



Academic Integrity and Misconduct Procedure

Contents

A. Introduction.....	1
B. Preliminary Investigation.....	2
C. Academic Misconduct Panel.....	3
D. Sanctions	3
E. Consideration at an Assessment Board	4
Appendix 1: Types of Academic Misconduct.....	5

A. Introduction

1. This procedure sets out the process if ArtsEd suspects a student has not upheld the principles of academic integrity.
2. **Academic integrity** is the commitment to, and demonstration of a shared set of principles which include honesty, trust, responsibility, fairness, and respect in an academic setting.
3. **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 can be intentional or accidental. It includes, but is not limited to, such instances as plagiarism (including Generative AI), impersonation, collusion and disruption (Appendix 1). ArtsEd and City St George's, University of London take a serious view of academic misconduct. All students are expected to uphold the academic integrity of City St George's, University of London's awards by demonstrating behaviour that is honest and ethical.
4. Possible outcomes following an investigation into alleged academic misconduct are as follows:
 - i. No case to answer
 - ii. Poor Academic Practice
 - iii. Academic Misconduct and Severe Academic Misconduct
5. Students should be aware that repeated or serious incidents could lead to expulsion from ArtsEd.
6. This procedure should be read in conjunction with with [City St George's, University of London Assessment Regulations \(Regulation 19\)](#) and with the following documents, available on the [Policies page of our website](#):
 - i. Disability and Reasonable Adjustments Policy

ii. Exceptional Circumstances Policy

B. Preliminary Investigation

7. The staff member who suspects misconduct will carry out a preliminary investigation with another member of staff (academic or professional services) to ascertain the initial concerns, gather evidence and notify the student's Head of Year/Course Leader (or nominee). The student will be informed of the allegation made and invited to an informal meeting to discuss the allegation. The preliminary investigation is a matter of academic judgement based on 'reasonable suspicion'. The "burden of proof" normally lies with ArtsEd, that is, ArtsEd must prove that the student has done what they are accused of doing.
8. The purpose of the preliminary investigation is to:
 - establish the facts of the allegation of academic misconduct and the evidence to support it
 - determine whether there is a case to answer and, if there is, determine whether the case relates to (ii) Poor Academic Practice or (iii) Academic Misconduct
 - resolve the matter, determine the action to be taken or refer the case to an Academic Misconduct Panel where appropriate
9. Academic staff are required to refrain from releasing the mark and any feedback on any assessments where the alleged academic misconduct has occurred until the procedures are complete.
10. The possible outcomes are outlined as follows:
 - i. **No case to answer**
 11. If the investigation finds that there is no case to answer because the allegation has been disproved or there is insufficient evidence to prove the allegation, no further action is taken and the allegation is removed from the student's record.
 - ii. **Poor Academic Practice**
 12. Poor academic practice relates to a lack of awareness and understanding of academic integrity in a student's work. It is not extensive, and clear attempts have been made by the student to uphold the principles of academic integrity. Examples include:
 - Poor use of referencing that has not materially given a student an unfair advantage
 - Several sentences of direct copying without acknowledging the source
 - Unacknowledged proof-reading
 13. Poor academic practice can be dealt with in the preliminary investigation meeting and does not require an Academic Misconduct Panel.
 14. No sanction shall be applied, but the assessment should be marked to reflect poor academic practice as detailed in the relevant assessment marking criteria. The student will normally be referred to the SpLD Study Skills Coordinator for further support. The notes from the investigation will be stored on the student's record.
 15. Any suspected subsequent allegations will be referred directly to an Academic Misconduct Panel.

iii. **Academic Misconduct**

16. Academic misconduct is more serious than poor academic practice. Examples of allegations considered to be academic misconduct are outlined in Appendix 1.

C. Academic Misconduct Panel

17. An Academic Misconduct Panel may be convened where:
- Severe academic misconduct is suspected
 - The student disputes the allegation and/or the outcome of the Preliminary Investigation
 - No agreement can be reached on the outcome of the Preliminary Investigation
 - The student has had previous upheld academic misconduct allegations, including poor academic practice
18. The Panel of three members of staff (at least two academic) shall investigate each case independently and can investigate other assessments that it believes might have been implicated. If the Panel has good reason to believe the work is not the student's original, the student may be asked to provide proof and demonstrate the originality of the work but should not have to disprove the allegation.
19. The student shall be given the opportunity to present their case to the Panel either in writing or in person and respond to any evidence used by the Panel. The student may be accompanied but is expected to speak on their own behalf. Legal representation is not permitted. If a student decides 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.
20. Additionally, the Panel must ascertain whether there are any declarations of disability and/or agreed reasonable adjustments for the student. Any potential impact of the disability or reasonable adjustments will be accommodated in the procedure, and potential mitigation must be recorded.
21. The Panel shall decide whether or not academic misconduct has taken place and is not required to prove intent, but instances of deliberate fraud may carry more severe sanctions. The "standard of proof" is based on the balance of probabilities, that is, it is more likely than not the allegation is true. The standard is higher than simply believing that something is likely to have happened." (Office of the Independent Adjudicator (OIA), The Good Practice Framework).

D. Sanctions

22. If academic misconduct has taken place, the Academic Misconduct Panel must decide an appropriate sanction to recommend to the Assessment Board. Different sanctions exist to accommodate different levels of academic misconduct.
23. The sanctions the Panel may recommend are:
- Capping of the assessment and/or module mark
 - Mark of zero for the assessment and/or module, and where a resit is available, the resit will be capped at the pass mark
 - Review of other assessments completed in the same period
 - Where severe academic misconduct is suspected, refer the case to City St George's, University of London's [Senate Regulation 13 Student Discipline Regulation](#).

24. Full details of the sanctions available to the Panel are set out in City St George's University of London's Academic Integrity Misconduct Policy and Guidance, available on [their policies webpage](#).
25. Recommendations as to sanctions should be based on the following facts:
- Whether previous academic misconduct and/or poor academic practice has taken place.
 - The extent and nature of the academic misconduct. This is a decision based on academic judgement.
 - Whether the misconduct was deliberately fraudulent.
26. In addition, the following circumstances may influence the choice of sanction:
- The effect a sanction would have on the student's ability to enter their chosen profession
 - The student's year of study
 - The nature of the module (number of credits, structure, aggregation formula)
 - Any extenuating or mitigating circumstances.
27. The reasons for the recommendation to the Assessment Board must be clearly recorded and communicated to the student. The Panel must also make clear the rationale for any deviations from sanctions that are the norm for a given type of misconduct.

E. Consideration at an Assessment Board

28. The Assessment Board retains oversight of academic misconduct. If the Academic Misconduct Panel determines academic misconduct has taken place, they will make a recommendation to the Assessment Board. The student will be informed of the final decision following the Assessment Board. Usual academic appeal procedures will apply following the Assessment Board.

Appendix 1: Types of Academic Misconduct

All work is marked on the assumption that it is the work of the student: the words, diagrams, computer programs, ideas and arguments should be their own. However, much written work will be based on what students have read and heard and it is important that they show where, and how, their work is indebted to their own sources.

Plagiarism	Plagiarism is passing off the ideas or words of someone else as though they were your own. It applies equally to the work of other students and submitting the same piece or part of your own work that has previously been submitted (unless directed by the tutor). E.g. Copying and pasting from the web and/or other sources without explicit acknowledgement of the author, paraphrasing ideas without reference to the author.
Collusion	Collusion is where students consciously collaborate 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 own, in part or whole, and to submit it as their own. Collaboration may be permitted at certain stages of a project or assessment; explicit instructions should be provided to students.
Contract Cheating	‘Contract cheating’ is when a third party completes any part or whole of a student’s work which is submitted to ArtsEd as their own. Essay mills are now illegal entities, and you should not engage with or respond to their advertising.
Generative Artificial Intelligence (AI)	Using Generative AI to gain an unfair advantage by misrepresenting its work as your own is considered to be plagiarism and can have serious consequences. Students are expected not to use Generative AI tools (e.g. ChatGPT and Microsoft Co-Pilot) to generate any work as part of an assessment, unless you have been explicitly told you may or must do so.

Proof Reading

Students may use proofreading services who check for, identify and suggest corrections for errors in the text of a student’s assessed work e.g. spelling, punctuation, formatting. A proofreader may not edit the writing of assessed work, check or amend ideas, arguments or structure. The student is ultimately responsible for the work submitted.

Version Control	
Document Title	Academic Integrity and Misconduct Procedure
Maintained By	Quality and Course Manager
Owned By	Registrar
Approving Committee / Ratifying Body	HE Committee
Last Reviewed	October 2024 (minor updates): • Update to name and web link of City St George's, University of London's Student Disciplinary Regulations • Addition of version control table January 2025 (major amendments): • Amend policy name from 'Academic Misconduct Procedure' to 'Academic Integrity and Misconduct Procedure' • Addition of academic integrity and associated principles, clearer reference to the Assessment Board's responsibilities and appeal information • Inclusion of the relevant parts of the Plagiarism Policy, and terminate the Plagiarism Policy • Addition of Poor Academic Practice to align with City St George's, University of London's Senate Regulation 19: Assessment Regulations • Addition of expected communication to students • Addition of Appendix 1: Types of Academic Misconduct from the Plagiarism Policy, and the addition of Generative AI • Formatting and structural edits • Update titles, references and web links for ArtsEd and City St George's, University of London regulations, policies and procedures
To be Reviewed	February 2030 (or prior if required)
Current Version	Version 2.1
Location of master document	Organisational File Shares > Policies > HE
Web location	artsed.co.uk/about-us/policies