# Policy and Procedures for Academic Integrity and Misconduct

# 2024-2025

# 1 Introduction

a) Middlesex University is committed to operating in an ethical way in every area to ensure the highest possible standards of decision-making and accountability (MU Ethics Framework Statement 2014).

b) The University Strategy (2031) has been developed to ensure our students learn about and develop a professional and ethically-informed skillset based on fundamental values and principles such as trust, honesty and integrity. This is because being able to work in a professional and ethical way is a highly valued graduate attribute. As part of this development it is fundamental that our students know how to learn from and acknowledge others' work in the process of creating their own unique pieces of academic work – and to be truthful about their own contribution.

c) The University recognises that academic integrity is a set of learned skills, with honesty, fairness and respect for others and their work at the core. The university will support and guide students to learn the necessary skills through education and reinforcement of learning, the promotion of core values, enabling policies and the appropriate use of technology

d) In order to demonstrate academic integrity, students must produce their own work, acknowledging explicitly any material that has been included from other sources or legitimate collaboration. Students must also present their own findings, conclusions or data based on appropriate and ethical practice.

e) It is a student's responsibility to familiarise themself with the academic conventions and practices applicable to the course on which they are registered. It will be the responsibility of students to ensure that the work they submit for assessment is entirely their own, or in the case of group-work the group's own and that they observe all Regulations, Procedures and instructions governing examinations.

f) It is the responsibility of each individual student when submitting an assessment item to ensure that the work which they are submitting is the work which they wish to be assessed.

g) Students must have ethical approval for their project/dissertation which cannot be gained retrospectively. Failure to do so may result in failure of the work. Refer to the programme and/or module handbook for details regarding requirements for ethical approval.

h) Academic misconduct is a breach of the values of academic integrity and can occur when a student cheats in an assessment or attempts to deliberately mislead an examiner that the work presented is their own when it is not. It includes, but is not limited to, plagiarism, commissioning or buying work from a third party or copying the work of others, unauthorised and/or unacknowledged use of artificial intelligence in a piece of work submitted for grading.

i) If a third party or anonymous whistleblower reports that there has been academic misconduct by a student of the University, the University may decide to investigate the allegations.

j) Regulations Section F deal with breaches of academic integrity through instances of academic misconduct. It will take action against any student who contravenes these regulations through negligence, foolishness or deliberate intent in any form of assessment.

k) This procedure is concerned with the actions of students and not their intentions. An excuse of "not intending to" is not an acceptable defence.

l) Where students are registered on awards which lead to professional registration and there is Fitness to Practise requirements, a major offence may be referred to an appropriate Fitness to Practice Committee for consideration.

m) In all cases of alleged academic misconduct and cheating, students will be treated as innocent until a case against them has been investigated and upheld.

n) A finding that academic misconduct has occurred is a judgement based on available evidence, the standard of proof being the balance of probability.

o) These Procedures should be read in conjunction with the Regulations - (Section F) for Academic Integrity and Misconduct

## 2 Aims and Purpose

This policy is designed to support staff and students to embed good practice and develop methods for enhancing Academic Integrity and it's aims are to:

a) ensure fair and equal treatment of all students when considering whether academic integrity has been breached
b) make clear the types of behaviours that are considered to be academic misconduct.
c) set out the penalties for academic misconduct and cheating
d) describe the procedures by which allegations of academic misconduct and cheating will be investigated and determined
e) create a culture of enhancement seeking to learn from cases of academic misconduct and improve the student experience including through appropriate detection training for decision-makers.
f) ensure clarity in language and process.
g) uphold fairness, consistency and natural justice in the treatment of the student body as a whole.
h) maintain awareness through collaboration with support services (academic and welfare), targeted local campaigns, and visible and accessible central information highlighted to students at relevant key points in the academic year.

## 3 Principles

The following principles underpin Middlesex's approach to Academic Integrity:

a) The University treats the decision as to whether minor errors, poor academic practice or unfair and/or dishonest academic misconduct has taken place as a matter for academic judgement [1] and the penalties applied will vary according to the individual case and the seriousness of the offence.
b) This policy and procedures apply to all work submitted for the undergraduate, postgraduate taught and postgraduate research degree programmes and will include all assessment items and for research students will include the research proposal, transfer document, thesis submitted for examination, and published Thesis
c) Cases of plagiarism at all levels due to poor referencing, paraphrasing and unintentional mistakes in the form and frequency of citations in text where deception does not appear to be the intention will be considered as Poor Academic Practice and marked accordingly.
d) The University complies fully with the Concordat to Support Research Integrity. Research students are also subject to the University Code of Practice for Research.
e) Taught Students will be registered* on the on-line **Student Success Essentials course** which includes sections addressing academic integrity and misconduct. Students should complete this course during their programme induction period. The course is available on myLearning. (Currently this is not available to students following programmes at partner institutions).
f) Research students will complete the research development programme (which includes sessions addressing researcher integrity and ethics)

[1] Where Turnitin indicates possible plagiarism, Examiners and Academic Misconduct Officers must still exercise academic judgement in determining whether plagiarism has taken place

* does not apply to students on programmes at Partner Institutions

g) The University recognises that undergraduate students (FHEQ Levels 3 & 4) who are new to Higher Education may need some time to learn how to acknowledge sources properly. Therefore, it operates an 'academic writing induction period' during which the focus of the University's response to signs of academic misconduct is to educate students in regard to appropriate academic practice and academic integrity rather than to penalise unacceptable academic practice. This applies to **plagiarism and collusion** (except collusion in an online examination) only. It does not apply to other forms of academic misconduct where penalties will immediately apply. The academic induction period does not apply to any reassessment.

h) Students will be required to accept a statement on myLearning which confirms that they will not plagiarise; self-plagiarise; copy material; embellish, fabricate or falsify any data; nor will they collude in producing any work nor submit commissioned or procured work for any assessments.

i) If academic misconduct is suspected in relation to work submitted by a student, in the interest of helping students to avoid continued acts, cases should be investigated as soon as possible and within one month of submission of the work.

j) Cases of suspected academic misconduct should be evidenced and documented before the appropriate procedure is instigated. Where appropriate a Viva should be conducted to demonstrate the student's understanding of the subject matter.

k) Taught students will receive notification from the marker that their work is under investigation for Academic Misconduct in place of a provisional grade for the work submitted. A Holding Grade of U will be recorded in the student record.

l) Research students will be notified that progression is suspended pending the outcome of the investigation

# 4 Allegations of Academic Misconduct (Third party Reporting)

a) Third parties include (a) students of the University (current or former students) reporting misconduct by another student, or (b) members of the public or (c) anonymous reporters.

b) If a third-party reports that there has been academic misconduct by a student of the University, the University may decide to investigate the allegations, taking into account the nature of the academic misconduct, any evidence provided by the reporting third party together with any other supporting evidence obtained from sources independent of the reporting third party.

c) The University will not (unless the law permits) report any details about the investigation undertaken and the outcome of the investigation to the reporting third party , as such information will include the personal information of other individuals including of the student who is being investigated, and such information must remain confidential to comply with Data Protection law, and other duties of confidentiality that the University may have in relation to the student being investigated and other individuals.

d) If a reporting third party insists on remaining anonymous, the University may not be able to rely on the anonymous information as evidence of academic misconduct, as under the data protection legislation and other legal rights that protect individuals faced with allegations against them, the accused person will have a right to know what information others hold about them and how they obtained such information as this is information relating to them and is therefore their personal data.

e) If a reporting third party consents to their identity being disclosed to the student who has allegedly committed academic misconduct, we may consider any precautionary measures that need to be put in place to safeguard the reporting person or anyone else involved, in consultation with the individuals to be safeguarded.

f) If we cannot investigate an anonymous report, we may use the information to better understand the issues impacting our community to understand trends and inform proactive preventive work.

# 5 Definitions of Types of Academic Misconduct:

Academic misconduct (cheating and unethical practices) in assessments is where a student gains, seeks, attempts or intends to gain advantage in relation to assessments or to aid another to gain such an advantage by unfair or improper means. The following list provides examples of misconduct, but is not exhaustive.

**a) Minor Errors/Poor Academic Practice**

Minor errors arise when a student has attempted to adopt academically acceptable practices but has failed to do so accurately or fully, producing work that is unduly derivative or which fails to recognise sources. Examples include forgetting to insert quotation marks, minor mistakes in referencing or citation, gaps in the bibliography or reference list, non- compliance with some aspects of presentation guidelines. Work will be marked down for an over-reliance on external sources or for being overly derivative.

**b) Cheating in examinations or tests**

Breaching the Examination Room Rules for Candidates (Section K). This includes assessments that are taken 'in-class', 'on-line' or any other form of summative examination.

**c) Collusion**

Collusion occurs when, unless with official approval (e.g. in the case of group projects), two or more students consciously collaborate in the preparation and production of work which is ultimately submitted by each in an identical or substantially similar form and/or is represented by each to be the product of individual efforts. Examinations and Online timed assessments that contain similar work will be referred as collusion. Collusion also occurs where there is unauthorised co-operation between a student and another person in the preparation and production of work which is presented as the student's own. This includes when one student produces work and allows another student to copy it - both students will be culpable. If both students submit the work in the same submission period, even at different times, both students will be deemed to have colluded.

Collusion can also be the act of one student presenting a piece of work as their own independent work when the work was undertaken by a group. With group work, where individual members submit parts of the total assignment, each member of a group must take responsibility for checking the legitimacy of the work submitted in his/her name. If even part of the work is found to contain academic misconduct, penalties will normally be imposed on all group members equally.

Peer review of each other's work or discussing an assignment can be helpful; however, students should be wary of falling into an act of collusion by actually producing/writing parts of an assignment for their peer/friend or giving them access to the work.

**d) Copying**

Copying occurs when a student consciously presents as their own work material copied directly from a fellow student or other person without their knowledge. It includes the passing off of another's intellectual property, not in the public domain, as one's own. It differs from collusion in that the originator of the copied work is not aware of, or party to, the copying. Copying of work from published sources would be dealt with as plagiarism.

**e) Dishonest Use of Data: Fabricating or falsifying data or using without permission another person's work**

Fabricating or falsifying data to include presenting work that has not taken place. This includes laboratory reports or projects based on experimental or field work. It may also include falsifying attendance sheets for placements where this is part of the assessment requirements.

**f) Requirement for Ethical Approval**

Failure to gain ethical approval through the University's ethical approval processes prior to beginning research, or where the student makes a major deviation from any approved research without gaining additional ethical approval, may result in failure of the work. Refer to the programme and/or module handbook for details regarding requirements for ethical approval.

**g) False declarations**

**False declarations and evidence presented in order to receive special consideration by Assessment** Boards, including deferrals and requests for exemption from work.

**h) Plagiarism - Passing off someone else's work, whether intentionally or unintentionally, as your own**

Plagiarism occurs when a student misrepresents, as their own work, work in the public domain, written or otherwise, of any other person (including another student) or of any institution. Examples of forms of plagiarism include:

a. the verbatim (word for word) copying of another's work without appropriate and correctly presented acknowledgement and citation of the source
b. the close paraphrasing of another's work by simply changing a few words or altering the order of presentation, without appropriate and correctly presented acknowledgement and citation of the source;
   - Sham Paraphrasing: When someone copies text, word for word from a source, references the work but does not place it in quotation marks so it appears to be paraphrased.
   - Illicit paraphrasing: When someone paraphrases text from a source but does not acknowledge the source.
c. failure to reference appropriately or to adequately identify the source of material used;
   - Concealing sources: If a student cites a piece of work from a source more than once they must reference it each time. No matter how many times they refer back to the source they must acknowledge the source, even if it is in the very next paragraph
   - Fake Referencing: To make up quotations and/or supply fake citations. The fake citation can be either completely fabricated or reference a real source (book, journal, or Web site) which contains no such article or words that have supposedly been used or to imply that books and/or journals have been used by copying citations from the work of other authors when they have not.
   - Secondary referencing: To mention someone's work which has been referred to in a document a student has read, even though the student hasn't read the original piece of work themselves. When a student compiles their reference list students must only include the document(s) read by the student.
d. the deliberate and detailed presentation of another's concept as one's own.

**i) Self Plagiarism**

Self plagiarism is when a student submits the same piece of work, or substantial part thereof, for assessment more than once for graded credit without acknowledging what they are doing by citing the original content. It will be regarded as Self-plagiarism unless the original piece of work is appropriately referenced in the new submission.

**j) Purchasing or Commissioning**

Purchasing or commissioning is either attempting to purchase or purchasing work for an assessment including, for example from the internet, or attempting to commission, or commissioning someone else to complete an assessment. Essay mills are now illegal entities, and use of them is facilitating an illegal activity.

For assessments at all levels, the commissioning of proof-reading where this substantially alters the content of the original work, whether this is from a commercial provider or a personal contact, falls under this definition and is considered academic misconduct.

**k) Deliberate attempt to gain advantage by unfair or improper means.**
Trying to deceive specialist text checking software (eg Turnitin) by, for example, using text replacement tools; images in documents instead of text; submitting documents in an alternative format than that stipulated by the assessor.

**l) Use of Artificial Intelligence**
Unauthorised use of artificial intelligence in a piece of work submitted for grading.

# 6 Roles and Responsibilities

**Institutional Policy**

1. Commit to the issue and communicate Importance of Academic Integrity to the University Community
2. Clearly define roles and responsibilities
3. Provide access to support and specialist advice
4. Embed good practice and develop methods for tackling academic misconduct relating to Teaching, Learning and Assessment
5. Review process and ensure consistency
6. Disseminate Information about how the institution values learning and tackles plagiarism

**Faculty and Departments**

1. Define operational procedures and identify staff to implement at a local level (Faculty Executive, Academic Integrity Tutors, Research Degree Coordinators, Chairs of Faculty Ethics Committees)
2. Promote staff/student awareness through workshops, documentation, briefings and resources, including integrating the Student success essentials into Programme Induction activities.
3. Ensure poor academic practice offences are responded to appropriately and Module Leaders and Research supervisors given the tools and resources to feedback to and support students

**Academic**

1. Brief and support students through induction/ assignment briefings and throughout academic cycle
2. Feedback to students where they have over relied on external sources and mark work accordingly
3. Design alternative assessment tasks to deter plagiarism
4. Provide opportunities for students to explore plagiarism software, ethics and data management (where relevant) within their studies
5. Maintain awareness of rules/regulations/procedures
6. Identify breaches of academic integrity and ethics and discuss with the Department AIT or Research Degree coordinator
7. Interpret reports from plagiarism software to determine whether work should be referred or marked down for over reliance on external sources
8. Make judgement and take ACTION as appropriate
9. Present the case for the Faculty at Academic Misconduct panels (Module Leaders/AITs/Director of Studies)

**Student**

1. Utilise resources and support for study skills, academic writing and plagiarism prevention
2. Complete online **'Student Success Essentials'** course/Researcher Development programme as appropriate, during the induction period of the programme of study
3. Develop academic writing skills
4. Learn conventions for citing references
5. Seek support and guidance on how to cite/reference correctly
6. Identify strategies to avoid plagiarism
7. Abide by University rules and regulations
8. Understand the requirements for ethical approvals and the management of personal data
9. Understand assessment offences and consequences
10. Utilise plagiarism detection software to improve writing

**Academic Misconduct Team and Secretary to Academic Board [2]**

1. Maintain awareness of University rules, regulations and procedures
2. Maintain an awareness of the tools and resources to help students avoid plagiarism
3. Receive and process allegations of Academic Offences in Categories B, C and D from the Departmental AIT
4. Write to the student with the evidence and guidance on how to respond.
5. Determine Action to be taken dependent on Student response
6. Arrange/Chair Academic Misconduct Panels if appropriate
7. Keep records of all academic offences on Student Records
8. Produce monthly reports for Faculty Deans, and Annual Report for Academic Board of Category B/C/D academic offences.

**Learning Support Service (LSS) and Centre for Academic Practice Enhancement (CAPE)**

1. Raise awareness of resources and support for study skills, academic writing and plagiarism prevention and ethics
2. Provide training and support to both staff and students in all areas of academic integrity (LSS & CAPE)
3. Administer and provide guidelines in the use of any plagiarism deterrent software (LSS)
4. Support academics in the use of the plagiarism software (CAPE)

**Middlesex University Student Union**

1. Raise awareness of resources and support for study skills, academic writing and plagiarism prevention.
2. Provide advice and guidance to students who have received an allegation of misconduct, and where necessary accompany students to panels of investigation.
3. Provide a student (normally a Sabbatical Officer) to sit as Panel member on panels of Investigation.

[2] Throughout this policy the role of Secretary to Academic Board may be delegated to a senior manager (normally the Deputy Academic Registrar) reporting directly to the Secretary to Academic Board.

## Procedures

**A Initial Procedures**

Whilst an investigation is being carried out, the Assessment Board may note the incident and defer judgement.

**1 Formal written examinations:**

a) Where an **invigilator** suspects a candidate of infringing examination room rules (section K) they shall, if possible in the presence of another invigilator to act as witness to the action taken:

i. Confiscate any unauthorised material in the possession of the candidate;
ii. endorse the candidate's script on the front cover with a note of the time when the alleged infringement is discovered. In the case of suspected collusion they should endorse the script of each candidate involved. Wherever possible they should require another invigilator to act as witness by countersigning the endorsement;
iii. issue a new examination script booklet to the candidate(s) in question, clearly instructing them to continue (not to restart) the examination;
iv. inform the candidate(s) in question, at the end of the examination, that a report of the incident will be submitted to the Academic Misconduct Team;
v. complete an Infringement of Exam Rules Report detailing the incident, and giving the opportunity to the student to comment on the report, and both invigilator and student sign and date it.
vi. enter details of the incident on the invigilator's report;
vii. report the allegation to an Assessment Manager for processing with the Academic Misconduct team.

b) Where an **internal examiner** suspects a candidate of infringing examination room rules they shall:

i. Complete an AIM Referral form detailing the alleged infringement, with evidence to support the allegation;
ii. report the allegation to the Academic Misconduct Team for processing.

**2 Formal timed online Assessments**

a) Where an internal examiner suspects a candidate of infringing online examination rules (Section K) they shall:

i. Complete an AIM Referral form detailing the alleged infringement, with evidence to support the allegation;
ii. report the allegation to the Academic Integrity Tutor for review.
- In the case of suspected collusion mark up the paper to show the similarities, and where available provide the Turnitin report.
- In the case of suspected plagiarism provide the external sources.

**3 Assessed coursework (including oral examinations, exhibitions, performances, assignments, research proposals):**

a) Where an internal or external examiner suspects a candidate of poor academic practice (Category A) due to poor referencing, paraphrasing and unintentional mistakes in the form and frequency of citations in text where deception does not appear to be the intention, the work should be marked taking into account over reliance on external sources, and the student should be given feedback and support and guidance, along with written advice of where they can seek help (eg Learning Enhancement Team) with referencing etc.

b) Where an internal or external examiner suspects a candidate of contravening the regulations in assessed coursework beyond the level of poor academic practice, they shall, where appropriate:

i. Complete an AIM Referral form, detail the location of any plagiarised passages or evidence of collusion and append sources where appropriate;

ii. Discuss the allegation with the Departmental Academic Integrity Tutor (AIT) to see if it should be treated as poor academic practice or referred to Academic Registry

c) Where an internal examiner identifies a candidate has not secured ethical approval they will refer the student to the Faculty Ethics Committee for investigation (See H4)

**4 Retrospective allegations of Academic Misconduct**

Exceptionally, where serious academic misconduct is discovered after the deadline for submission of an allegation of academic misconduct, an allegation may be pursued retrospectively under these procedures. Where a student has already graduated, the outcome may result in the revoking of a qualification already awarded.

**B Initial Review by Academic Integrity Tutor (AIT)**

**1.** If the AIT determines the work referred to them for review should be treated as a case of Poor Academic Practice (Category A), the work should be returned to the Module Leader and marked (taking into account over reliance on external sources), and the student should be given feedback, support and guidance by the Module Leader, along with written advice of where they can seek help (eg Learning Enhancement Team) with referencing etc

**2.** If the AIT confirms Category B – D misconduct the case should be referred to the Academic Misconduct Team for investigation (see C below). The deadline by which evidence supporting an allegation of academic misconduct should normally be submitted by Departments should normally be no more than **one month** after the completion date for that component of assessment.

Please note: If a viva voce assessment of the student is considered appropriate before an allegation is reported to the Secretary to Academic Board, it must not be treated as a formal hearing to consider academic misconduct. However, non attendance, without good reason, will be interpreted as acceptance of academic misconduct. If a student does not attend, or admits to academic misconduct during a viva meeting, the case will be referred to Academic Registry for confirmation of the allegation to the student, and applications of the appropriate penalty.

**C Referral to Academic Registry**

To proceed with an investigation into an allegation of academic misconduct the following, **where appropriate,** should be submitted by the Examination Manager, AIT or Faculty Leadership Office to the Academic Misconduct Team no more than one month after completion date for that component of assessment:

**1. For Written Examinations**

a. a report of the incident; (use the Form: Academic Misconduct Allegation)
b. the invigilator's report;
c. originals of scripts involved in alleged infringement of examination room rules;
d. copy or original of unauthorised material used in an examination;

**2. For all other Assessments**

a. Completed Academic Integrity & Misconduct (AIM) Referral Form
b. Copy/original work with appropriate passages **marked**;
c. copy of source material with appropriate passages **marked**;
d. summary of any informal interview with the student regarding the incident (it is preferred that no interview (excluding a Viva) takes place before a written allegation is put to the candidate by the Secretary to Academic Board);
e. notes of any viva that has taken place (eg for confirmation of the originality of the work).
f. copy of the instructions given to the candidate regarding the component and a copy of the referencing instructions given to the candidate;

**D Procedure for investigation by the Academic Misconduct Team**

**1.** As soon as reasonably practicable following receipt of any allegation and supporting documentation, the Academic Misconduct Team shall decide if there are reasonable grounds at first sight to suggest the candidate contravened assessment regulations.

**2.** If the Academic Misconduct Team determines there are no reasonable grounds, they shall request the Module Leader to consider the work on its academic merits and remove all record of the alleged misconduct from the student's record.

**3.** If the Academic Misconduct Team determines there are reasonable grounds to suggest the candidate has contravened the regulations in assessment, they shall write to the student(s) concerned:

a. To put the allegation.
b. If appropriate, to enclose copies of any evidence or report.
c. To request a written statement to explain how the allegation may have arisen, stating any mitigating circumstances which may be taken into account when considering a penalty (authenticated evidence to be provided where appropriate).
d. To request a reply within 10 working days of the date on which the letter is sent and explaining the consequences of failure to reply.
e. To refer to guidance notes on Unihub and the MDXSU Student Support Service

**4.** **A holding grade of U** (allegation of academic misconduct under investigation) should be entered by the Academic Misconduct Officer on the student's module record (for cross-reference with other alleged infringements).

**E Consideration of Student Response**

1. If a written reply to the allegation is not received from the student within 10 working days of the date on which the letter is sent, or if the student replies accepting the allegation, the Academic Misconduct Team shall report accordingly to the Secretary to Academic Board and recommend an appropriate penalty. The outcome and penalty will be processed according to Section G Outcome of an Investigation
2. If the student does reply within the time limit denying the allegation the Secretary to Academic Board will consider the allegation in light of the student's response and in consultation with appropriate members of staff to decide whether to dismiss the allegation, or to proceed to consideration by a panel.
    a. A student denying the allegation will be given the opportunity to select that the allegation and their defence to it are heard by a panel via:
        i. written representations; or
        ii. in person at a Panel of Investigation hearing (which may be held electronically).

**F Panel to investigate the allegation of academic misconduct**

1. Following **E2ai** above a monthly panel meeting which shall consist of at least four members of staff (one from each faculty) drawn from Senior staff of the University – including Deputy Deans; Heads of Department; Directors of Programmes; Programme Leaders; Academic Integrity Tutors, and Research Leads together with one member from MDXSU, will consider the responses of students who have denied the allegations against them and selected to have their written representations considered by a panel.
   a) The panel shall consider the evidence provided by the tutors and the student relating to the allegation and determine, on the balance of probabilities, whether the allegation should be upheld or dismissed.
   b) The outcome of the panel, including any recommended sanction, will be reported to the Secretary to Academic Board and processed according to Section G Outcome of an Investigation

2. Following **E2aii** above the Secretary to Academic Board (or nominee) shall convene a Panel of Investigation which shall consist of two members of staff drawn from Senior staff of the University – including Deputy Deans; Heads of Department; Directors of Programmes; Programme Leaders; Academic Integrity Tutors and Research leads, together with one member from MDXSU to meet with the student to hear their case. The hearing may take place in person or electronically.
   a) Staff involved in the referral of the student shall be required to attend as witnesses.
   b) The Chair of the Panel shall be the Secretary to Academic Board or a nominee (eg AIT from another Faculty).
   c) No member of staff who has been involved in teaching or assessing the student shall be eligible to serve.
   d) The student will be given 5 working days' notice, wherever possible, of the date, time, place and membership of the panel, together with any documents to be consulted.
   e) The student may object to the appointment of members and to the date giving grounds for the objection. However, any change to the arrangement is solely at the discretion of the Chair.
   f) Due notice of the Panel meeting will be considered to have been given on sending the notice and supporting information to the student's University email address, or last registered personal email address for students who are no longer enroled.
   g) The meeting may proceed in the absence of a student who has either a) indicated an intention to attend and does not attend, b) never responded to communications; or c) indicated they do not wish to attend. The Chair should be content that there is sufficient evidence available to consider the case and that the student has been given adequate notice of the meeting and an opportunity to provide a written submission.

3. All proceedings and papers associated with the meeting shall be strictly confidential to those invited to attend.

4. The student shall have the right to be accompanied by a companion, who will be a member of the University (ie a registered student, a staff member or a member of staff of MDXSU) and to submit oral or written evidence to the meeting. Legal representation is not allowed at a Panel meeting.

5. Procedure for the Panel of Investigation in session
   a) The Panel of Investigation may not be held in the absence of the Secretary to Academic Board or their nominee.
   b) The Chair has discretion to organise the meeting as they see fit in order to achieve the principal aims of a hearing:

i) to clarify evidence as necessary by questioning those who have submitted it;
ii) to enable the student to dispute the allegation;
iii) to enable the Panel to reach a decision.

6. Mechanical, electrical or electronic recording by any means shall be prohibited, except where the meeting is held online, where a recording may be taken in case of any technical issues for any panel members. The recording shall be deleted once the panel has reached a conclusion of the case.

7. The Panel shall consider its decision in private after the evidence has been heard and shall reach a decision by majority vote, in the light of the evidence presented and on the balance of probabilities, whether the student infringed assessment regulations. Panel members are only concerned with the actions of the student, not their intentions. If the votes cast are equal, the Chair shall have a second or casting vote.

8. The student and their companion shall normally be recalled for the Chair to inform them of the decision of the Panel, which will then be sent to the student, with a report of the hearing, normally within 5 working days of the panel.

9. Where the penalty involves awarding a lower qualification, expulsion or revoking an award, the Secretary to Academic Board will
   a) make a recommendation to the Academic Dean (or nominee) and;
   b) record the decision of the Academic Dean (or nominee) and;
   c) will be responsible for communicating the decision to the student, normally within 5 working days of the panel.

**G Outcome of an Investigation**

**1.** Where an allegation of academic misconduct is not sustained following investigation, the work shall be assessed on its academic merit, and all record of the alleged misconduct shall be removed from the student's record.

**2.** Where an allegation of academic misconduct is sustained, either by admission of the student or following investigation:
   a) For Category B and C offences, where the penalty does not involve retaking a module, the Secretary to Academic Board has delegated authority of the Programme Assessment Board to apply the standard penalty.
   b) For Category B and C offences where the penalty involves retaking a module the programme team will advise which module, if any, should be re-registered. The Secretary to Academic Board has delegated authority of the Programme Assessment Board to apply the standard penalty and will include module information when applying the standard penalty.
   c) For Category D offences where the penalty involves awarding a lower qualification, expulsion or revoking an award, the Secretary to Academic Board will make a recommendation to the Academic Dean (or nominee) and will be responsible for communicating the decision to the student, copied to the appropriate Academic Dean and the President of the Students Union.
   d) Any reassessment following the Assessment Board's decision to fail the student in one or more units of assessment shall be at the absolute discretion of the Assessment board under the programme assessment regulations.

**3.** The Secretary to Academic Board will report all decisions to Assurance Committee for recording and monitoring purposes.

**4.** A student may appeal against the decision to impose a penalty. Such an appeal will be made through the established appeal procedures for a) taught programmes or b) research programmes and must be received by the Secretary to Academic Board within 10 working days of the decision being issued. The only subsequent involvement of the Secretary to Academic Board will be to refer the appeal for decision to a senior member of staff with appropriate academic background, outside the Faculty/School to which the student belongs.

a) Normally an appeal may be made on the following grounds:

i. That there is new and relevant evidence which the student was demonstrably and for the most exceptional reasons unable to present to the Secretary to Academic Board or Panel of Investigation meeting.

ii. That the procedures were not complied with in such a way that it might cause reasonable doubt as to whether the result would have been different had they been complied with.

iii. That there is documented evidence of prejudice or bias on the part of the Secretary to Academic Board or by one or more members of the Panel of Investigation.

iv. That the penalty imposed exceeds the maximum penalties listed in Table F5.

**H Guidelines for penalties for Academic Misconduct**

a) The minimum penalty imposed shall normally exceed that which would follow if the student had merely failed the assessment.

b) The penalties listed must be taken as indicative of the maximum penalties which may be imposed (see Table H).

c) All confirmed offences for taught programmes must be recorded on the student's record as grade P for the module. This grade to remain throughout the student's registration at Middlesex University and to be replaced on formal documents by grade 20.

d) All confirmed offences for research programmes will be recorded on the student record and remain throughout the students registration at Middlesex University.

e) All records of disproved offences must be deleted from the student record.

f) A student may appeal against the decision of the Assessment Board to impose a penalty. (see G4 above)

g) If a student submits multiple assessments within a similar timeframe (and will not have had the opportunity to have had feedback) and has made the same type of offence the appropriate penalty will be applied to all the assessments as a simultaneous offence.

# H Categories, Actions and Penalties

| Responsibility | Penalty | Description of Action |
|---|---|---|
| Module Leader<br><br>Academic Integrity Tutor<br><br>Research Supervisor | Category A | The Module Leader will mark the work, but the mark/grade may be reduced to reflect a student's failure to address the assessment criteria in areas of collation of sources and their citation leading to the work being overly derivative/overly reliant on external sources; or failure to gain appropriate ethical approval(s) for work that is deemed ethically low risk. **The student may be required to redo the assessment at the next assessment opportunity if the downgrading results in the assessment and the overall module being failed.**<br><br>Research Students will be<br>Tutorial support and guidance to help the student understand what is and is not acceptable, including written advice on where they can seek help (such as LET)<br>Warning regarding penalties for Academic misconduct offences.<br><br>For cases involving inadequate or inappropriate use of source material, the student should be referred to a Liaison librarian for a tutorial on finding and referencing appropriate source materials. They should also ensure completion of the Student Success Essentials online course. |
| Secretary to Academic Board (or nominee) | Category B | Failure of the assessment component, with reassessment right where permissible.<br><br>A fail grade of P (with Reassessment Required) will be recorded. The **assessment component** mark/grade will be capped at the minimum pass mark/grade.<br><br>For cases involving inadequate or inappropriate use of source material, the student should be referred to a Liaison librarian for a tutorial on finding and referencing appropriate source materials. They should also ensure completion of the Student Success Essentials online course. |
| Secretary to Academic Board (or nominee) | Category C | Failure of the assessment component, with reassessment right where permissible.<br><br>A fail grade of P (with Reassessment Required) will be recorded. The **module** result will be capped at the minimum pass mark/grade.<br><br>Research students will be required to resubmit a revised proposal/transfer document.<br><br>For cases involving inadequate or inappropriate use of source material, the student should be referred to a Liaison librarian for a tutorial on finding and referencing appropriate source materials. They should also ensure completion of the Student Success Essentials online course |

| | | |
|---|---|---|
| Secretary to Academic Board (or nominee) /Academic Dean (or nominee)<br><br>Research Degree Coordinator for Research Students | Category C1 | To include cases where there is no right of reassessment permissible.<br><br>Failure in the module: the student must retake the same (or a substitute) module at the next opportunity where the module result will be capped at the minimum pass mark/grade, and full fee is payable.<br><br>When it is not possible to retake the same module or no substitute module is permissible the student may not be able to continue on the course.<br><br>A fail grade of P (Proven Academic Misconduct) will be recorded, with no reassessment allowed.<br><br>Research degree students will not be permitted to progress (including transferring to next stage) until they have clearly evidenced that they have addressed the issues that have come to light. Where appropriate any data, evidence or results collected/obtained up to that point cannot be used in any subsequently submitted thesis.<br><br>For cases involving inadequate or inappropriate use of source material, the student should be referred to a Liaison librarian for a tutorial on finding and referencing appropriate source materials. They should also ensure completion of the Student Success Essentials online course. |
| Secretary to Academic Board (or nominee) /Academic Dean (or nominee) | Category D | Failure in the module. A fail grade of P (Proven Academic Misconduct) will be recorded, with no reassessment allowed<br><br>Additionally:<br><br>Exit Qualification with no opportunity for resit<br>OR<br>Expulsion<br>OR<br>Revoking a previously awarded degree<br><br>A student will not be permitted to exit with their named award but may be permitted to exit with a lower award.<br><br>Research students will be not awarded the degree and not be permitted to be reassessed. |

.

**Note: All cases will sit on a sliding case of severity. There will be occasions when the misconduct is normally considered minor, but the extent of the deliberation and intention to deceive is such that it fits the criteria of serious misconduct. As a result, the examples given should be used as a guide to help staff identify procedures, but there will always be an element of academic judgement in determining the level of misconduct and the appropriate action to take**

H1 Penalties associated with Plagiarism in Coursework on taught modules (including written submissions, online submissions, presentations, performances, and physical artefacts)
*(For Category B or C, where there is no right of reassessment, or is a repeat offence, Category C1 or D may apply)*
*(Where the component contributes up to 20 % of the overall module/programme a lesser penalty may apply)*

| Type of offence | Penalty | Summary outcome (see Table H for detail) |
|---|---|---|
| Making available one's own work to another student, either intentionally or as a result of negligence, that can be presented as another student's. | Category A | Tutorial Support and Guidance. |
| • Isolated use of quotes without the use of quotation marks and citation<br>• Failure to use quotes where the student has cited plagiarised material in the body of the work and in the reference list, (secondary referencing)<br>• use of word replacement techniques to hide sources | Category A | Mark work down for over reliance on external sources, Tutorial Support and Guidance. |
| • Inadequate referencing, for example missing citations in paraphrased text (illicit paraphrasing)<br>• Extensive use of quotes or close paraphrasing without the use of quotation marks and referencing, where the student has not cited the plagiarised material in the reference list. | Category A | Mark work down for over reliance on external sources, Tutorial Support and Guidance. |
| • Close paraphrasing without the use of quotation marks, where the student has cited the plagiarised material in the reference list (Sham paraphrasing) | Category A | Mark work down for over reliance on external sources, Tutorial Support and Guidance. |

| | | | |
|---|---|---|---|
| Collusion - Representation of work produced in collaboration with another person or persons as the work of a single student. | Level 3/4 | Category A | Mark work down for over reliance on external sources, Tutorial Support and Guidance. |
| | Level 5/6 | Category B | Resit, Cap Component |
| | Level 7 and above | Category C/C1 | Resit, Cap Module/Retake Module |

| | | | |
|---|---|---|---|
| Self-plagiarism where the student re-uses isolated parts of their own work for which credit has previously been awarded, without citing the original content | Category A | | Tutorial Support and Guidance. |
| Self-plagiarism where the student re-uses extensively their own work for which credit has previously been awarded, without citing the original content | Level 3/4/5 | Category A | Mark work down for over reliance on external sources, Tutorial Support and Guidance. |
| | All other Levels | Category C | Resit, Cap Module |
| Fake Referencing throughout assignment where the citation is fabricated or the citation does not include the information indicated | Category C | | Resit, Cap Module |
| Copying another student's work and submitting some or all of it as if it were the student's own | Level 3/4 | Category A | Tutorial Support and Guidance. |
| | Level 5 | Category B | Resit, Cap Component |
| | Level 6 and above | Category C/C1 | Resit, Cap Module/Retake Module |
| The presentation of data in laboratory work, projects etc. based on work purporting to have been carried out by the student but which has been invented, altered, or falsified. | Category C/C1<br>The student may also be investigated under the Fitness to Practice Procedures if appropriate. | | Resit, Cap Module/Retake Module |

| | | |
|---|---|---|
| Where a student commissions another party (either paid or unpaid) to complete an assessment item on their behalf. | Category C/C1 or Category D | Resit Cap/Retake Module or Expulsion |
| Deliberate attempt to gain advantage by unfair or improper means.<br>• Trying to deceive specialist text checking software (eg Turnitin) by, for example, using text replacement tools; images in documents instead of text; submitting documents in an alternative format than that required.<br>• Unauthorised use of artificial intelligence in a piece of work submitted for grading | Category C/C1 or Category D | Resit Cap/Retake Module or Expulsion |

| | | |
|---|---|---|
| Attempting to persuade another member of the University (student or staff) to participate in actions that would breach these Procedures. | Category C1 or Category D<br>May also be investigated under the Student Misconduct and Disciplinary procedures | Retake Module or Expulsion |
| Being party to any other arrangement that would constitute a breach of these Procedures. | Penalty will correspond to the nature of the offence and will be in accordance with penalties outlined for each of the above | |

H2 Penalties associated with Examinations or tests (including online examinations and tests – see Section K of the regulations) on taught modules

(For Category B or C, where there is no right of reassessment, or is a repeat offence, Category C1 or D may apply)

(Where the component contributes up to 20 % of the overall module/programme a lesser penalty may apply)

| **Type of offence** | **Penalty** | |
|---|---|---|
| Removing any script, paper, or other official stationery (whether completed or not) from the examination room, unless specifically authorised by an invigilator or examiner. | Category B | Cap component |
| Introduction or use of devices of any kind other than those specifically permitted in the rubric of the paper. Including accessing unauthorised web browsers when carrying out an online exam | Category C | Cap module |
| Communicating with another student or with any third party other than the invigilator/examiner during an examination or test. | Category C | Cap module |
| During an examination or test, copying or attempting to copy the work of another student, whether by overlooking their work, asking them for information, or by any other means. | Category C | Cap Module |
| Possession of crib sheets, revision notes (including, for example, those held on digital media devices) or accessing the internet in contravention of the examination rubric. | Category C | Cap Module |
| Attempting to persuade another member of the University (student, staff or invigilator) to participate in actions that would breach these Procedures. | Category C1 or Category D<br>May also be investigated under the Student Misconduct and Disciplinary procedures | Retake Module or Expulsion |
| Being party to any arrangement whereby a person other than the candidate represents, or intends to represent, the candidate in an examination or test. | Category C1 or Category D<br>May also be investigated under the Student Misconduct and Disciplinary procedures | Retake Module or Expulsion |
| Obtaining access to an unseen examination or test prior to the start of an examination/test. | Category D | Expulsion |
| Being party to any other arrangement that would constitute a breach of these Procedures and Section K of the regulations | Penalty will correspond to the nature of the offence and will be in accordance with penalties outlined for each of the above | |

H3 Penalties associated with research degree programmes

Students on Research degree programmes are subject to the Code of Practice for Research in addition to this Policy and Procedures for Academic Integrity and Misconduct

| **Type of offence** | **Penalty** | **Action** |
|---|---|---|
| Evidence of plagiarism in the documentation at the Stage 1 Review (Registration) | Category A | Students will be required to resubmit a revised Research Proposal.<br><br>Tutorial Support and Guidance from the Supervisor/Director of Studies |
| Evidence of plagiarism in the documentation at the Stage 2 Review (PaP/Transfer) | Category C1 | Students will not be permitted to progress (including transferring to next stage) until they have clearly evidenced that they have addressed the issues that have come to light<br><br>Tutorial Support and Guidance from the Supervisor/Director of Studies |
| Evidence of plagiarism in any other documentation identified prior to the submission of a thesis | Category C1 | Students will not be permitted to progress (including transferring to next stage) until they have clearly evidenced that they have addressed the issues that have come to light<br><br>Tutorial Support and Guidance from the Supervisor/Director of Studies |
| Plagiarism suspected/discovered, prior to submission for examination, in the thesis or artefact.<br><br>(A supervisor should report such concerns to the DoS) | Category C1 | Students will advised that they should not submit the work until they have clearly evidenced that they have addressed the issues that have come to light<br><br>Tutorial Support and Guidance from the Supervisor/Director of Studies |

| | | |
|---|---|---|
| Evidence of significant plagiarism in a thesis submitted for examination (significant would be determined by the scale, frequency and type of plagiarism; where there is evidence of plagiarism but it is not deemed significant, this could be addressed by examiners through amendments to the thesis in advance of the oral examination) | Category C1/D | Research students will be not awarded the degree and not be permitted to be reassessed.<br><br>Where this is identified by examiners (or others) prior to *viva voce* then the viva must not go ahead unless the case is dismissed; where plagiarism is identified during the *viva voce*, the examiners should continue with the viva and make recommendations to be ratified in the event that the alleged misconduct is not proven. |
| Evidence of fabrication or falsification of data, results, evidence or other information prior to submission of the thesis (e.g. at transfer stage) | Category C1<br>The student may also be investigated under the Fitness to Practice Procedures if appropriate.<br><br>In addition, the student may be subject to investigation under the University's Code of Practice for Research PRINCIPLES AND PROCEDURES FOR HANDLING ALLEGATIONS OF RESEARCH MISCONDUCT | Research degree students will not be permitted to progress until they have clearly evidenced that they have addressed the issues that have come to light and may in some cases have their programme terminated. Any data, evidence or results collected/obtained up to that point cannot be used in any subsequently submitted thesis. |

| | | |
|---|---|---|
| Evidence of fabrication or falsification of data, results, evidence or other information in a thesis submitted for examination | Category D<br><br>In addition, the student may be subject to investigation under the University's Code of Practice for Research PRINCIPLES AND PROCEDURES FOR HANDLING ALLEGATIONS OF RESEARCH MISCONDUCT | Research students will be not awarded the degree and be not permitted to be reassessed.<br><br>Where this is identified by examiners (or others) prior to *viva voce* then the viva must not go ahead unless the case is dismissed; where plagiarism is identified during the *viva voce*, the examiners should continue with the viva and make recommendations to be ratified in the event that the alleged misconduct is not proven. |
| Commissioning or seeking to commission another party (either paid or unpaid) to complete some or all of a thesis on their behalf | Category D | Research students will be not awarded the degree and be not permitted to be reassessed. |
| Failure to gain appropriate ethical approval prior to undertaking research | Category C1 where this comes to light prior to the submission of the thesis for examination (e.g. at Review Stages 1 or 2)<br>Category D where this comes to light after the thesis is submitted for examination | See H4 for action |

H4 Processes and Penalties associated with failure to get ethical approval where it is required.

Where a student carries out research but does not have appropriate ethics approval they will be referred to the Faculty Research Ethics Committee for investigation.

The investigation will determine the:

- Extent to which the student engaged in the supervisory process;
- Extent to which the supervisor responded to reasonable requests from the student;
- The level of risk of the application (screening form, minimal risk, more than minimal risk, high risk);
    - Low risk (most literature review studies)
    - Minimal risk. (anonymous questionnaires – participants not identified) ,
    - More than minimal risk (e.g., identifiable participants, interviews, focus groups, sensitive topics, risk of physical/psychological harm, personal data processing etc)
    - High risk (e.g., illegal/harmful activities, cell culture research, gene therapy research, human tissue research etc)
- Whether there is any record of an application (e.g. was a resubmission required but not forthcoming?)

A panel will be convened drawn from the University Research Ethics Committee Co-Chairs.

Following investigation, the panel will determine a penalty to be applied by the Module Leader:

- No case to answer – dismissed
- Proceed to marking, but withhold marks that would have been awarded for analysis (as the data was collected inappropriately).
- Fail mark awarded (score of 0%) with resit opportunity. Module mark for resit capped at 16.