



Academic Misconduct

Academic misconduct is any action that produces an improper advantage for a student in relation to their assessment, or that deliberately and unnecessarily disadvantages other students. It includes, but is not limited to, such instances as plagiarism, impersonation, collusion and disruption.

Academic misconduct is different from poor academic practice, which can be dealt with within the assessment criteria.

ArtsEd recognises different levels of academic misconduct to be considered when determining appropriate penalties. Cases of suspected academic misconduct shall be reported to the student's Head of Year (or nominee) who shall, without delay, establish a Panel of three members of teaching staff to consider the allegation. The Head of Year shall not be a member of the Academic Misconduct Panel but may be present in an advisory capacity.

Where academic misconduct is alleged, the student shall be given the opportunity to present their case to the Panel either in writing or in person. The student may also respond to any evidence used by the Panel. The student may be accompanied but is expected to speak on their own behalf. If a student decides not to attend in person but does not attend the meeting and has not given adequate reasons for this in advance, the Panel shall continue in the student's absence.

The Panel shall investigate each case and shall decide whether or not academic misconduct has taken place. The Panel is not required to prove intent but instances of deliberate fraud may carry more severe sanctions.

- (i) If academic misconduct has not taken place no further action is taken and no note is entered on the student's record. The notes of the Panel are retained. The marking process is resumed in the normal way and the results are considered by the Assessment Board. If a student has committed poor academic practice this should be taken into account during the marking process.
- (ii) 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:
 1. The instance of the misconduct (first or subsequent).
 2. The extent of the misconduct (major or minor). This is a decision based on academic judgement.
 3. Whether the misconduct was deliberately fraudulent.

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

1. The effect a sanction would have on the student's ability to enter his/her chosen profession.
2. The student's year of study.

3. The nature of the module (number of credits, structure, aggregation formula).
4. Any extenuating or mitigating circumstances.

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

The sanctions a Panel may recommend are:

- (i) Minor first instance: marking work with appropriate mark reductions for affected sections (which may mean marking the work excluding the affected sections). In addition a written warning may be given
- (ii) Major first instance or subsequent minor instance: a fail (0%) for the assessment component with the right to remaining resit(s) retained (maximum mark at resit = minimum pass mark)
- (iii) Major first instance or subsequent instance (major or minor): a fail (0%) for the module with the right to remaining resit(s) retained (maximum mark at resit = minimum pass mark)
- (iv) Major first instance or subsequent instance (major or minor): a fail (0%) for the assessment component or module with the right to remaining resit(s) retained; however, although the student can gain the credit for the component or module they will not be given any marks for it
- (v) Subsequent instance (major or minor): a fail (0%) for the assessment component or module with the right to remaining resit(s) retained (maximum mark at resit = minimum pass mark) but where the student's marks in other assessments in the same diet are capped

In addition, the Panel may recommend that the student undergo training in good academic practice.

Where the Panel considers that the case is serious enough to warrant a sanction greater than those it is able to recommend, it may ask that the case be dealt with under City, University of London's Student Discipline Regulations (see Senate Regulation 13 http://www.city.ac.uk/adu/dps/senate_regs/s13.doc). The panel may recommend a sanction it considers appropriate for consideration by the University Disciplinary Panel. Sanctions the Panel may recommend include any of those listed in the University's Student Discipline Regulations.