



ACADEMIC INTEGRITY & MISCONDUCT POLICY AND GUIDANCE

Scope: All taught programmes leading to an award of City, University of London.

Senate Regulations

[Senate Regulation 19 Assessment \(Includes section 5.7.2\(ii\) - 'Academic Misconduct'\)](#)

[Senate Regulation 13 Student Discipline](#) is also relevant.

Date approved/re-approved

Approved by Senate for implementation from 2016/17

Minor Updates November 2018

Approved by Senate May 2020

Approved by Senate October 2020

Minor Updates August 2021

Minor Updates October 2021

Minor Updates September 2022

Minor Updates April 2023

Equality and Diversity Statement

City, University of London is committed to promoting equality, diversity and inclusion in all its activities, processes, and culture, under its Public Sector Equality Duties and the Equality Act 2010. This includes promoting equality and diversity for all, irrespective of any protected characteristic, working pattern, family circumstance, socio-economic background, political belief, or other irrelevant distinction.

Where relevant to the policy, decision-making panels will ensure a reasonable gender balance (with at least one man and one woman) and will actively consider representation of other protected groups.

Academic Integrity & Misconduct Policy and Guidance

Contents

Contents	2
1. Academic Integrity & Misconduct Policy	4
1.1. Policy Introduction	4
1.2. Preliminary Investigations.....	5
1.3. Academic Misconduct Panel conduct and recommendations	5
1.4. Assessment Board decisions	6
1.5. Reporting and statistics	6
1.6. Rights to Appeal	6
2. Academic Integrity & Misconduct Guidance	7
2.1. Introduction	7
2.2. Responsibilities.....	7
2.3. Training for staff and student support.....	9
2.4. Identifying suspected Academic Misconduct and the Preliminary Investigation	9
2.5. Determining the required actions.....	11
2.6. Gathering evidence to investigate the allegation.....	12
2.7. Case Management	12
2.8. Determining the category of Academic Misconduct	13
2.9. Dealing with Poor Academic Practice Cases	13
2.10. Dealing with (Severe) Academic Misconduct Cases	13
2.11. The Academic Misconduct Panel.....	14
2.12. Academic Misconduct Panel recommendations	18
2.13. Disciplinary Panel Considerations – Sanction 6	18
Appendix 1 – Definitions of Academic Misconduct	19
Appendix 2 - Types of Academic Misconduct Cases.....	25
Appendix 3 – Sanctions	27
Appendix 4 - Mapping of Sanctions	28
Appendix 5– Academic Misconduct Process Flowchart	30

Context

In this document, "you", "your" and "yours" means a student of City, University of London. "We", "us" and "ours" means the City, University of London and, depending on context, staff and officers of City acting on its behalf.

Academic integrity is at the heart of our commitment to academic excellence and reflects a shared set of principles which include honesty, trust, diligence, fairness and respect. Academic integrity which thrives through honesty, trust, and respect. We strive to communicate and support clear standards of integrity so you can value and embed those standards in your academic study and carry them forward in your professional life.

This policy applies to all taught programmes leading to an award of City, University of London. There may be exceptions to this policy on certain programmes that are governed by PSRB requirements.

Section 1 of this Policy outlines the general principles and the purpose of our Academic Integrity & Misconduct Policy, and the context in which the relevant procedures will be implemented if the principles of good academic practice have not been upheld and should be read in conjunction with the Assessment Regulations ([Section 5.7 – Academic Misconduct](#)).

Section 2 provides practical guidance on how to uphold academic integrity and good academic practice, our responsibilities and yours, and the process for consequences and penalties that could be applied if academic misconduct has been established.

Section 1 is aimed mostly at Students; Section 2 is aimed mostly at staff, but you will benefit from reading it all.

1. Academic Integrity & Misconduct Policy

1.1. Policy Introduction

- 1.1.1. You are expected to uphold academic integrity and good academic practice by demonstrating behaviour that is honest and ethical in all of your academic work. This policy sets out the process which is triggered if we suspect that you have not upheld these principles and committed Academic Misconduct.
- 1.1.2. Academic Misconduct is any action that produces an improper advantage for you in relation to your assessment(s) or deliberately and unnecessarily disadvantages other students. It can be committed intentionally or accidentally. We actively pursue all cases of suspected misconduct. (Please see **Appendix 1**)
- 1.1.3. We will manage and consider cases of alleged Academic Misconduct in accordance with the [Assessment Regulations \(Regulation 19\)](#). The regulations are designed to ensure that students suspected of Academic Misconduct are provided with an independent and transparent system that is both efficient and fair. This system safeguards the integrity of our awards as well as the interests of the majority of students who work hard for their award through their own efforts.
- 1.1.4. Following investigation into a case, the assessment of the type and severity of individual cases will be determined by academic judgement and these may be designated as:
- Poor Academic Practice
 - Academic Misconduct
 - Severe Academic Misconduct
- (**Appendix 2** gives more detail of this)
- 1.1.5. Academic Misconduct investigations can be conducted either in-person, online (by Zoom or Teams) or by correspondence.
- 1.1.6. The range of sanctions available are published within the Assessment Regulations and in **Appendix 3** of this policy. **Appendix 4** outlines examples of Academic Misconduct and related indicative sanctions.
- 1.1.7. The Academic Misconduct Regulation ([section 5.7 of the Assessment Regulations](#)) and the [Student Disciplinary Regulation \(Regulation 13\)](#) set out the levels at which cases of alleged academic misconduct might be considered:
- Initial consideration (the Preliminary Investigation)
 - School-level consideration (via an Academic Misconduct Panel)
 - Institutional-level consideration (via the City Disciplinary Panel)
- 1.1.8. Cases of Academic Misconduct will be recorded and reported to your School's Board of Studies on an annual basis.

1.2. Preliminary Investigations

- 1.2.1. Where an allegation of academic misconduct has been made against you, we will carry out a Preliminary Investigation in accordance with [section 5.7.2 of the Assessment Regulations](#). A fair and robust preliminary investigation is key to ensuring that the evidence establishes as much as possible if a case can be confirmed, dismissed, or resolved as outlined below.
- 1.2.2. Cases relating to a first instance of Poor Academic Practice (PAP) may be resolved at the Preliminary Investigation stage without the need for an Academic Misconduct Panel. However, any subsequent offence will be escalated to the 'Academic Misconduct' level which will be reviewed by an Academic Misconduct Panel ([regulation 5.7.2\[ij\]](#)).
- 1.2.3. Academic Misconduct Panels can be conducted either in-person, online (by Zoom or Teams) or by correspondence. Academic Misconduct Panels can also take place in the absence of a student where it is reasonable and justifiable to do so.
- 1.2.4. Where you commit a first Poor Academic Practice (PAP) or first Academic Misconduct offence and admit that you are at fault, the case may be dealt with in accordance with Sanction 1 or Sanction 2 (if deemed appropriate) at the Preliminary Investigation stage. ([Regulation 5.7.2\[iii\]a of the Assessment Regulations shows this.](#)) Where such cases are resolved during a Preliminary Investigation rather than by an Academic Misconduct Panel, we will ensure that you are not advantaged or disadvantaged in any way.

1.3. Academic Misconduct Panel conduct and recommendations

- 1.3.1. Academic Misconduct Panels will be held in accordance with [section 5.7 of the Assessment Regulations](#).
- 1.3.2. If the Academic Misconduct Panel finds that you have committed academic misconduct it will recommend one of the standard sanctions appropriate to the level of the offence. We have set out standard sanctions (**Appendix 3**) to ensure parity of treatment for students across City. Panels should aim to achieve an equitable and consistent outcome for students in the sanctions recommended for cases of Academic Misconduct.
- 1.3.3. Decision makers are asked to bear in mind that some penalties for a disciplinary offence might have more serious implications for some students. The same sanction might have a different outcome depending on when the misconduct was committed (e.g. year of study, first sit or re-sit) and the structure of the programme. For example, a penalty limiting your progression may have an unintended negative impact on a student with a deteriorating health condition or an international student's visa status. The decision maker is asked to explain how they have taken these implications (where relevant) into account, as well as any extenuating circumstances, disability (**see paragraph 2.4.7 within the Guidance**) and other potential mitigating factors ([Regulation 19 - 5.7.4 Sanctions](#)).

- 1.3.4. If the Academic Misconduct Panel considers that you have committed Severe Academic Misconduct, the appropriate sanction may be greater than those available in the Academic Regulations. In this case, a Panel may recommend to the Assessment Board that your case is dealt with under City's Student Discipline Regulations ([Senate Regulation 13](#)) or, for PSRB regulated programmes, be referred to a Fitness to Practice Panel.

1.4. Assessment Board decisions

- 1.4.1. The Assessment Board has the final decision about whether a sanction (or referral to the Disciplinary Panel or a Fitness to Practice Panel) recommended by the Academic Misconduct Panel or via the Preliminary Investigation is imposed. The Assessment Board will not reconsider the findings of the Panel.
- 1.4.2. If you are awaiting the outcome and Assessment Board ratification of an Academic Misconduct Panel, you will be advised to continue with the programme. Exceptionally, where the case would be designated as Severe Academic Misconduct the case may be referred to the Disciplinary Panel prior to the meeting of the Assessment Board.

1.5. Reporting and statistics

- 1.5.1. In order to ensure consistency of practice, equity and comparability and to support monitoring of the process and the outcomes. Cases of Academic Misconduct will be recorded and reported to the Board of Studies on an annual basis.
- 1.5.2. Schools are asked to keep a log of all Academic Misconduct allegations, whether dealt with by informal resolution or by a full meeting of the Academic Misconduct Panel. The log should be considered annually by Boards of Study and should record the nature of the offence, the outcome of any investigation or hearing, and the decision of the Assessment Board.
- 1.5.3. Records should also be retained for cases where the preliminary investigation or Panel determine that an offence has not taken place. This is to provide City with an overview of the nature and quantity of cases that occur, and any patterns or trends that are developing.
- 1.5.4. Your record will only show Academic Misconduct cases that have been proven and the sanctions that have been applied. A non-proven case will not feature on any records for any purposes. Any sanctions applied including reprimands (Sanction 1) will be formally recorded on your record and will appear on your final transcript.

1.6. Rights to Appeal

- 1.6.1. City's Academic Misconduct process is governed by [Senate Regulation 19 \(Assessment Regulations\)](#). You have the right to appeal the recommendation of the Academic Misconduct Panel following ratification of the decision by the Assessment Board.

- 1.6.2. In managing cases of alleged academic misconduct your School must ensure that you:
- know about the case being put against you at a reasonable time before the case is heard;
 - are able to challenge the outcome of the case;
 - are treated without any bias;
 - are offered the opportunity to appeal against the final outcome or decision.

1.6.3. Further details can be found in our [Appeals](#) process.

2. Academic Integrity & Misconduct Guidance

2.1. Introduction

- 2.1.1. The University has an obligation to uphold the academic integrity of the degrees it awards. Academic Integrity includes undertaking assessments honestly, in a responsible manner and respecting the work and ideas of others.
- 2.1.2. Academic integrity means conducting all aspects of your academic life in a professional manner. It involves:
- taking responsibility for your own work;
 - respecting the rights of other scholars;
 - behaving with respect and courtesy when debating with others even when you do not agree with them;
 - fully acknowledging the work of others wherever it has contributed to your own (thereby avoiding plagiarism)
 - ensuring that your own work is reported honestly;
 - ensuring that you follow the ethical conventions and requirements appropriate to your discipline;
 - if you are studying on a professionally-recognised vocational programme, maintaining standards of conduct which are appropriate to a practitioner in that area;
 - supporting others in their own efforts to behave with academic integrity;
 - avoiding actions which seek to give you an unfair advantage over others;
 - following the requirements of the University Assessment Regulation;
 - complying with and undertaking your research responsibly, following all necessary regulatory, legal and professional obligations.

2.2. Responsibilities

- 2.2.1. We will promote good academic conduct in relation to all assessments. This means providing to you during the induction process and in writing, in programme materials and other media as appropriate, guidance on academic integrity, which should cover programme-specific content and include at least:
- a) referencing (and any preferred referencing style);
 - b) how to avoid plagiarism;

- c) acceptable use of a proof-reader, including guidance on declaring the use of a proof-reader;
- d) collusion;
- e) contract cheating;
- f) fabrication.

Where Programmes include collaborative/group work we will:

- a) advise you on the boundary between legitimate collaboration and inappropriate collaboration/collusion;
- b) advise you about any method to be used to demonstrate individual and/or collective contributions.

2.2.2. You are expected to undertake your assessment with academic integrity and in doing so have the following responsibilities:

- To familiarise yourself with the guidance we provide, in relation to the avoidance of academic misconduct.
- To familiarise yourself with guidance we provide in relation to conduct in Practical Examinations, Class Tests and Written Examinations.
- To follow written and oral instructions provided in relation to all Practical Examinations, Class Tests and Written Examinations, including:
 - a) the announcements made at the start, during and at the end of the Practical Examination, Class Test and Written Examination;
 - b) The instructions at the top of the question paper (rubric), and any other written instructions provided by the University.

2.2.3. A key element of academic integrity is understanding good academic practice in written work, numerical disciplines and creative practice. Understanding how to use the work of other scholars, including your peers, to develop your own insights into a subject and spark new ideas is an important professional skill. The skills you need to succeed in higher education in the United Kingdom (UK) may be different from those you have learned at school, college or in your workplace as you will be expected to follow professional academic standards. Within the UK professional academic community, it is never acceptable to use the words of others or their creative output (whether published or unpublished, including material from the internet) without explicit acknowledgement. To do so would not be seen as a mark of respect but rather as plagiarism.

2.2.4. By submitting your work, you acknowledge that:

- you have read and understood the regulations and code regarding academic misconduct, including that relating to plagiarism, as specified in the Programme Handbook.
- this work will be subject to a variety of checks for academic misconduct.

- 2.2.5. By submitting your work, you declare that:
- the work is entirely your own except those parts duly identified and referenced within the submission
 - It complies with any specified word limits and the requirements and regulations detailed in the coursework instructions and any other relevant programme and module documentation.

2.3. Training for staff and student support

- 2.3.1. Schools, supported by the wider University, are asked to establish a pool of Academic and Professional Staff experts to support and deliver training to academic staff on how to identify academic misconduct and what to do when suspected cases are discovered.
- 2.3.2. Within each School, the Associate Dean of Education in liaison with the Heads of Academic Services (or equivalent) should develop local plans on disseminating information to staff and students on how to maintain academic integrity and how to avoid any form of misconduct when undertaking academic writing or completing academic assessments. The underlying principle of academic originality is central to avoiding academic misconduct; Programme Teams should direct students to current and relevant advice on an ongoing basis throughout their programme and informational websites should be linked to pages on Moodle. The process of informing and teaching students necessary skills on avoiding Academic Misconduct, should also be included in departmental induction week or at another appropriate and timely point.

For further support available to students please see the [Student Hub](#).

2.4. Identifying suspected Academic Misconduct and the Preliminary Investigation

- 2.4.1. If a member of staff suspects that you have committed academic misconduct, their first step is to ascertain the initial concerns, gather evidence and notify your Course Director / Head of Department (or nominee) that a preliminary investigation is required. Academic staff are advised not to discuss the matter with you informally but to ensure that due process is followed as per [Assessment Regulations 19 \(5.7.2.\)](#). The investigation should then be delegated to, and led by, an appropriately trained member of Academic staff (which can be the same staff member who originally suspected the academic misconduct). Other members of staff can be involved if it is appropriate and permitted by section 5.7.2 of the Assessment Regulations. The investigating staff will then discuss the matter and gather together as much evidence in support of the allegation as possible.
- 2.4.2. Academic Misconduct investigations can be conducted either in-person, online (by Zoom or Teams) or by correspondence. This means that, where it is reasonable and justifiable to do so, Academic Misconduct investigations can take place via a written statement provided by you.

For example, where:

- there is a high number of potentially related cases within the same module, programme or School;
- where legitimate adjustments and considerations are required to ensure the process is accessible and runs fairly;
- where there are specific equality needs, and/or where reasonable adjustments are required.

- 2.4.3. The Office of the Independent Adjudicator (OIA) Good Practice Framework provides guidance on academic judgment and states that ‘where an academic judgement is made it should be evidence based’.

Deciding questions of fact do not involve academic judgement.

Questions normally involving academic judgement:

- Is the standard of work so out of line with the student’s other work that it suggests cheating?
- Are the ideas copied from someone else’s work?
- Do the student’s working notes support their case that the submitted work is theirs?

Questions of fact that do not normally involve academic judgement:

- Did the student advertise for someone to do the work for them?
- Did the student buy an essay online?
- Are the quotations marked by indented text or quotation marks?
- Did the student intend to cheat?

[\(Office of the Independent Adjudicator \(OIA\), The Good Practice Framework, Disciplinary procedures June 2018, Page 27\)](#)

- 2.4.4. In order to promote a consistent approach to this process, academic staff are asked to refrain from releasing the mark and any feedback on any assessments where the alleged academic misconduct has occurred until the procedures are complete.

- 2.4.5. Members of staff may identify suspicious assignments due to a variety of reasons. Some of the most common are listed below, although this list is not exhaustive:

- a) Similarity to another student’s assignment.
- b) Incoherent structure.
- c) Recognition of text from elsewhere.
- d) False data provided.
- e) Dissertation handed in on different topic or without supervision.
- f) Shifts in language style/grammar/vocabulary throughout the work.
- g) Submission not aligned to assignment set.
- h) Odd changes in font or layout.
- i) Presence of characteristics typical in a web-published document (URLs, formatting in html, hyperlinks, etc.).

- j) Bibliographies which are exclusively non-UK material (unless appropriate to specific assignment) OR include references over three years old, especially where assignment is on a topical issue.
- k) Highly specific professional language used by a student who is new to the discipline.

2.4.6. Technologies (such as Turnitin) may be used to support academic judgement in cases of suspected academic misconduct, for example: to investigate suspected cases of academic misconduct already identified via other means; or to check the work of a whole cohort or a defined sample of students as detailed in the Assessment Regulations. The reports arising from these technologies should only be used as evidence if they are subject to academic interpretation and accompanied by a short-written analysis of the results.

2.4.7. Staff must perform a background check to ascertain whether there are any declarations of a disability and agreed reasonable adjustments for the student from the Academic Skills Team. Where this is the case, advice should be sought from the Academic Skills Team in processing the case and it is essential that any potential impact the disability or reasonable adjustments may have had on the academic misconduct must be considered and outlined clearly within the investigation and Panel (were appropriate) documents.

2.4.8. Preliminary Investigations will be carried out in accordance with [section 5.7.2 of the Assessment Regulations](#). During the preliminary investigation, you will be informed of the allegation made against you and invited to discuss the allegations. It is recommended that 7 calendar days' notice are provided where possible in order to ensure that you are able to sufficiently prepare; this can include seeking advice and support from the Students' Union.

2.5. Determining the required actions

2.5.1. If the Academic member of staff, in consultation with the professional member of staff, agree that further investigation is required, a case should be opened to review the suspected academic misconduct. The student should be informed about the suspicion and that they will receive an update as soon as the initial investigations are complete. Details on when the investigations will be complete must be explicitly noted in the communications to the student.

2.5.2. If the preliminary investigation concludes that further investigation is required, a case should be opened and an Academic Misconduct Panel should be arranged to review the suspected academic misconduct.

2.5.3. If the case is escalated to Panel, the following actions should take place: a letter will be sent to you stating that the case has been referred to an Academic Misconduct Panel; If the preliminary investigation concludes that there is insufficient evidence to confirm the case (e.g. if you have provided adequate evidence of originality) then the case should be dismissed.

- 2.5.4. If the case is dismissed, the following actions should take place:
- a) a letter will be sent to you stating 'No Case To Answer';
 - b) details of the outcome should be sent to relevant colleagues such as the Module Tutor or Leader.

2.6. Gathering evidence to investigate the allegation

- 2.6.1. Sufficient evidence is required to determine whether there is a case to answer and to build a case once this has been determined. Decisions about whether a submission is, or is not, your own work can be made based on enquiries about the process of producing the work rather than on making a judgment about the originality of its content.
- 2.6.2. If a reasonable judgement cannot be made, the investigating staff may carry out further investigations. Where there is no hard evidence of plagiarism, it has been demonstrated that there are good reasons to believe that the work is not your own, it may be deemed appropriate for the Academic Misconduct Panel to expect you to demonstrate that the work is your own original work.
- 2.6.3. Whilst investigations are the responsibility of the trained academic representative, they may ask others to assist as required or delegate to another trained member of staff.
- 2.6.4. Details of any previous Academic Misconduct cases should also be available to the Academic Misconduct Panel for consideration with the current case.
- 2.6.5. Once the academic and professional members of staff have completed gathering all relevant evidence for a case the type of offence can be determined.

2.7. Case Management

- 2.7.1. The School Head of Academic Services (or equivalent member of staff) is responsible for the overall administration of Academic Misconduct cases, including the record keeping and conducting appeal hearings. The daily management of casework is the responsibility of the School professional member of staff who ensure that cases referred to them are progressed until completion. (The 'professional member of staff' should be a Quality Officer or an equivalent member of staff.) They will support the investigation of suspected Academic Misconduct cases in liaison with relevant academic member(s) of staff to establish whether there is a case (please see 5.1.2 of the Assessment Regulations).
- 2.7.2. This will include ensuring that you receive communications about the investigation, arranging meeting(s) with you where possible to discuss cases of Poor Academic Practice and, where relevant, escalating cases to an Academic Misconduct Panels for further review.

2.8. Determining the category of Academic Misconduct

2.8.1. City has defined three categories for Academic Misconduct which are:

- **Poor Academic Practice**
- **Academic Misconduct**
- **Severe Academic Misconduct**

(Please see **Appendix 2** for more details and guidance)

2.9. Dealing with Poor Academic Practice Cases

2.9.1. When sufficient evidence has been gathered to indicate that poor academic practice has occurred, the relevant members of academic and professional staff should meet with you to give you the opportunity to discuss the matter. The School will make reasonable attempts to contact you to arrange this discussion in person, via virtual meeting platforms, or by correspondence. But the investigation will continue if you fail to respond to these requests or does not attend an arranged meeting.

2.9.2. The discussion may follow an agenda to ascertain whether poor academic practice or academic misconduct may have occurred, and the student can be asked about the work and the allegation, but it is important to remember that this is not a formal hearing, and such questions should be framed appropriately. The Academic Misconduct Panel will be able to question the student more thoroughly at the hearing if this is appropriate and required.

2.9.3. A written summary of the conversation should be drawn up and, wherever possible, signed by you as a true record.

2.9.4. Cases of Poor Academic Practice should be referred to the Academic Skills Team to give the student the opportunity to receive additional help and advice on avoiding the same mistakes in the future.

2.10. Dealing with (Severe) Academic Misconduct Cases

2.10.1. A first Academic Misconduct offence, where it is deemed appropriate, and where the student has admitted to the misconduct, may be dealt with at the Preliminary Investigation stage, in accordance with Sanction 2. As outlined in the above Policy (section 1.2). Subsequent offences would be referred to an Academic Misconduct Panel.

2.10.2. For a Sanction 2 to be applied at a local level, it must be the students first offence (any previous offence including PAP must then mean that the case is referred to Panel), it must be deemed appropriate to apply a Sanction 2 (if there is debate on whether or not the severity of the case should call for a higher sanction, the case must be referred to Panel) and the student must admit they committed the offence.

2.10.3. However, if the case of academic misconduct is more serious or complex, it can be immediately referred to an Academic Misconduct Panel. This will ensure that such cases are considered by a group of experienced and trained staff and not by one or two individuals.

2.11. The Academic Misconduct Panel

2.11.1. The responsibility for considering Academic Misconduct offences lies with an impartial, experienced and trained panel of staff. With the aim of building up a body of knowledge and experience amongst its members and to maintain parity of treatment of students within the School, and across City, the Academic Misconduct Panel will conduct all Academic Misconduct hearings within the School.

2.11.2. Academic Misconduct Panels can be conducted either in-person, online (by Zoom or Teams) or by correspondence. This means that, where it is reasonable and justifiable to do so, Academic Misconduct Panels can take place via written statements provided by you.

2.11.3. Academic Misconduct Panels can also take place in the absence of a student. For example, where:

- there is a high number of potentially related cases within the same module, programme or School;
- where legitimate adjustments and considerations are required to ensure the process is accessible and runs fairly;
- where there are specific equality needs, and/or where reasonable adjustments are required.

2.11.4. At an Academic Misconduct Panel, the responsibility for proving an Academic Misconduct issue i.e. the “burden of proof” lies with the University and the level of proof required is measured using the “balance of probabilities”.

2.11.5. **“Burden of Proof:**
The “burden of proof” determines whose responsibility it is to prove there is cause to launch an investigation and confirm a case. In a disciplinary case we would expect the burden of proof to be on the provider, that is, the provider must prove that the student has done what they are accused of doing. The student should not have to disprove the allegation.

2.11.6. **Standard of Proof:**
The “standard of proof” is the level of proof required. In legal proceedings the standard of proof in criminal cases is normally “beyond reasonable doubt”, which is a very high standard. In civil cases it is normally “the balance of probabilities”, that is, it is more likely than not that something happened. Although the “balance of probabilities” standard is lower than “beyond reasonable doubt”, decisions must still be supported by evidence. The standard is higher than simply believing that something is likely to have happened.”

[\(Office of the Independent Adjudicator \(OIA\), The Good Practice Framework, Disciplinary procedures June 2018, Page 23\)](#)

2.11.7. The Panel Composition:

The Panel including Chairs and Deputy Chairs will be selected from a pool of staff members approved by Boards of Studies. Panel Chairs will be members of staff who have had no previous involvement in the case. Chairs will be appointed at the start of each academic year by Boards of Studies.

A selection of Deputy Chairs should be identified for circumstances which prevent the Chair from attending, either due to other commitments, or due to issues of impartiality.

The Chair will be joined by two academic members of staff or one suitable professional member of staff and one academic member of staff from the approved pool of staff members. A secretary will also be present at all Panel meetings.

2.11.8. Student Attendance:

When an investigation is escalated from the Preliminary Investigation to an Academic Misconduct Panel (in accordance with [Regulation 19](#)), you should be informed within 14 calendar days of the Panel, in order to enable you to prepare for the hearing.

You are entitled to bring a member of City's community to support you at the hearing or act as a witness. Or if you choose not to attend, to ask the member of City's community to represent you at the hearing but not defend the allegation on your behalf. You may not be legally represented at the hearing and if the individual accompanying you is legally qualified, they may attend, but only in a supporting role and not to provide legal representation.

The names and roles of those attending must be notified to the Secretary in advance of the hearing.

2.11.9. Academic Misconduct Panel Business:

As part of the Academic Misconduct Panel, you will be informed of the reasons for the allegation(s), and provided with any directly relevant evidence that will be used, including a copy of any electronic reports, at least 7 calendar days in advance of the hearing. Where possible, you should be given guidance on interpreting an electronic report (e.g. from the Students' Union).

The usual order of business for a hearing at which you are present is:

- The Chair will ask those present to introduce themselves; Panel members should be clearly identified.
- The Chair will ask you (where present) if you refute the allegations.
- The Chair will make a statement supporting the allegation(s).
- The Chair will invite you to respond to the allegation(s).
- During and after these statements the Panel may ask questions of either you or the Departmental representative for clarification.
- All except the Panel members should withdraw while the Panel reaches its recommendation.

- The Panel's recommendation will be communicated to you verbally and again in writing as soon as possible after, and at the latest within 14 calendar days of, the hearing.
- Where you choose to or are unable to attend the hearing in person the usual process is:
 - You will provide a written response to the allegations and the evidence.
 - Any points requiring clarification will be followed up before the Panel meeting.
 - The Panel will meet to review the evidence and decide on the case.
 - The Panel's recommendation, along with reasons, will be communicated to you in writing as soon as possible after, and at the latest within 14 calendar days of, the hearing.

2.11.10. **Deliberating on Sanctions:**

The fundamental principle behind determining a sanction to impose on students who have committed academic misconduct of any level, is that no student should be dealt with in such a way that they benefit from their misconduct. For example, it would not be acceptable even for a Poor Academic Practice case to be allocated a sanction which allowed the student to correct the misconduct and receive full marks, as this would be equivalent to providing formative feedback and an extension. However, the primary purpose of the Academic Misconduct procedure is not to punish students but to ensure the achievement of relevant learning outcomes. Therefore, City has prescribed a range of sanctions (as detailed in **Appendix 3**) that should be used to apply the appropriate level of sanction.

If Academic Misconduct has taken place the Panel must decide an appropriate sanction to recommend to the Assessment Board. Different sanctions exist to accommodate different levels of Academic Misconduct. Recommendations as to sanctions should be based on the following facts:

- the instance of the misconduct (first or subsequent);
- the nature of the misconduct;
- the extent of the misconduct. This is a decision based on academic judgement;
- whether the misconduct was deliberately fraudulent.

In addition, the following circumstances may have an effect on the choice of sanction:

- The effect a sanction would have on the student's ability to enter his/her chosen profession;
- The student's year of study;
- The nature of the module (number of credits, structure, aggregation formula);
- Any extenuating or mitigating circumstances.

In deciding on an appropriate sanction, the Academic Misconduct Panel should take into account all circumstances related to the academic misconduct, the evidence provided, any historical offences, PSRB requirements and the overall impact that the sanction applied will have on the student.

Repeated Poor Academic Practice, particularly if the student has been previously reprimanded should escalate to Academic Misconduct.

Where a student is found guilty of academic misconduct, personal tutors may include this information in their references and where appropriate, sanctions may also be shared with relevant professional bodies.

2.11.11. Considering Intentionality:

Before a sanction is established, consideration should be given to whether the misconduct was deliberate, e.g. whether there are any differences in facts, and whether it is likely that the student was aware that they were committing an academic offence:

- Differences of fact may, for example, be about whether or not the student was given an electronic copy of a fellow student's work or whether or not the student was advised about academic integrity.
- Examples of actions construed as deliberate might be the student declaring they were running out of time and had to choose between not submitting the assessment and submitting something largely copied from the Internet. It is less likely that the misconduct was deliberate if the student can show it to be due to lack of understanding of the required academic standards. Not properly understanding what is required should be distinguished from failing to have proper regard for the need to comply with academic standard.

In addition, there may be extenuating circumstances, language and cultural differences to be taken into consideration. Sanctions given must be both reasonable and proportionate to the misconduct committed. It might therefore, depending on the severity of the misconduct committed, be reasonable to be more compassionate with a case of Academic Misconduct by a student in their first semester of study on the grounds that they are not completely familiar with the concept or where the misconduct was not deliberate. Misconduct does not have to be deliberate to incur a sanction. However, a student that has studied at another UK institution, or, is in the latter years of their degree should fully understand the principles of good academic practice and therefore has a less valid case.

2.12. Academic Misconduct Panel recommendations

- 2.12.1. In order to maintain parity for students across City, the Panel will consider the allegation of misconduct whilst taking other factors into account - such as the number of attempts that the student has had, any previous cases recorded on the student file or whether there are any material extenuating circumstances. The Panel will decide whether they are satisfied or not satisfied that misconduct has taken place.
- 2.12.2. If the Panel judges that Academic Misconduct has not been committed, you will be informed in writing and the allegation will not be considered as part of the Assessment Board's deliberations.
- 2.12.3. If the Panel concludes that misconduct has taken place, they will make a recommendation to the Assessment Board providing the details of the offence along with an appropriate sanction. The reasons for the recommendation must be clearly recorded. The Panel must also make clear the rationale for any deviations from sanctions that are the norm for a given type of misconduct.
- 2.12.4. Where you are awaiting the outcome and Assessment Board ratification of an Academic Misconduct Panel, you will be advised to continue with your programme. Exceptionally, where the case is designated as 'Severe Academic Misconduct' the case may be referred to the Disciplinary Panel prior to the meeting of the Assessment Board.
- 2.12.5. The Assessment Board Secretary will present the recommendations to the Chair of the Assessment Board for final approval.
- 2.12.6. Outcomes of the Academic Misconduct Panel meeting will be recorded and communicated to you. The sanction applied is not final until it is ratified by the relevant Assessment Board.

2.13. Disciplinary Panel Considerations – Sanction 6

- 2.13.1. In cases of severe academic misconduct (**Appendix 2, 3 & 4**) where the application of sanctions 1 – 5 are not appropriate due to the severity of the misconduct the Academic Misconduct Panel may deem it necessary to escalate the case to the Disciplinary Panel (Sanction 6) who have the ability to apply more appropriate sanctions.
- 2.13.2. In such instances, where the allegations are found to be substantiated the Disciplinary Panel can apply relevant Sanctions as listed in the Assessment and Student Discipline Regulations. Sanctions may also be combined as appropriate and reasonable. The outcome and rationale for the sanction(s) applied will be recorded and communicated to you in writing.
- 2.13.3. The Disciplinary Panel will be conducted in line with [Student Disciplinary Policy](#) and the [Guidance for Disciplinary Panel Hearings](#).

Appendix 1 – Definitions of Academic Misconduct

Plagiarism:

Plagiarism is defined as use of intellectual material produced by another person without acknowledging its source, for example:

- Wholesale copying of passages from works of others without acknowledgment.
- Use of the views, opinions, or insights of another without acknowledgment.
- Submitting as one's own, an assignment prepared by another student

Self-Plagiarism:

It is possible to plagiarise yourself by re-using work you have previously submitted* without acknowledgement:

- The submission of work that the student, as the author, has previously submitted, without suitable acknowledgement of the source of their previous work; this should not normally be more than a short quotation as the same work cannot be submitted for different assignments.

*This does not include any re-submissions of work for the same assignment which have been approved by your lecturer/tutor.

Collusion:

The University defines collusion as a form of cheating which may occur where students have consciously collaborated on a piece of work, in part or whole, and passed it off as their own individual efforts or where one student has authorised another to use their work, in part or whole, and to submit it as their own.

Actions which would be considered to be Collusion:

- Planning a response together; copying a plan for an individual assessment.
- Paraphrasing someone else's assignment and submitting it as your own.
- Relying on some group members to do all the work.
- Getting someone else to do your assessment task.

Actions that would be considered to be Cooperation:

- Analysing the assessment question together.
- Practising paraphrasing skills together and sharing tips.
- Sharing work evenly among group members.
- Getting help from your personal tutor

Working together with other students on a piece of work that will be submitted for individual assessment is not permitted and can result in an accusation of academic misconduct for all the students involved.

Discussing the material and ideas you are learning with your colleagues is beneficial and is encouraged, however, when you start to write down the material that you will use for assessment, make sure this is entirely your own work and do not share it with other students.

Collusion is different from group work where students are instructed by the university to work together and the work is then assessed as a group effort. For group tasks you will be advised what the members of the group are expected to do together, and that (if anything) they are expected to do separately. If you are unsure, check with your tutor or lecturer.

If collaboration is permitted at certain stages of a project, explicit instructions should be provided to students regarding when this is and when it is not allowed. For example, if students must complete an assignment independently, explain both verbally and in the assignment guidelines that collaborations will strictly not be permitted.

Written and verbal guidelines for students:

It is essential to provide clear instructions for handling group assignments. It is encouraged that this is provided to students both verbally and in writing. When group assignments are issues, the following should also be taken into consideration as methods of avoiding academic misconduct:

- requiring each student to provide a clear specific statement indicating each individual's contribution to the project as part of the work.
- providing clear guidelines on what a student should do if there are problems with other students in the group to disrupt potential academic misconduct.
- requiring that students should engage in some degree of collaboration on all parts of the project, rather than dividing the tasks and simply assembling the pieces into a final assignment at the end.
- providing students with a submission checklist and requiring the signing of a group assignment disclosure.

Student tips for group work:

Before beginning the project:

- clearly outline which parts of the assignment are group and which are individual.
- discuss preferred working styles and expectations with your group members before beginning the assignment.
- anytime your group uses someone else's work (ideas, words, images, code, etc.), it needs to be referenced.
- create a schedule to stay on track.

While working on the project:

- be respectful to others in all communications (face to face or online).
- keeps evidence of your own planning, preparation and resources.
- keep track of what each group member is contributing.
- have frequent meetings with your group members to review the assessment as a whole, discuss progress and resolve challenges.
- before submitting, review the submission checklist. (If provided)

Falsification of evidence & Fabrication of data:

Falsification of evidence and fabrication of data is cheating by faking results, as of an experiment, or otherwise “making up” something that one presents as true, factual, or real. Fabrication in an academic context may occur in a number of forms, including these:

- falsifying research results or a report of research processes
- falsifying reports or records related to a field, practicum, or clinical experience

Cheating:

Cheating is a general category of academic misconduct that, in the context of an academic course, involves dishonesty in completing work in the course — whether an examination or other kind of assignment. Assisting another student dishonestly is also cheating. Note that plagiarism, fabrication of research results, and other such violations of academic integrity may correctly be identified as particular kinds of cheating. Examples of cheating include, but are not limited to, the following:

- knowingly discovering or attempting to discover the contents of an examination before the contents are released
- taking a picture of or otherwise copying an examination without permission to do so
- providing such a picture/copy to another person
- obtaining, using, or attempting to obtain or use any material or device dishonestly
- supplying or attempting to supply any material or device to another person dishonestly
- obtaining or attempting to obtain unauthorized information during the course of an examination from another student or another student’s test materials
- unauthorised possessing, taking, copying, or sharing of solutions manuals or computerized solutions for assignment or research problems

Breaching the Regulation for Conduct in Examinations:

The University operates a zero-tolerance policy in relation to cheating in examinations.

Breaching the regulation for conduct in examinations includes but is not limited to:

- copying from the examination script of another candidate;
- obtaining or offers any other improper assistance from or to another candidate (or any other person unless an approved reader or scribe);
- refusing to comply with invigilator instructions in an exam
- has with them any unauthorised book (including mathematical tables), manuscript or loose papers of any kind, unauthorised electronic devices* (e.g. mobile telephones, smart watches) or any source of unauthorised information.
- allows himself/herself to be impersonated or when any person impersonates another examination candidate.

*Note: Where a student is found to have taken unauthorised materials or an electronic device to their desk, the student is guilty of academic misconduct, irrespective of that student’s intent or the nature of the materials.

Contract Cheating & Essay Mills:

'Contract cheating' happens when a third party completes work for a student who then submits it to an education provider as their own, where such input is not permitted. It is distinct from collusion, as the student utilises the third party to provide the assessment, usually a company or individual using a website to promote themselves and receive orders.

This is a form of cheating where a student submits work to a higher education provider for assessment, where they have used one or more of a range of services provided by a third party, and such input is not permitted. The contract with the student can in some cases include payment, or other favours, but this is not always the case.

'Services' may include essays or other types of written assignments, conducting research, numerical disciplines, impersonation in exams and other forms of unfair assistance for completing assessed work.

'Third parties' include web-based companies or auction sites (essay mills), sharing websites (including essay banks) or an individual such as a lecturer, colleague, friend or relative.

'Input' means that the third party makes a contribution to the work of the student, such that there is reasonable doubt as to whose work the assessment represents.

Universities have developed several strategies to combat this type of academic misconduct including using anti-plagiarism software such as Turnitin and accessing large databases of known assignments sold to students by Essay Mills which we have access to and can check your work against.

The consequences of contract cheating are very serious. Contract Cheating and the use of Essay Mills is defined by the University as Severe Academic Misconduct.

Additionally, the [Skills and Post-16 Education Bill](#) has become law. Through this act, the Government has passed changes that will transform higher education, including criminalising Essay Mills.

Essay mills are now illegal entities, and you should not engage with or respond to their advertising.

It is no longer a moral question; you will be entangling yourself with an illegal activity and you will be providing your personal information (name, phone number, email address) to people offering a service that is now against the law.

What does this mean in terms of the law in England?

- **A person who provides or arranges to provide a relevant service to students commits an offence:** It is now a criminal offence to provide, or arrange for another person to provide, contract cheating services to students taking a qualification at a University or Higher Education Institution in England. A person guilty of an offence under this section is liable on summary conviction to a fine.

- **A person who advertises a relevant service to students commits an offence:** 'it is now an offence for a person to advertise any service or individual that is offering a cheating service. A person guilty of an offence under this section is liable on summary conviction to a fine.

What does this mean for me as a student?

In order to comply with City Policy and Regulations, students should not use any material provided as a result of an Essay Mills service in completing all or part of the assignment. This is deemed by City University to be 'severe academic misconduct'.

While it is not a criminal offense to make use of a contract cheating service, this is deemed by City University to be 'severe academic misconduct'. The consequences of contract cheating are very serious. Making use of contract cheating services can lead to disciplinary action and expulsion from the University.

What do I do if I am targeted?

Essay Mills will often disguise themselves as 'proofreading', 'tutorial' and 'academic support' services. They may target you via email, text, pop-up ads and social media.

If you receive this marketing you must:

- **Delete it immediately**
- **Do not use click through links**
- **Do not offer any personal information or contact details**

If you are found to have committed contract cheating and/or have been using Essay Mills, you are likely to be referred to a Disciplinary Panel as an outcome of the academic misconduct process.

The outcome is often expulsion from the University as it includes an element of deception/fraud.

The Students' Union website offers information on Academic integrity and contract cheating: the pitfalls of paying someone to do your studies for you.

More information on how to avoid Contract Cheating can be found on the [Student Hub](#).

Proofreading:

There is clear guidance as to what is or is not deemed acceptable in terms of the proof-reading of students' assessed work. (NB. Proofreading should not be allowed at all where formatting, grammar etc are part of the criteria for assessment)

A proof-reader MAY proofread to check for, identify and suggest corrections for errors in the text of a student's assessed work. This means a proof-reader may:

- Identify typographical, spelling and punctuation errors;
- Identify formatting and layout errors and inconsistencies (e.g. page numbers, font size, line spacing, headers and footers);
- Identify grammatical and syntactical errors and anomalies;
- Highlight overly-long or complex sentences or paragraphs, especially where meaning is ambiguous;
- Identify minor formatting errors in referencing (for consistency and order);
- Identify errors in the labelling of diagrams, charts or figures;
- Identify lexical repetition or omissions.

A proof-reader MAY NOT edit the writing of a student's assessed work (that is, check or amend ideas, arguments or structure), since to do so is to compromise the authorship of the work. This means a proof-reader may not:

- Add to content in any way;
- Check or correct facts, data calculations, formulae or equations;
- Rewrite content where meaning is ambiguous;
- Alter argument or logic where faulty;
- Re-arrange or re-order paragraphs to enhance structure or argument;
- Implement or significantly alter a referencing system;
- Re-label diagrams, charts or figures;
- Reduce content so as to comply with a specified word limit;
- Make grammatical, syntactical or stylistic corrections;
- Translate any part of the work into English.

Students should be aware that:

Students have overall authorial responsibility for their work and are responsible for choosing whether they wish to accept the proof-reader's advice.

It is suggested that the student asks their proof-reader to annotate on a hard copy so as to avoid the risks of them making changes that would inadvertently or intentionally breach the guidance and result in an allegation of Academic Misconduct. If a proof-reader reviews work electronically, they should do so using tracked changes and comments so that a student can keep a record of the evolution of their work. This will be helpful if the academic integrity of their work is ever challenged.

Any accepted proof-reader advice must be clearly acknowledged.

Students should be cautious of web-based services which claim to offer proof-reading services and then suggest edits to the writing that compromise the authorship of the work (as detailed above). This would be an alleged academic misconduct and could be considered to be a type of contract cheating, where the work has been produced by a commissioned service. This is a severe type of academic misconduct that could lead to serious sanction and outcomes.

For further details and guidance on Proofreading please see the [LEaD Proofreading Guide on the Student Hub](#).

Appendix 2 - Types of Academic Misconduct Cases

The following definitions are indicative and for guidance (based on sector research) but are not exhaustive. The severity of individual cases is a matter for academic judgement.

Poor Academic Practice:

Poor academic practice can be defined as inappropriate use of a referencing system which includes but is not limited to the following:

- Unattributed quotations;
- Inappropriate paraphrasing;
- Reproducing an existing concept or idea unintentionally;
- Some missing, incorrect or incomplete citations;
- Several sentences of direct copying without acknowledging the source;
- Unacknowledged proof-reading by another person;
- Unacknowledged help with English language accuracy.

Falsification of Attendance:

Your 'Count Me In' card is for your use only and attendance registers (both paper and electronic) should only to be signed by you. It is prohibited to ask another person to tap in on your behalf, for a session you are not going to attend. Not only is this preventing City from supporting students, in addition, recording your attendance inaccurately can be viewed as misconduct through falsification of attendance. This can have serious consequences for your progress and action will be taken where evidence of this has been obtained.

If a student is found to have falsified their attendance in order to appear present, action may be taken as outlined within City's [Disciplinary Policy](#) & [Disciplinary Guidance](#).

If a student is found to have falsified their attendance in order to actively engage in any academic work on behalf of another student, action may be taken as outlined within this Policy & Guidance.

Academic Misconduct:

Academic misconduct cases can include:

- Plagiarism
- Submission of the same piece of work, or major part thereof, for more than one assessment;
- Collusion i.e. unauthorised collaboration on assessable written, oral or practical work with another person or persons;
- An assignment which has been translated into English by another person;
- Repeated Poor Academic Practice, particularly if the student has been previously reprimanded;

- Cheating, e.g.
 - Breaching the [Regulation for Conduct in Examinations](#) (with the exception of instances listed under Severe Academic Misconduct);
 - The lending of work which has been submitted for assessment to another student;
 - Fabrication of data e.g. altering research data;
 - Falsification of evidence e.g. altering supporting evidence to obtain advantage;
 - Inclusion of whole paragraphs or significant sections of unattributed work;
 - Including significant sections of unreferenced text

Severe Academic Misconduct:

Severe Academic Misconduct cases could include cases such as:

- Theft of work of other students or practitioners;
- Contract Cheating e.g.:
 - Buying work from services such as essay mills or similar
 - Commissioning work from individuals (including friends and family) or organisations
- Evidence of extensive cheating e.g.:
 - Obtaining access to an unseen examination or test prior to the start of an examination/test;
 - Impersonating another person during an examination or arranging for another person to impersonate the student during an examination;
- Copying each other's work;
- Evidence of extensive collusion;
- Fabrication of data e.g. generating an entire set of research data;
- Falsification of evidence e.g. creating or obtaining evidence illegally.
- Failure to obtain ethical approval prior to conducting research

Appendix 3 – Sanctions

Poor Academic Practice	Sanction 1	<p>Reprimand</p> <p>A formally recorded warning kept on the student’s record. The work should be marked, but the mark may be reduced to reflect a student’s failure to address the assessment criteria in areas of collation of sources and their citation.</p>
	Sanction 2	<p>Capping of the assessment component</p> <p>Failure in the assessment component, with an opportunity to resit where permissible. The assessment component mark for the resit will be capped at the pass mark.</p>
Academic Misconduct	Sanction 3	<p>Capping of the module mark</p> <p>Failure in the assessment component, with an opportunity to resit where permissible. The mark for the module will be capped at the pass mark.</p>
Severe Academic Misconduct	Sanction 4 / 5	<p>Option 1: Capping of the assessment component and other assessments for the same period</p> <p>Failure in the assessment component, with an opportunity to resit where permissible. The mark for the resit will be capped at a pass. Additionally, capped marks will be imposed on other assessments completed during the same assessment period in which the Academic Misconduct took place.</p> <p>Option 2: Award of zero for the module mark and credits awarded for progression</p> <p>Failure in the assessment component with an opportunity to resit where permissible. If passed, credit for the module will be awarded in recognition of the learning outcomes being met but a module mark of zero will be recorded.</p> <p>Sanction 5 should not normally be applied to foundation or year one undergraduate students.</p>
	Sanction 6	<p>Referral to City Disciplinary Panel.</p> <p>A student will be referred to the City Disciplinary Panel. Sanctions the City Disciplinary Panel may apply for Academic Misconduct are set out in the Student Discipline Regulation (see Senate Regulation 13).</p>

Where a student is found guilty of academic misconduct, personal tutors may include this information in their references and where appropriate sanctions may also be shared with relevant professional bodies.

Appendix 4 - Mapping of Sanctions

** The Indication Sanctions are not prescriptive. In deciding on an appropriate sanction, the Academic Misconduct Panel should take into account all circumstances related to the academic misconduct, the evidence provided, any historical offences, PSRB requirements and the overall impact that the sanction applied will have on the student.

Examples of types of Academic Misconduct	Severity	Indicative* * Sanction
Unattributed quotations	Poor Academic Practice * Repeated Poor Academic Practice, particularly if the student has been previously reprimanded should escalate to Academic Misconduct	1
Inappropriate paraphrasing		
Reproducing an existing concept or idea unintentionally		
Some missing, incorrect or incomplete citations		
Several sentences of direct copying without acknowledging the source		
Unacknowledged proof-reading by another person		
Unacknowledged help with English language accuracy		
Repeated Poor Academic Practice	Academic Misconduct	2 - 3
Plagiarism: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Inclusion of whole paragraphs and/or significant sections of unattributed work • Inclusion of significant sections of unreferenced text 		
Self-Plagiarism: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Submission of the same piece of work, or major part thereof, for assessment 		
Collusion: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Unauthorised collaboration on assessable written, oral or practical work with another person or persons 		
Falsification of evidence: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Altering supporting evidence to obtain advantage 		
Fabrication of data: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Altering research data 		
The lending of work which has been submitted for assessment to another student		
An assignment which has been translated into English by another person;		
Examinations:		

<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Breaching the Regulation for Conduct in Examinations <p>(with the exception of instances listed under Severe Academic Misconduct)</p>		
Theft of work of other students or practitioners	Severe Academic Misconduct	4 - 6
Contract Cheating: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Buying work from essay services such as essay mills or similar Commissioning work from individuals (including friends and family) or organisation 		
Examinations: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Obtaining access to an unseen examination or test prior to the start of an examination/test Impersonating another person during an examination or arranging for another person to impersonate the student during an examination; Copying each other's work 		
Collusion: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Evidence of extensive collusion 		
Fabrication of data: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Generating an entire set of research data 		
Falsification of evidence: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Creating or obtaining evidence illegally 		
Failure to obtain ethical approval prior to conducting research		

Appendix 5– Academic Misconduct Process Flowchart

