires supportive, constructive and pedagogical approaches by programme teams and members of the learning support services, working with the active participation of the student.

## **7. Definition of Academic Misconduct**

7.1 The University defines academic misconduct as "Any action by a student which gives or has the potential to give an unfair advantage in an examination or assessment, or might assist someone else to gain an unfair advantage, or any activity likely to undermine the integrity essential to scholarship and research."

7.2 Academic misconduct typically falls under one of the following headings:

- Plagiarism;
- Collusion;
- Contract Cheating;
- Cheating;
- Unauthorised Use of Artificial Intelligence (AI);
- Falsification or fabrication of data;
- Failure to have ethical approval.

## **8. Plagiarism**

8.1 Plagiarism is defined as the presentation of another person's work or ideas as the student's own, without proper acknowledgement. This could be in direct copy or close paraphrase.

8.2 In the context of the policy, another person's work or ideas includes text, images (graphics, illustrations or photographs), designs, computer code, diagrams, data and formulae or any other representation of ideas (written, visual or oral) in print, electronic or other media, and may be from any published or unpublished source including books, journals, newspapers, the internet, programme handouts or another student's work.

8.3 Plagiarism can occur in examinations and/or coursework assessment which may take a variety of forms including, but not limited to, essays, reports, presentations, dissertations and projects.

8.4 The reproduction of a student's own previously submitted work, without acknowledgement, is regarded as self-plagiarism and will be treated in the same way as any other form of plagiarism.

8.5 Cases of potential plagiarism may be dealt with by the Viva Voce Procedure. Please, refer to Annex I for more information.

8.6 Guidance on sources of evidence to evaluate cases of suspected plagiarism is set out in Appendix III.

## **9. Collusion**

9.1 Collusion is the unauthorised co-operation between at least two people, normally with the intent to deceive. It can take the following forms:

- the conspiring by two or more students to produce a piece of work together with the intention that at least one passes it off as their own work;
- the willing provision of work or examination questions and/or answers by one student to another student where it should be evident to the student providing the work that by so doing an advantage could be gained by the other student. In this case both students are guilty of collusion;
- the unauthorised co-operation between a student and another person in the preparation and production of work which is presented as the student's own work.

9.2 Cases of potential collusion may be dealt with by the Viva Voce Procedure. Please, refer to Annex I for more information.

9.3 Guidance on sources of evidence to evaluate cases of suspected collusion is set out in Appendix III.

## **10. Contract Cheating**

10.1 Contract cheating is the commissioning and submission of work as the student's own where the student has paid or solicited another person to produce the work on the student's behalf.

10.2 Contract cheating can also include sections of work that are improved by third parties, either for payment or for free.

10.3 While the use of proofreading services to help students identify deficiencies in their work does not constitute contract cheating, students must retain ownership of their work, and allowing third parties such as proof-readers to edit the work themselves could be deemed as contract cheating.

10.4 Cases of potential contract cheating may be dealt with by the Viva Voce Procedure. Please, refer to Annex I for more information.

10.5 Guidance on sources of evidence to evaluate cases of suspected contract cheating are set out in Appendix III.

## **11. Cheating**

11.1 Cheating includes any behaviour which the student would reasonably know would interfere with the fair operation of the assessment process and could gain unfair advantage, such as:

- any transgression of the University's examination room rules, as set out in the BMU Examination Rules;

- obtaining or seeking to obtain access to examination papers prior to an examination;
- behaviour in a manner likely to prejudice the chances of another student in an assessment;
- offering a bribe or inducement to invigilators, examiners or other persons connected with the assessments;
- being party to an arrangement whereby a person other than the student would fraudulently represent them at an assessment;
- submitting a fraudulent claim for extenuating circumstances.

## **12. Unauthorised Use of Artificial Intelligence (AI)**

12.1 Unauthorised use of AI is when a student presents the output of an artificial intelligence technology (for instance, a large language model (LLM) or paraphrasing application) as their own work. The use of AI tools may be legitimate within some assessments, where this is the case, this will be set out in the module descriptor or assessment brief. The use of AI tools in this instance will be appropriately cited within the student's submitted assessment.

## **13. Falsification or fabrication of data**

13.1 Falsification of data occurs where data, evidence or experimental results are altered or enhanced. Fabrication of data occurs where a student creates data, results or other outputs and presents them as if they were real.

## **14. Failure to have ethical approval**

14.1 Failure to have ethical approval includes instances where students embark on research activities which require ethical approval without that approval being formally granted. It is the student's responsibility to apply for ethical approval and to seek clarification on whether ethical approval is required if unsure.

## **15. Process for Dealing with Cases of Examination Cheating**

15.1 Where an invigilator suspects a student of infringing examination rules or any other requirements relating to the conduct of the examination, they shall take the appropriate action as detailed in the Examination Rules.

15.2 A report of the incident should be provided to the Registrar Exam Officer, who will refer the case to the Academic Misconduct Committee.

## **16. Process for Dealing with Suspected Cases of Academic Misconduct (Stage 1)**

16.1 All potential instances of poor academic practice or academic misconduct will require action.

16.2 The Module Co-ordinator must report all suspected infringements, other than exam cheating instances, to the Programme Leader for consideration before any allegation of academic misconduct is put to the student.

16.3 It is the responsibility of the person identifying the suspected infringement to clearly set out the nature of their suspicions and provide supporting evidence showing how and where the suspected infringement has taken place.

16.4 Where a marker suspects an infringement, they will, if appropriate, note on the student's work the nature of the alleged offence and report their concerns to the Module Co-ordinator.

## **17. Consideration by the Programme Leader**

17.1 Upon receipt of any reports of suspected infringement, the Programme Leader will consider the evidence provided and decide how to proceed.

17.2 It is important for the Academic Staff to be aware that in some instances, particularly in the early stages of a module, it will not always be appropriate to proceed to a formal allegation. In particular, if the assessed work, or student's conduct, can be considered as poor academic practice then it should not normally be considered as a potential case of academic misconduct. The Academic Staff should also satisfy themselves that the student

has been given appropriate advice on attributing sources and the production of bibliographies prior to assessment.

17.3 In considering second or subsequent instances of poor academic practice, the Programme Leader may decide to proceed to a formal allegation, however:

- Concurrent instances of infringements should be treated as one instance;
- Repeat infringements may still be treated as poor academic practice if the student has not had sufficient time to engage with academic support;
- Repeat infringements can be deemed to be academic misconduct if:
  - the student has failed to engage with academic support, or
  - the principle of unfair advantage is breached.

17.4 Having reviewed the evidence, the Programme Leader will decide that either:

- no offence has been committed;
- there is insufficient evidence of an offence;
- no offence has been committed but there is evidence of poor academic practice; or
- there is sufficient evidence of academic misconduct.

17.5 Records should be maintained, in line with University Data Protection Policy requirements, to enable the identification and monitoring of students who have been judged to have demonstrated poor academic practice. These records will be made available to the relevant Assessment Board.

#### **18. Actions if no offence has been deemed to have been committed**

18.1 If the Programme Leader decides that no offence has taken place, or that there is insufficient evidence of an offence, they shall request the marker to consider the work on its academic merits and mark it in accordance with the assessment criteria. They may also recommend that the student is made aware of the concerns and offered further support and guidance to avoid any similar concerns about their academic practice in future. This advice, along with details of where to go for further support, should be given to the student with the feedback on their assessment. No further action will be taken with the student.

18.2 If the Programme Leader decides that the case constitutes poor academic practice, they shall:

- a. request the marker to consider the work on its academic merits;
- b. ensure that the feedback to the student identifies their poor academic practice and how this can be addressed; and
- c. issue the student with an informal warning about their academic practice and require them to engage with Academic Success Centre.

#### **19. Actions if academic misconduct deemed to have been committed**

19.1 If the Programme Leader decides that there is sufficient evidence that an offence may have been committed, they instruct the Module Co-ordinator to proceed to a formal allegation.

19.2 To proceed to a formal allegation, the Module Co-ordinator should:

- a. complete the Allegation of Academic Misconduct form with the following information:
  - the student's name, ID number, level of study and programme details;
  - module details, including information about the weighting of the component of assessment;
  - the formal allegation to be put to the student;
  - a summary of the alleged offence.
- b. collate the relevant supporting evidence, with the assistance of the Registrar. This may include:
  - a report of the incident, where relevant;

- a copy of the original script marked with the allegedly plagiarised passages or passages where there is suspected collusion;
- a copy of source material marked with passages which have allegedly been plagiarised or where there is suspected collusion;
- a copy of the plagiarism detection software report, where relevant;
- a copy of the instructions given to the student regarding the component of assessment and a copy of the referencing instructions given to the student where relevant;
- any other evidence to support the allegation. Where an allegation of collusion implicates more than one student, a single allegation of Academic Misconduct form should be completed including details of each student.

19.3 The completed Allegation of Academic Misconduct form and supporting documentation should be submitted by the Registrar's Office to the Academic Misconduct Committee for the formal allegation to be put to the student.

19.4 Following notification to the student of an allegation by Academic Misconduct Committee, the Module Co-ordinator is responsible for ensuring the student is provided with support to enable them to understand the allegation and respond appropriately.

## **20. Process for Dealing with Suspected Cases of Academic Misconduct (Stage 2: Formal Allegation)**

20.1 Upon receipt of the Allegation of Academic Misconduct form and supporting documentation from the Module Co-ordinator, Academic Misconduct Committee shall write to the student concerned to:

- a. put the allegation as defined by the Module Co-ordinator;
- b. request a written statement in response to the allegation and submission of any evidence they deem appropriate;
- c. signpost support available to the student to enable them to respond, including from their programme team, student support services and the Students' Union;
- d. request confirmation of whether the student also wishes to attend an investigative meeting of the Academic Misconduct Committee to respond in person;
- e. request a reply within five working days of the date on which the letter is sent;
- f. enclose a copy of this policy;
- g. enclose copies of any evidence or reports.

20.2 The letter from Academic Misconduct Committee to the student shall be copied to the relevant Chair of the Assessment Board and Programme Leader. Where possible, every effort should be made to resolve the matter before the meeting of the Assessment Board. However, where it remains unresolved, the Assessment Board will record a *deferred decision* (DD) on the electronic student record.

20.3 If no written reply to the allegation is received from the student within five working days of the date on which the letter is sent, this is deemed to be acceptance of the allegation.

20.4 If the student replies denying the allegation, or if they ask to also respond in person, Academic Misconduct Committee shall invite the student to attend an investigative meeting. The student should be given at least five working days' notice of the meeting.

20.5 While the allegation remains unresolved, the student shall have the right to continue on the programme or commence the next part or stage of the programme (where permitted within the relevant assessment regulations).

## **21. Academic Misconduct Committee**

21.1 The Academic Misconduct Committee (the Committee) shall comprise:

- Vice Rector Academic or nominee (Chair);
- Dean of Undergraduate Studies;
- Programme Leader;

- At least two members of academic staff (to be drawn from a pool of academics who have been trained for the role); and
  - Registrar acting as Committee's Secretary.
- 21.2 Membership of the Committee may be varied to ensure that the academic staff members are not considering any allegations concerning their own modules, but have the necessary understanding of the discipline to inform discussions. A representative from the Registrar's Office will be in attendance to record the Committee's decision and justification for that decision.
- 21.3 The Committee will be convened at regular intervals to consider all formal allegations of academic misconduct. This will ensure consistency of approach across the range of programmes offered within the University. The Committee has the authority to determine:
- a. that no offence has been committed, or there is insufficient evidence of an offence, in which case the allegation will be removed from the student's record, and the case should be referred back to the programme team to be dealt with by them in accordance with paragraph 17.1;
  - b. that this is a case of poor academic practice, and the case should be referred back to the programme team to be dealt with by them in accordance with paragraph 17.2;
  - c. that an offence has been committed and recommend the penalty to be imposed, as set out in the Academic Misconduct Penalties table in Appendix I.
- 21.4 The decision of the Committee as to whether an offence has been committed is final and will be reported to the student and relevant Assessment Board. The Assessment Board will consider the penalty recommended by the Committee and inform the student of the penalty imposed and the impact of that penalty on their studies and/or award.
- 21.5 In determining whether an offence has been committed, the judgement will be made on the balance of probability.
- 21.6 In determining the recommended penalty, the Committee will take into account:
- the severity of the offence;
  - the intent;
  - whether it is a first or subsequent offence;
  - the academic stage of the student;
  - any mitigation;
  - the proportionality of the penalty to the offence.
- 21.7 A guide to the standard penalty to be imposed for first offences is provided in Appendix II.
- 21.8 The University does not normally accept a student's medical or personal circumstances as an excuse or reason for academic misconduct. However, where the Committee deems that the evidenced circumstances have severely impaired the student's capacity for rational judgement, the Committee may take account of the circumstances in determining the recommended penalty for the offence.
- 21.9 The Committee shall normally recommend the standard penalties suggested for first offences. However, the Committee may vary the penalty in such circumstances where the suggested penalty is deemed to be too lenient or too harsh to ensure that the outcome is not disproportionate to the offence. In all cases, the penalty should normally exceed that which would follow if the student had failed the assessment without academic misconduct.
- 21.10 The penalty recommended for second or third offences will normally be one penalty point higher than the standard penalty for the offence or one point higher than the penalty previously imposed, whichever is higher. Any student with three sequential offences will automatically receive a minimum of penalty 6 and be required to withdraw.

## **22. Standard Meeting of the Academic Misconduct Committee**

- 22.1 Where a student accepts the allegation and does not want to respond in person, a standard meeting of the Academic Misconduct Committee will be convened, normally no later than ten working days after the date of the letter putting the allegation to the student. The documentation, including any written response submitted by the student, will be distributed to the Committee for consideration, normally five working days before the meeting.
- 22.2 The consideration of accepted allegations of academic misconduct where the student does not wish to also respond in person need not involve a physical meeting of members of the Committee if alternative methods of discussion and mutual deliberation are available.
- 22.3 The Committee's decision and recommended penalty will be based on the documentary evidence provided.

### **23. Investigative Meeting of the Academic Misconduct Committee**

- 23.1 Where a student denies the allegation, or wishes to respond to the allegation in person, an investigative meeting of the Committee will be arranged. This will normally take place no later than ten working days after the date of the letter putting the formal allegation to the student.
- 23.2 The Secretary of the Committee will inform the student, in writing, of the date, time and venue of the investigative meeting.
- 23.3 The student may be accompanied at the meeting by a friend. A friend is defined as a member of staff of the University, or a registered student of the University, or a member of the Students' Union. The role of the friend is to act as an observer, give moral support and to assist the student to make their case. In addition, where reasonable adjustments are required, a student may be accompanied by a supporter, for example a sign language communicator or a notetaker.
- 23.4 If the student does not appear at the meeting, the Committee may proceed with the consideration of the allegation in the student's absence provided the Committee is satisfied that the student has received proper and timely notification of the meeting.
- 23.5 The Chair of the Committee shall explain that the purpose of the meeting is to establish whether an offence of academic misconduct has been committed. They will put the allegation to the student and make available for scrutiny any relevant documentary evidence, including any statements by staff or students, sources of allegedly plagiarised passages and/or passages where collusion is suspected, annotated coursework or scripts, and falsified documents.
- 23.6 The student will make a statement in response to the allegation, following which the members of the Committee have the right to put any questions to the student.
- 23.7 At any time during the meeting, the Chair of the Committee 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.
- 23.8 If the student admits the offence at the meeting, the Chair of the Committee shall invite the student to sign a written statement to this effect.
- 23.9 At the end of the questioning, the student will be asked to leave the meeting for the Committee to deliberate and reach its decision in private.
- 23.10 The Committee shall determine its decision based on the written and oral evidence. If the Committee finds that there is no case to answer, or that it is a case of poor academic practice, the Chair will inform the student accordingly, and all record of the alleged academic misconduct will be removed from the student's record. The Programme Leader and the Chair of the Assessment Board will be informed of the decision and the work will then be marked on its academic merit.

23.11 In cases where it is determined that there is no case to answer or that it is a case of poor academic practice, the case will be referred to the programme team to be dealt with by them in accordance with paragraphs 17.1 to 17.2.

23.12 If the Committee finds that an offence of academic misconduct has been committed, the Committee will agree a penalty to be recommended to the Assessment Board in accordance with paragraphs 20.6 to 20.10.

#### **24. Notification of the Decision**

24.1 The Registrar's Office will communicate the decision of the Committee to the student and the relevant Assessment Board in writing within five working days of the Committee meeting.

24.2 The notification to the student will include the decision and the rationale for the decision. The Assessment Board will also be notified of the recommended penalty.

#### **25. Action by Assessment Board**

25.1 Following receipt of the Committee's decision, the Assessment Board will meet (where necessary as an extraordinary meeting) to consider the penalty recommended by the Committee and determine the penalty to be imposed and the consequence of that penalty in the context of the student's overall profile and the relevant assessment regulations.

25.2 The Assessment Board do not have the authority to amend the decision of the Committee as to whether or not an offence has been committed, but may apply a lower penalty where the recommended one will have a disproportionate impact.

25.3 The Chair of the Assessment Board will notify the student, in writing, of the penalty imposed and the appropriate course of action within ten working days of the date of the letter informing the student of the Committee's decision. A copy of the letter should be sent to Academic Misconduct Committee.

#### **26. Appeals Procedure**

26.1 Students may appeal against the verdict of academic misconduct and/or the penalty imposed under the provisions of the Academic Appeals Policy.

#### **27. Plagiarism Detection Software**

27.1 All work that is submitted electronically will be passed through plagiarism detection software.

### **Revision History**

<b>Version</b>	<b>Approved by</b>	<b>Approval Date</b>	<b>Description of Change</b>
4	Academic Council	January 18 <sup>th</sup> , 2024	This policy should be reviewed in June 2024, when new Senior Staff are onboard and some of the responsibilities mentioned herein can be devolved.

Rector Conrad Ozóg

## **Annex I Viva Voce Procedure**

### **1. General Principles**

1.1 The Viva Voce Procedure exists within the marking process in order to address potential academic misconduct concerns where evidence of a misconduct is not always obtainable, and to provide markers with a means by which they can satisfy themselves that the student can demonstrate knowledge of the work and topic in question to be assured of the legitimacy of the work.

1.2 To avoid adding undue delay to the marking process, the viva should be held as soon as possible.

1.3 Where there is evidence of an academic misconduct, the matter can be referred to the Academic Misconduct Committee.

### **2. Criteria**

2.1 The Viva Procedure should only occur if two or more members of the marking team share two or more of the following concerns:

a) The content of the work falls consistently outside of the topics taught on the module and there is no reasonable explanation for the student to have responded to the question in that way;

b) The Turnitin report shows AI percentage;

c) The methods used in the submission are substantially different from those taught on the module;

d) The anticipated mark for the assignment falls outside that predicated for anyone within the cohort and is excessively high for a student working at that stage of study;

e) The sources used are not on the reading list for the module and are a significantly unusual resource for the student to have obtained and/ or cited;

f) The language and/ or syntax used in the assessment are incoherent;

g) The language and / or syntax are at a level of sophistication beyond that anticipated of a student working at this stage of study;

h) The language and syntax used in certain sections of the assessment response are demonstrably different from that in other sections of their assignments;

i) Sources referenced do not match the content of the assessment;

j) Sources referenced do not appear to be real;

k) There is hard evidence in the submission of third-party involvement (such as track change comments in the submission);

l) The student has responded to an entirely different title without explanation.

### **3. Viva Voce Meeting**

3.1 The following procedures are suggested as minimum operational standards for the holding of Viva Voce Meeting:

a) A Viva should be held if requested by two or more members of the marking team;

b) The criteria for the selection of students for Viva Meetings, as outlined above, must be consistently applied;

c) The Registrar invites students to the Viva Voce Meeting. Students must be given five working days' notice of a Viva so as to enable them to attend;

d) In the invitation to the Viva, the student must be notified of the assignment about which concerns have been raised; which of the concerns listed in section 2 above have been raised about their assignment, who will be conducting the Viva and their reason for their attendance and the date and time of their Viva;

e) Viva Voce Panel (hereinafter, the Panel) should consist of two members of the Academic Staff, a member of the marking team and a member of the Programme team, and a Registrar acting as the Panel's Secretary.

- f) The focus of attention in the viva discussion will be the areas of study covered within the relevant examination or assessment;
- g) The Viva should not usually extend beyond 30 minutes in duration;
- h) The Viva should be conducted in English;
- i) The student should not be asked to undertake a new assignment or test of their knowledge.

3.2 The VIVA VOCE Meeting must always be organised, when the Turnitin report demonstrates AI percentage of 40% to 60%.

3.3 In case if Turnitin report shows AI percentage of 60% or higher, the decision to organise the VIVA VOCE meeting will rest with the Marker.

#### 4. Outcome

- 4.1 Through the course of the Viva Meeting a student will be asked to demonstrate their knowledge of the work and topic in question. If they demonstrate sufficient understanding of the information to assure the Viva Voce Panel of the legitimacy of their work, then the piece of work will be returned to the standard making process with no further action taken.
- 4.2 If through the Viva a student fails to reassure the Panel of the veracity/authenticity of their work, then the Panel may decide to refer the case to the Academic Misconduct Committee for investigation.
- 4.3 The respective outcome of the Viva Voce Meeting should be communicated to all participants of the Meeting by the Registrar.
- 4.4 If the student does not attend the Viva Voce Meeting, their case will be automatically referred to the Academic Misconduct Committee and that student will receive an official warning.

### APPENDIX I: Penalties for Academic Misconduct

The following table sets out the standard penalties for proven offences.

<b>Minor Offence</b>	<b>Penalty 1</b>	The student will receive a formal written warning.
	<b>Penalty 2</b>	The work submitted will be marked in accordance with the assessment criteria but the component mark will be capped at the pass mark (40%). The student will receive a formal written warning.
<b>Serious Offence</b>	<b>Penalty 3</b>	Refer component (mark of 0%, recorded as refer infringement (RI)) with reassessment opportunity where permissible under the relevant assessment regulations. On reassessment, the component mark will be capped at the pass mark. The student will receive a formal written warning.
	<b>Penalty 4</b>	Fail module (mark of 0%, recorded as fail infringement (FI)) with opportunity to retake module where permissible under the relevant assessment regulations. On retake, the component and module mark will be capped at the pass mark. The student will receive a formal written warning.
<b>Grave Offence</b>	<b>Penalty 5</b>	Fail module (mark of 0% for all components, recorded as fail infringement (FI)) and the student required to withdraw. The Assessment Board will be instructed to ratify the marks for any work already submitted for outstanding modules (with no opportunity for reassessment or retake) and to consider the student for an exit award based on the credit achieved.
<b>Gross Misconduct</b>	<b>Penalty 6</b>	Fail module (mark of 0% for all components, recorded as fail infringement (FI)) and the student required to withdraw immediately without being awarded a degree or exit award. Credits which have already been ratified by an Assessment Board will be recorded on a record of achievement only.

All students who receive a penalty between 1 and 5 will be offered support through an Academic Success Centre on plagiarism and academic writing. Uptake of the support will be monitored for evaluation.

## APPENDIX II: Indicative Offences and Standard Penalties for First Offences

Coursework and Time Constrained Assignments (including, but not limited to, written work, presentations, posters, dissertations, final projects)

	<b>Indicative Offence</b>	<b>Standard penalty</b>
<b>Minor Offence</b>	Limited use of quotes or close paraphrasing (not more than a few lines) without the use of quotation marks and/or correct referencing, where the student has cited the plagiarised material in the reference list and/or bibliography.	Penalty 1
	Using substantial amount of work previously submitted for another assignment without acknowledgement (self-plagiarism).	Penalty 1
	Extensive use of quotes or close paraphrasing without the use of quotation marks and/or correct referencing, where the student has cited the plagiarised material in the reference list and/or bibliography.	Penalty 2
<b>Serious Offence</b>	Submission of work produced in collaboration by two or more students as the work of a single student.	Penalty 3
	Using another person's work or ideas and submitting some of it as if it were the student's own.	Penalty 3
	Submitting a fraudulent claim for extenuating circumstances.	Penalty 3
	Using another person's work or ideas and submitting all of it as if it were the student's own.	Penalty 3
	The presentation of data based on work purporting to have been carried out by the student but which has been fabricated (i.e. invented, altered or falsified).	Penalty 3
	Failure to have ethical approval where required and embarking on research activities which require ethical approval without that approval being formally granted.	Penalty 3
	Extensive use of quotes or close paraphrasing without the use of quotation marks and/or correct referencing, where the student has not cited the plagiarised material in the reference list and/or bibliography.	Penalty 3
	Unauthorised use of AI	Penalty 3
<b>Grave Offence</b>	Commissioning another person to complete an item of assessment that is submitted as the student's own work (e.g. friends and family members).	Penalty 4
	Disguising work in a deliberate attempt to conceal its origins.	Penalty 4
	Offering a bribe or inducement to persons connected with the assessment in order to gain an unfair advantage.	Penalty 5
	Persuading another student or a member of staff to participate in any other actions in order to gain an unfair advantage.	Penalty 5

Examinations and Time Constrained Assignments (including, but not limited to, written, online, viva and practical)

	<b>Indicative offence</b>	<b>Standard penalty</b>
<b>Minor Offence</b>	Removing any script, question paper, or other official stationery (whether completed or not) from the examination room, unless specifically authorised by an invigilator or examiner.	Penalty 1
	Communicating with another student or with any third party other than the invigilator or examiner during an examination.	Penalty 2
<b>Serious Offence</b>	Possession of devices (such as mobile phones, smart watches or personal multimedia devices) of any kind other than those specifically permitted.	Penalty 3
	Copying or attempting to copy the work of another student, whether by overlooking, asking for information, or by any other means.	Penalty 3
	Behaviour in a manner likely to prejudice the chances of another student.	Penalty 3
	Submitting a fraudulent claim for extenuating circumstances.	Penalty 3
	Possession or use of crib sheets, revision notes or unauthorised texts; unauthorised access of the internet; or use of devices (such as mobile phones, smart watches or personal multimedia devices) of any kind other than those specifically permitted.	Penalty 3
<b>Grave Offence</b>	Being party to any arrangement whereby a person other than the student represents, or intends to represent, the student in an examination.	Penalty 4
	Taking into an examination a pre-written examination script for submission.	Penalty 4
	Obtaining, or seeking to obtain, access to an unseen examination paper prior to the start of an examination.	Penalty 4
	Offering a bribe or inducement to invigilators, examiners or other persons connected with the examination in order to gain an unfair advantage.	Penalty 5
	Persuading another student or a member of staff to participate in any other actions in order to gain an unfair advantage.	Penalty 5

**Note**

The tables above are provided as a guide to the recommended standard penalty to be imposed for first offences of academic misconduct with examples given as an indication of the type of offence. The penalty for a second or subsequent proven offence will normally be one penalty point higher

than the standard penalty shown or one point higher than the previously imposed penalty, whichever is higher.

The examples given above do not represent an exhaustive list of potential offences and should not be interpreted as such.

### **APPENDIX III: Guidance on Types of Evidence to Evaluate and Present in Suspected Infringements of Policy**

#### **Evidence to evaluate in cases of suspected plagiarism**

- Data from Turnitin (or equivalent plagiarism detection software) indicating matches in sections of text – cross referenced against student's referencing for absences of acknowledgment. **Note: a high similarity 'score' is not acceptable as a stand-alone justification for allegations of plagiarism;**
- Unacknowledged text/idea/image that in the marker's judgement is not 'in the public domain' but comes from an identifiable source/set of sources;
- Absence of clear acknowledgement of source of text/idea/image in citations or narratives;
- Heterogeneity of font/pica/style of sections of text; variations in spellings (UK/US);
- Absence of elements of bibliographical details;
- Students' use of language about their ownership of text/idea/image;
- Students' responses to viva/informal questions.

#### **Evidence to evaluate in cases of suspected collusion**

- Data from Turnitin (or equivalent plagiarism detection software) indicating matches in texts between two students in same cohort;
- Marker's comments and evaluation of students' assessments;
- Level of cooperation/group work that exceeds set parameters;
- Set requirements of assessment brief on acceptable limits of group work activity;
- Students' responses to viva/informal questions.

#### **Evidence to evaluate in cases of suspected contract cheating**

- Module Co-ordinators' and markers' familiarity with students' work – unexplained grade shifts;
- Failure of essay to align to assignments as set, and to content of lecture(s);
- Errors/inconsistencies in use of English (UK/US), changes in style, voice or syntax, heterogeneity in fonts/styles;
- Outcome of investigative interview / viva with student;
- Third party evidence (other students);
- IT forensics.