

HIGHER EDUCATION ACADEMIC MISCONDUCT POLICY

1. Introduction

1.1. Academic integrity is fundamental to the reputation of individual students and to academic institutions. University Centre Bishop Burton is committed both to developing high standards of academic practice among its students and to safeguarding the standards of its academic awards by detecting and acting upon cases of academic misconduct.

2. Purpose and Scope

2.1. The Academic Misconduct Policy applies to all credit bearing awards of the University Centre and should be read in conjunction with the relevant Academic Misconduct Procedure.

2.2. The purpose of the policy is to facilitate investigation of and, if proven, levy a penalty on any form of unacceptable behaviour by a candidate taking any qualification (academic, professional or combined).

2.3. The policy and procedures for academic misconduct are monitored and reviewed by the Executive Committee who are the final arbiter of these regulations.

3. Definitions

3.1. Acts of academic misconduct can take many forms. Indicative definitions are given below, although these are not exhaustive and not intended to constrain or determine the outcome of an academic misconduct allegation.

3.2. **Plagiarism:** using the ideas or work of another person (including experts, artificial intelligence and fellow or former students) and submitting them as though they are original work. By not referencing the source properly, paraphrasing it without acknowledging it, or by not mentioning it at all, the true origin of the material is hidden from the marker. Plagiarism may take the form of direct copying, reproducing or paraphrasing ideas, sentences, drawings, graphs, internet sites or any other source and submitting them for assessment without appropriate acknowledgement. Plagiarism can also include copying another student's work without their knowledge, or submitting work which has already been published in another language. The latter relates to copying of translated material, copying and re-arranging material, as well as taking ideas and findings of the material without attribution.

3.3. **Self-Plagiarism:** submission of work that is the same as, or broadly similar to, assessments previously awarded academic credit, without proper acknowledgement. This may include work submitted and awarded credit at this University Centre or another institution.

3.4. **Collusion:** unauthorised collaboration between two or more students in the preparation and production of an assessment, which is then submitted by each of them individually as their own work.

3.5. **Cheating in an exam:** either possessing or using materials prohibited in the examination venue and/or breaching any of the conditions outlined in the relevant Programme Handbook. This may include but is not limited to actions such as:

- a) Continuing to write after the invigilator has announced the end of the examination;
- b) Copying, or attempting to copy, from any other candidate during the examination;
- c) Communication of any kind with any other person other than an authorised invigilator or other member of staff during an examination;
- d) Possession of any written, printed or electronic materials in the examination room unless expressly permitted;
- e) Involvement in impersonation of another during an examination or other assessment event.

3.6. **Contract cheating:** to seek to gain advantage by incorporating material in work submitted for assessment that has been improved by, or commissioned, purchased or obtained from a third party for example: family members, friends, essay mills or other students.

3.7. **Fabrication or falsification of data:** submitting work containing data measured in the field, in the laboratory or other setting, any part of which is untrue, made up, falsified or fabricated in any way. This includes the presentation of data in reports, projects, thesis etc. based on experimental work falsely purported to have been carried out or data obtained by unfair means. This also includes using false statements or presenting false evidence in support of a request to withdraw from an examination, obtain an assessment extension, or explain any form of absence.

4. Categories of Academic Misconduct

4.1. The University of Hull recognise three categories which determine the seriousness of the alleged academic misconduct.

4.2. Poor academic practice

This may arise from a lack of understanding of the standard methods of acknowledging the source of words, ideas or diagrams in a piece of work or the appropriate levels of collaboration or the correct behaviour within an exam. It may also be applicable where the extent does not justify further investigative proceedings or a penalty, for example, for errors made through carelessness.

4.3. Academic Misconduct

This is behaviour which, if not detected, would give a student an unfair advantage in an assessment. The main difference between academic misconduct and severe academic misconduct is the extent of the alleged misconduct. Indicative examples of what constitute academic misconduct are:

- a) Failure to correctly reference sources and claim an idea as original work (i.e. plagiarism);
- b) Submitting for assessment an item which has been previously submitted for credit in another module with little change made to the assessment (i.e. self-plagiarism);
- c) Submitting coursework in collaboration with another student (i.e. collusion);
- d) Attempts to communicate with another candidate during an examination (i.e. cheating).
- e) Unauthorised use of Artificial Intelligence

4.4. Severe Academic Misconduct

Where there is clear evidence of extensive or substantial attempts to gain an unfair advantage or where there has been a previous, proven case of academic misconduct or severe academic misconduct against a student. Any proven allegations of contract cheating, impersonation or fabrication or falsification of data will always initially be considered as a case of severe academic misconduct.

4. Related Documents

UK Quality Code for Higher Education (2018) Advice and Guidance: Assessment

Bishop Burton College Higher Education Academic Misconduct (Non-University Provision) [OP1.111]

Bishop Burton College Higher Education Academic Misconduct (University Validating Partners) [OP1.110]

Bishop Burton College Academic Appeals Procedure [OP_2.01]

Bishop Burton College Higher Education Academic Misconduct Appeal Form [CQD38]

Higher Education Academic Misconduct (Non-University Provision) [OP1.111]

University of Huddersfield [Regulations for Taught Students: Section 10 Academic Misconduct](#)

University of Huddersfield [Academic Misconduct Procedure](#)

University of Huddersfield [Academic Misconduct Appeal Form](#)

University of Hull [Regulations Governing Academic Misconduct](#) [Assessment Section]

University of Lincoln [University General Regulations \(Academic Offences\)](#)

Updated: November 2023

By: Assistant Principal HE

Procedure Approval

Approval By Corporation	Date: 19 December 2023
-----------------------------------	----------------------------------