



Academic Misconduct Policy and Guidance

Scope

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

Senate Regulations

[Senate Regulation 19 Assessment](#)

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

Date approved/re-approved

Approved by Senate for implementation from 2016/17

Date for review

To be reviewed on a periodic basis, with allowance for minor annual updates of roles and responsibilities by Education and Student Committee, as required

To be read in conjunction with

Quality Manual Section 6

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.

Contents

- 1. Academic Misconduct Policy** 4
 - 1.1. Policy Introduction 4
 - 1.2. Preliminary Investigations 4
 - 1.3. Academic Misconduct Panel conduct and recommendations 5
 - 1.4. Assessment Board decisions 5
 - 1.5. Reporting and statistics 5
 - 1.6. Rights to Appeal 5
- 2. Academic Misconduct Guidance** 6
 - 2.1. Case Management 6
 - 2.2. Training for staff and students 6
 - 2.3. Identifying suspected Academic Misconduct and the Preliminary Investigation 6
 - 2.4. Determining the required actions 7
 - 2.5. Gathering evidence to confirm the case 7
 - 2.6. Determining the category of Academic Misconduct 8
 - 2.7. Dealing with Poor Academic Practice Cases 8
 - 2.8. Dealing with (Severe) Academic Misconduct Cases 8
 - 2.9. The Academic Misconduct Panel 8
 - 2.9.1. The Panel Composition 8
 - 2.9.2. Student Attendance 9
 - 2.9.3. Academic Misconduct Panel business 9
 - 2.9.4. Deliberating on Sanctions 10
 - 2.9.5. Considering Intentionality 10
 - 2.10. Academic Misconduct Panel recommendations 11
- Appendix 1: Types of Academic Misconduct Cases** 12
 - Poor Academic Practice 12
 - Academic Misconduct 12
 - Severe Academic Misconduct 13
- Appendix 2: Sanctions** 14
- Appendix 3: Mapping of Sanctions** 15
- Appendix 4: Flow Chart** 16

1. Academic Misconduct Policy

1.1. Policy Introduction

- 1.1.1. Cases of alleged Academic Misconduct will be managed and considered in accordance with the Assessment Regulations. The regulations are designed to ensure that students suspected of Academic Misconduct are provided with an independent and transparent system that is efficient, fair and speedy. This system safeguards the integrity of City's awards as well as the interests of the majority of students who work hard for their award through their own efforts.
- 1.1.2. Academic Misconduct is any action that produces an improper advantage for the student in relation to their assessment(s) or deliberately and unnecessarily disadvantages other students. It can be committed intentionally or accidentally. City actively pursues all cases of suspected misconduct.
- 1.1.3. 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.as outlined more fully in Appendix One.
- 1.1.4. The range of sanctions available are published in the Assessment Regulations and in Appendix 2 of this policy and guidance document. Appendix 3 outline examples of Academic Misconduct and related indicative sanctions.
- 1.1.5. The Academic Misconduct Regulation (section 5.7 of the Assessment Regulations) and the Student Disciplinary Regulation 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).
- 1.1.6. Cases of Academic Misconduct should be recorded and reported to the Board of Studies on an annual basis.

1.2. Preliminary Investigations

- 1.2.1. Preliminary Investigations will be carried out in accordance with section 5.7.2 of the Assessment Regulations.
- 1.2.2. Cases relating to a first instance of Poor Academic Practice may be resolved at the Preliminary Investigation stage without the need for an Academic Misconduct Panel. However, any subsequent offence should be escalated to the 'Academic Misconduct' level which will be reviewed by an Academic Misconduct Panel (regulation 5.7.2[i]).
- 1.2.3. Where a student commits a minor first Academic Misconduct offence and admits that they are guilty, the case may be dealt with at the Preliminary Investigation stage (regulation 5.7.2[ii]a). Where such cases are resolved during a Preliminary Investigation rather than by an Academic Misconduct Panel, it should be ensured that the students 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. The Academic Misconduct Panel will recommend one of the standard sanctions appropriate to the level of the offence; the standard sanctions have been agreed 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. However, the same sanction might have a different outcome depending on when the misconduct was committed (e.g. year of study, first sit or resit) and the structure of the programme.
- 1.3.3. Cases of Severe Academic Misconduct may attract a greater sanction than those available in the Academic Regulations. Where appropriate, a Panel may recommend to the Assessment Board that a 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 will ultimately determine 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 Investigations is imposed. The Assessment Board will not reconsider the findings of the Panel.
- 1.4.2. Where students are awaiting the outcome and Assessment Board ratification of an Academic Misconduct Panel, they should 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. Cases of Academic Misconduct will be recorded and reported to the Board of Studies on an annual basis. This is to ensure consistency of practice, equity and comparability and to support monitoring of the process and the outcomes.
- 1.5.2. Schools must 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 held on SITS and should record the nature of the offence, the outcome of any investigation or hearing, and the decision of the Assessment Board. 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.
- 1.5.3. The student's record will only show Academic Misconduct cases that have been proven and sanctions have been applied. Reprimands and any non-proven case will not feature on the student's record under the Freedom on Information requests.

1.6. Rights to Appeal

- 1.6.1. City's Academic Misconduct process is informed by Senate Regulation and as such has similarities to a legal case. Therefore the student will have the right to appeal the recommendation of the Academic Misconduct Panel following ratification of the decision by the Assessment Board. The student should:
 - know about the case being put against them at a reasonable time before the case is heard;
 - be able to challenge the outcome of the case;
 - be treated without any bias;
 - be offered the opportunity to appeal against the final outcome or decision.

For more details, the student should be referred to City's Appeals process¹.

¹ http://www.city.ac.uk/__data/assets/pdf_file/0004/69025/student_appeals_policy.pdf

2. Academic Misconduct Guidance

2.1. Case Management

- 2.1.1. 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 staff² who ensure that cases referred to them are progressed until completion. 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). This will include ensuring that the student receives communications about the investigation, arranging meeting(s) with the student where possible to discuss cases of Poor Academic Practice and, where relevant, escalating cases to an Academic Misconduct Panels for further review.

2.2. Training for staff and students

- 2.2.1. 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 requisite skills on avoiding Academic Misconduct should also be included in departmental induction week.
- 2.2.2. Schools should 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. Identifying suspected Academic Misconduct and the Preliminary Investigation

- 2.3.1. If a member of staff suspects that a student has committed academic misconduct, the first step is to ascertain the initial concerns, gather evidence and notify their Head of Department (or nominee) that a preliminary investigation will be conducted. Academic staff are advised not to discuss the matter with the student informally but to ensure that due process is followed as per regulation 5.7.2. Academic staff should seek support for the investigation from the professional member of staff whilst bearing in mind that they have ultimate responsibility for the investigation. Other members of staff can be involved if it is appropriate and permitted by section 5.7.2 of the Academic Misconduct Regulation. Both members of staff should discuss the matter and gather together as much evidence in support of the allegation as possible.
- 2.3.2. In order to promote a consistent approach to this process, academic staff should refrain from marking the assessment where the alleged academic misconduct has occurred until the procedures are complete.
- 2.3.3. Members of staff may identify suspicious assignments due to a variety of reasons. Some of the most common are listed below, although this 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.

² The 'professional member of staff' should be a Quality Officer or an equivalent member of staff.

- (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.

2.3.4. 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 Academic Misconduct Regulation. 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.

2.3.5. Staff should also perform a background check to ascertain whether there are any declarations of a disability and agreed reasonable adjustments for the student from Learning Success. Where this is the case, advice should be sought from Learning Success in processing the case.

2.4. Determining the required actions

2.4.1. 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. Gathering evidence to confirm the case

2.5.1. 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, the student's 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. If a reasonable judgement cannot be made, the relevant staff will carry out further investigations.

2.5.2. Whilst investigations are the responsibility of the academic representative, they may ask others to assist as required.

2.5.3. The professional member of staff should support the collection of relevant evidence in order to confirm a case and also ensure that details of any previous Academic Misconduct cases are available for consideration with the current case.

2.5.4. If the preliminary investigation concludes that there is insufficient evidence to confirm the case (e.g. if the student has provided adequate evidence of originality or it appears likely that the student did not knowingly lend their work to another student) then the case should be dismissed. Likewise, it should be remembered that, where there is no hard evidence of plagiarism but the Module Leader or Tutor has demonstrated that there are good reasons to believe that the work is not that of the student, it is then up to the student to demonstrate that the work is their own original work and not for City to further prove that the student has committed a misconduct.

2.5.5. If the case is dismissed, the following actions should take place:

- (a) A letter will be sent to the student stating 'Case Dismissed';
- (b) Details of the outcome should be sent relevant colleagues such as the Module Tutor or Leader.

- 2.5.6. Once the academic and professional members of staff have completed gathering all relevant evidence for a case the type of offence can be determined.

2.6. Determining the category of Academic Misconduct

City has defined three categories for Academic Misconduct which are:

- Poor Academic Practice
- Academic Misconduct
- Severe Academic Misconduct

Please see Appendix 1 for more details and guidance.

2.7. Dealing with Poor Academic Practice Cases

- 2.7.1. 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 the student to give them the opportunity to discuss the matter. The School will make reasonable attempts to contact the student to arrange this discussion in person or via virtual meeting platforms, but the investigation will continue if the student fails to respond to these requests or does not attend an arranged meeting.
- 2.7.2. Whilst the discussion may follow a viva agenda to ascertain whether poor academic practice or academic misconduct may have occurred, this discussion should not be seen as a formal viva as City cannot require the student to undertake an additional assessment. 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.
- 2.7.3. A written summary of the conversation should be drawn up and, wherever possible, signed by the student as a true record.
- 2.7.4. All cases of Poor Academic Practice should be referred to Learning Success to give the student the opportunity to receive additional help and advice on avoiding the same mistakes in the future

2.8. Dealing with (Severe) Academic Misconduct Cases

- 2.8.1. A minor first Academic Misconduct offence may be dealt with at the Preliminary Investigation stage as outlined in the Academic Misconduct Regulations (5.7.2[iii]) and the Academic Misconduct Policy (section 1.2). Subsequent offences would be referred to an Academic Misconduct Panel.
- 2.8.2. If the case is more serious or complex, it will be referred to an Academic Misconduct Panel. This will ensure that such cases are considered by a group of experienced staff and not by one or two individuals.

2.9. The Academic Misconduct Panel

The responsibility for considering Academic Misconduct offences lies with an impartial, experienced 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.

2.9.1. The Panel Composition

The Panel including Chairs and Deputy Chairs will be selected from a pool of staff members approved by Boards of Studies. 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.

2.9.2. Student Attendance

The student is entitled to bring a member of City's community to support them at the hearing or act as a witness or if the student chooses not to attend, to ask the member of City's community to represent them at the hearing but not defend the allegation on their behalf³. The student may not be legally represented at the hearing and if the individual accompanying the student is legally qualified, they may attend, but only in a support 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.

2.9.3. Academic Misconduct Panel business

A student suspected of Academic Misconduct must be informed of the reasons for the allegation, and provided with any directly relevant evidence that will be used, including a copy of any electronic reports, at least two days in advance of the hearing. Where possible, students 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 the student is present is:

- The Chair will ask those present to introduce themselves; Panel members should be clearly identified.
- The Chair will ask the student (where present) if they refute the allegations.
- The Chair will make a statement supporting the allegation(s).
- The Chair will invite the student to respond to the allegation(s).
- During and after these statements the Panel may ask questions of either the student 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 the student verbally and again in writing as soon as possible after, and at the latest within ten working days of, the hearing.
- Where a student does not attend the hearing in person the usual process is:
 - The student 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 the student in writing as soon as possible after, and at the latest within ten working days of, the hearing.

³ Please note that any notes presented to the Panel should originate from the student being investigated.

2.9.4. Deliberating on Sanctions

The fundamental principle behind determining a sanction to impose on students who have committed (severe) Academic Misconduct 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 2) that should be used to apply appropriate sanctions.

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.

2.9.5. 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 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.

In addition, there may be extenuating circumstances, language and cultural differences to be taken into consideration. It might also be reasonable to be more lenient 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. 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.

2.10. Academic Misconduct Panel recommendations

- 2.10.1. 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.
- 2.10.2. If the Panel judges that Academic Misconduct has not been committed, the student will be informed in writing and the allegation will not be considered as part of the Assessment Board's deliberations.
- 2.10.3. 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.
- 2.10.4. Where students are awaiting the outcome and Assessment Board ratification of an Academic Misconduct Panel, they should 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.
- 2.10.5. The Assessment Board Secretary will present the recommendations to the Chair of the Assessment Board for final approval.
- 2.10.6. Outcomes of the Academic Misconduct Panel meeting will be communicated to the student and the penalty applied should not be disclosed until it is ratified by the relevant Assessment Board.

Appendix 1: 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.

Academic Misconduct

Academic misconduct cases can include:

- Plagiarism
- Submission of the same piece of work, or major part thereof, for 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 Examinations⁴ (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

⁴http://www.city.ac.uk/_data/assets/pdf_file/0004/201577/Senate_Regulation_11_Conduct_of_Examinations-20130923.pdf

Severe Academic Misconduct

Severe Academic Misconduct cases could include cases such as:

- Buying work from essay services or similar;
- Theft of work of other students or practitioners;
- Commissioning work from individuals 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 2: Sanctions

Sanction 1⁵ Reprimand	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.
Sanction 2 Capping of the assessment component	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.
Sanction 3 Capping of the module mark	Failure in the assessment component, with an opportunity to resit where permissible. The mark for the module will be capped at the pass mark.
Sanction 4 Capping of the assessment component and other assessments for the same period	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.
Sanction 5 Award of zero for the module mark and credits awarded for progression	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. <i>Sanction 5 should not normally be applied to foundation or year one undergraduate students.</i>
Sanction 6 Referral to City Disciplinary Panel.	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).

⁵ Students should be referred to sources of help to avoid further offences (e.g. to their personal tutor or Learning Success).

Appendix 3: Mapping of Sanctions

Examples of types of Academic Misconduct	Indicative sanctions
Unattributed quotations	<p style="text-align: center;">Sanction 1 Any latter offences: Sanction 2</p>
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	
Plagiarism	<p style="text-align: center;">Sanction 2</p>
Submission of the same piece of work, or major part thereof, for 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	<p style="text-align: center;">Sanction 3</p>
Inclusion of whole paragraphs or significant sections of unattributed work	
Including significant sections of unreferenced text	
Breaching the Regulation for Conduct in Examinations (with the exception of instances listed under Severe Academic Misconduct)	<p style="text-align: center;">Sanction 4</p>
The lending of work which has been submitted for assessment to another student	
Fabrication of data e.g. altering research data	<p style="text-align: center;">Sanction 5/6</p>
Falsification of evidence e.g. altering supporting evidence to obtain advantage	
Buying work from essay services or similar	
Theft of work of other students or practitioners	
Commissioning work from individuals or organisations	
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 4: Flow Chart

