

ACADEMIC MISCONDUCT

Policy and Procedure

1. It is University policy that the values of academic integrity are promoted and that academic misconduct is prevented through educating students in appropriate academic conduct. Academic integrity represents a set of values which operate as the foundation of academic practice. These values include honesty, trust, fairness, respect and responsibility.
2. All instances of plagiarism, collusion, personation, fabrication of results, exam misconduct or a breach of research ethics are serious failures to respect the integrity and fairness of the assessment process.
3. As such, all cases¹ of academic misconduct in module assessment must be seriously considered and appropriate penalties applied, as determined by the Academic Misconduct Panel. A First Case of collusion/plagiarism will not be penalised, provided a previous occurrence of academic misconduct has not taken place. Instead, the student will be given feedback and referred to an Academic Practice Workshop, provided that the student is not at the end of their course.
4. Module assessment includes any work undertaken by a student for which marks contributing to a module are awarded, including those modules which are marked pass/fail. s their work prior to submission for assessment. In addition, any student is guilty of collusion if they access and copy any part of the work of another to derive benefit irrespective of whether permission was given. Where joint preparation is

directly acknowledged. For cases where work has been re-used see '**Overlapping material**' in '**Marking, Moderation and Feedback Regulations**'.

Personation

7. **Personation in written submissions** is where someone or software (unless explicitly permitted in the assessment guidance from the module convenor) other than the student prepares the work, part of the work, or provides substantial assistance with work submitted for assessment. This includes but is not limited to: AI generated text or responses; purchasing essays from essay banks; commissioning someone else to write an assessment; writing an assessment for someone else (including where no benefit is gained by the student producing the assessment); using a proofreader where this is not allowed; using substantive changes proposed by a proofreader or third party (person or electronic service) that do not adhere to the University guidance on proofreading; work that has been written in a language other than the language required for assessment and translated (for language based assessments only); work including sections that have been translated without acknowledgement. **Personation in examinations held on campus** includes asking someone else to sit an examination. Students who attend an examination without their student ID-card or other acceptable form of photo-ID will not have their

12. The University takes misconduct in examination extremely seriously and any concerns raised will result in an investigation of potential major academic misconduct.

Fabrication

13. Fabrication of results or sources is where the results of an experiment, focus group or other research activity have been made up. It also includes observations in practical or project work, such as not accurately recording the outcome of a lab experiment that did not go as planned.

students at induction, through course/module handbooks, module teaching sessions and assessment briefings, as appropriate. Markers must ensure that discipline specific referencing norms have been adhered to.

19. All sources of information used in preparing the work being submitted must be fully acknowledged, in an approved format. This includes acknowledging all written and electronic sources. Where work is produced in an examination on campus it will be sufficient to acknowledge the source without providing a full reference.
20. Students must not take notes or other unauthorised materials/devices into an examination, unless the instructions explicitly state that this is allowed.
21. Unless explicitly allowed in the module documentation or specified in the assessment task, students must work alone on preparing their assessment and must not share their work with other students until both students have submitted and the late submission deadline has passed.
22. The development of acad.6 ((n t9)T0 T95c)-w.207 -1.239 Td(22.)Tj0 Tc 0.5 (t)-9.6 (w/.6 (w/.6 Td[Th

Levels of Misconduct

26. Misconduct is categorised as 'minor' or 'major' by the Panel.

Determination of minor and major cases of misconduct

27. The Investigating Officer should bear in mind the following when making a preliminary determination of a misconduct case as either major or minor:

(i) the assessment *impact* is not a relevant issue. For example, cheating will not be ignored just because the work in question is not heavily weighted for the module mark, or the module itself is not a significantly weighted module within the course. Stage of study is not germane to the decision;

(ii) the extent of the misconduct is a key factor: a piece of work which has been downloaded verbatim from the internet will inevitably be regarded as a *prima facie* case of major misconduct, whereas the lack of proper citation in one or two small sections paraphrased from an article, or referencing that is incorrectly formatted, might be seen as a minor case of misconduct;

(iii) consideration of the extent of the pre-meditated intention involved in the

32. Cases of pre-

Referral to the APW will apply whether the case is determined to be minor or major.
For a First Case (minor or major), the following applies:

- For plagiarism: a mark will be given based only on the sections believed to be the

54. Any instance of misconduct in an examination held on campus or remotely will be considered as major misconduct. For exams held on campus, students must place mobile phones, watches or other valuable items on the floor in front of the student's desk. Where a concern has been raised regarding misconduct in an examination held on campus or remotely and the candidate has not been considered by the Panel previously, the case may be processed by the Misconduct Panel Secretary, under the delegated authority of the Misconduct Panel Chair. In these circumstances the student will not be invited to a Panel meeting, even where they have previously had a First Case of plagiarism or collusion. Where the case is delegated, the penalty will be a mark of 0 for the assessment component. The standard appeals procedure will apply. For exams taken remotely, any concerns raised as part of the marking process may result initially in the student/s being asked to participate in a meeting with the Module Convenor, Marker/s and/or another member of academic staff. This is to establish how the assessment was completed and to ascertain the student's understanding of the assessment material. The Investigating Officer will decide whether or not the case will be taken forwards to a Panel. Where the student accepts that academic misconduct occurred and they have not been considered by the Panel before, the case can be considered by a delegated Panel. The full Panel process below applies where the student has been considered by the Panel previously, where the case is referred to the Panel or where the candidate (or one of the candidates in an exam collusion case) does not accept that academic misconduct occurred, during the meeting with the School.

Procedure for minor and major misconduct (other than a First Case of collusion/plagiarism or misconduct in examination considered under the delegated authority of the Chair)

Panel meetings may proceed in the absence of the student, unless the Panel Chair decides the student's presence is key to reaching a conclusion.

59. An annual workshop will take place for Chairs of Academic Misconduct Panels to review

Composition and Quoracy

70. Once the Chair deems that all the relevant evidence has been heard, they will invite the student, the student's representative and the Presenter to withdraw, while the Panel members reach a conclusion. The Chair will then ask the student, the student's representative and the Presenter to return for the Panel's conclusion on whether academic misconduct has been found to have occurred. The Chair may give permission for the Presenter to leave after presenting the case, provided they are not required.

Not guilty

71. If the student is found not guilty of academic misconduct, where appropriate, the work will be sent back to the Marker in order for the work to be marked (in a major collusion/plagiarism case) and the mark used for prog0.5 (c)-2 (as)6iC1.3 (t)-6(ded)11.ng.6 (equi)ub
71.

confirm that the extent of the academic misconduct is relatively limited.

- (iii) Confirm the mark of 0 for the assessment component. This penalty should normally be applied for Major cases where the Panel confirm that the extent of the academic misconduct is not limited. This penalty may also be applied by a Panel for a candidate with a case of Minor misconduct, where they have been considered by the Panel previously.
- (iv) The penalties listed below may also be applied, provided all Panel members agree.

Penalties where the candidate *has* previously been considered by a Panel

77. The penalties below may be applied singly or in combination where the Panel has previously considered a candidate:
- (i) The Panel may also apply one of the above penalties for a candidate who has been considered by the Panel previously.
 - (ii) No penalty may exceptionally be agreed. This penalty is not available for a breach of exam procedures.
 - (iii) Reduce the mark for the BDC (r)-5.B (t)-6.6

83. The Panel may refer any cases to the Student Discipline Committee for consideration in addition to conducting the academic misconduct procedure.

Progression and Award Boards (PABs)

84. PABs will not proceed to confirm progress or determine classification whilst an allegation of academic misconduct is outstanding in relation to a student. However, candidates must be considered to enable any resits/sits to be offered on other modules with the candidate reconsidered by a virtual PAB, if necessary, once the outcome of the misconduct process is known.

Appeals

85. Students have the right of appeal against academic misconduct decisions, where the criteria are met. Please refer to the appeals criteria available at:
<https://student.sussex.ac.uk/complaints/appeals/types-of-appeal#misconduct>