

UNIVERSITY OF BIRMINGHAM

CODE OF PRACTICE ON ACADEMIC INTEGRITY

(INCLUDING PLAGIARISM AND CONDUCT IN EXAMINATIONS AND CLASS TESTS)

Index of Points

1. Introduction
2. Principal Academic Units (PAU) Responsibilities
3. Student Responsibilities
4. General Points Relating to Commencing Both Types of Investigations

Part A – Plagiarism related concerns and investigations

5. Identifying Concerns
6. Academic Writing Concerns That will be Addressed Without Requiring a Formal Investigation
7. Identifying and Referring Plagiarism Related Concerns to the Academic Integrity Officer
8. Plagiarism Investigation
9. Categories of Plagiarism – Following an Investigation

Part B – Examination Irregularity Concerns and Investigations

10. Identifying and Referring Examination Irregularity Concerns for Investigation
11. Minor Examination Irregularity Concerns – That Do Not Require a Formal Investigation
12. Examination Irregularity Investigations
13. Categories of Examination Irregularity

Part C – Consequences of a Plagiarism and Examination Irregularities (Moderate and Serious findings)

14. Moderate Plagiarism or Moderate Examination Irregularity
15. Serious Plagiarism, Serious Examination Irregularities and other reasons for referral to a College Misconduct and Fitness to Practise Committee
16. Relation to other Procedures

Appendix A – Plagiarism Related Concerns

Appendix B – Examination Irregularity Related Concerns

1. Introduction

- 1.1. The University has an obligation to uphold the academic integrity of the degrees, diplomas and certificates it awards. Academic Integrity refers to the values and practices of the academic community and includes undertaking assessments honestly, in a responsible manner and respecting other's ideas.
- 1.2. This Code of Practice applies to all Registered Students, Students on Leave of Absence, Students with Thesis Awaited Status, Externally Registered Students and Graduands ('Students').
- 1.3. This Code of Practice relates to all assessed academic work (Assessments) required for academic progress or award (e.g., summative assessments) which include:
 - 1.3.1 'Coursework', which means written assignments, data interpretation and calculations, essays, reports, dissertations, theses, portfolios, projects, presentations;
 - 1.3.2 'Practical Examinations', which means clinical assessments, laboratory assessments, oral examinations;
 - 1.3.3 'Class Tests', which means timed assignments, including data interpretation and calculations, and timed essays;
 - 1.3.4 'Written Examinations', which means Centrally Coordinated Written Examinations, which are those arranged by the Central Examinations Office, Principal Academic Unit (PAU) Written Examinations, which are those arranged by the PAU;
 - 1.3.5 'Online (digital) Examinations', which means an examination that is taken online using a device connected to the internet,
 - 1.3.6 'Take-home' Examinations, which means an open book examination where students normally have a period of time to download the examination paper, answer the questions, and then submit their answers online; and
 - 1.3.7 any other Assessment type not covered by the categories mentioned above.
- 1.4. Any Assessment will be liable to scrutiny to identify any issues of academic misconduct or plagiarism. This scrutiny may include, but is not limited to; the use of text-matching and other software, and the use of invigilators in Written and Online Examinations.
- 1.5. Plagiarism can occur in all types of assessment when a Student claims as their own, intentionally or by omission, work which was not done by that Student. This may occur in a number of ways e.g. copying and pasting material, adapting material and self-plagiarism. Submitting work and assessments created by someone or something else, as if it was your own, is plagiarism and is a form of academic misconduct. This includes Artificial Intelligence (AI)-generated content and content written by a third party (e.g. a company, other person, or a friend or family member) and fabricating data. Other examples of what constitutes plagiarism are set out in Appendix A to this Code of Practice.
- 1.6. A Practical Examination Irregularity, Class Test Irregularity and Written Examination Irregularity occurs when a Student fails to follow oral and written instructions for the Assessment and includes but is not limited to the examples set out in Appendix B to this Code of Practice.
- 1.7. For the purposes of this Code of Practice, any department within Corporate Services delivering a Programme or module of the University is considered to be the (PAU) in respect of that Programme.

- 1.8. For the purpose of this procedure, 'working days' refers to University working days (i.e. Mondays – Friday, excluding Public Holidays and University Closed Days).
- 1.9. In the case of Students based at the University's overseas campuses working days will reflect national public holidays and any locally designated closed days.
- 1.10. During a period of study abroad Students will be subject to the rules and procedures of their host institution in relation to academic misconduct.

2. PAU Responsibilities

- 2.1. The PAU has the following responsibilities in regards to promoting good academic conduct to Students in relation to all Assessments:
 - 2.1.1 To provide to Students during the induction process and in writing, in programme materials and other media as appropriate, guidance on plagiarism, which should cover programme-specific content and include:
 - (a) referencing (and any preferred referencing style);
 - (b) how to avoid plagiarism;
 - (c) acceptable use of a proof-reader, including guidance on declaring the use of a proof-reader.
 - 2.1.2 Where Programmes include collaborative/group work:
 - (a) to advise on the boundary between legitimate collaboration and inappropriate collaboration/collusion;
 - (b) to advise on any method to be used to demonstrate individual and/or collective contributions.
 - 2.1.3 To provide to Students during the induction process and in writing, in programme materials and other media as appropriate, guidance on conduct and permitted materials in Practical Examinations, Class Tests and Written Examinations, Online and Take-Home Examinations.
- 2.2. Where a PAU has in place any formal learning agreement relating to the avoidance of plagiarism, advice will be given to Students on the requirements before a Student is asked to sign the agreement.
- 2.3. All PAUs will have in place an Academic Integrity Officer (AIO) who will normally be nominated by the Head of School or Head of PAU, or nominee.
- 2.4. The PAU will have in place methods for upholding the Academic Integrity of their assessments including:
 - methods of detecting any plagiarism;
 - procedures to review, monitor and quality-assure reports generated by any text-matching or other software;
 - procedures to detect issues around conduct in Practical Examinations, Class Tests and PAU Written Examinations.



- 2.5. PAUs will assist with the implementation of procedures to detect issues around conduct, in Centrally Coordinated Written Examinations.

3. **Students Responsibilities**

- 3.1. Students are expected to undertake their Assessments with Academic Integrity and in doing so have the following responsibilities:
- 3.1.1 To familiarise themselves with the guidance provided by the PAU and/or the University, in relation to the avoidance of plagiarism.
 - 3.1.2 To familiarise themselves with guidance provided by the PAU and the University in relation to conduct in Practical Examinations, Class Tests and Written Examinations
 - 3.1.3 To follow written and oral instructions provided in relation to all Practical Examinations, Class Tests and Written Examinations, including:
 - (a) the announcements made at the start, during and at the end of the Practical Examination, Class Test and Written Examination,
 - (b) the instructions at the top of the question paper (rubric), and
 - (c) any other instructions provided by the PAU and/or University in relation to the Practical Examination, Class Test or Written Examination.
- 3.2. Students will be expected to provide evidence of their identity in Class Tests and Written Examinations by displaying their University identification card on the desk.

4. **General Points Relating to Commencing Both Types of Investigations**

- 4.1. Where concerns are raised about a student's behaviour during an Assessment, consideration will be given to the nature of the concerns and how they were identified to determine if they should be investigated as a plagiarism related concern or Examination Irregularity related concern. More information is provided later in this Code of Practice about the identification and types of concerns.
- 4.2. The University will not normally investigate concerns that have been raised about a student anonymously unless there is some other information or evidence to corroborate the concerns raised. Where anonymous concerns are received by the University, the University will consider the nature and severity of the concern reports and any corroborating information before deciding whether to commence an investigation.
- 4.3. Where there is a reasonable suspicion that plagiarism or an Examination Irregularity may have occurred in an Assessment for which the marks have been confirmed, as long as the Student has not graduated, and in exceptional circumstances, with the permission of the Chair of the Board of Examiners, an investigation may be carried out. This will only apply to the most recent academic year. If there are exceptional circumstances and sufficient evidence that plagiarism or an Examination Irregularity has occurred in a student's previous academic year the permission to investigate must be sought from the Deputy Pro-Vice-Chancellor (Education Policy and Academic Standards). An investigation has the potential to lead to a change to the confirmed mark.



- 4.4. If concerns are raised after the Student has graduated (is a graduate) the University will not be able to investigate under this Code of Practice, but will consider the option of invoking the procedure to revoke a degree under the University Ordinance 4.8.

Part A – Plagiarism Related Concerns and Investigations

5. Identifying Concerns

Concerns may be raised about a Student's academic writing in all types of Assessments. This could include Assessments involving course-work, computer-code, images, e.g. posters, graphs. Some of these concerns may be low level and can be addressed through the marking scheme and providing advice to the Student. When it appears that the concerns are more substantial an investigation will take place and a decision made on whether plagiarism has taken place and if so what category of plagiarism.

6. Academic Writing Concerns That will be Addressed Without Requiring a Formal Investigation

6.1. Minor Academic Concerns - That Can Be Addressed Through the Marking Process

Where the marker identifies minor issues in a student's work, (e.g. missing quotation marks, minor missing references or an incomplete bibliography), provided the marking scheme allows it, the student's mark would normally be affected. The marker should normally provide comments on the concerns in the Assessment feedback. The marker may contact the student's Personal Academic Tutor or similar role or the PAU AIO to inform them so that they can provide the student with further guidance on good academic practice.

6.2. Poor Academic Practice – Where an Advice Letter is Sent to the Student, but No Formal Investigation is Required

Poor Academic Practice arises from a Student's failure to follow expected academic conventions, where a Student may not yet be familiar with the requirements of University level Assessments. Where such concerns are raised by the Marker it is likely that the student's mark will be affected as with Minor Academic Writing Concerns. The Marker will also confirm with the AIO that the concerns are simply Poor Academic Practice and do not require investigation as possible plagiarism.

If the AIO agrees that the concerns are simply Poor Academic Practice, the Student will be sent a letter advising them that there were issues in their work, they should re-familiarise themselves with resources available and have a discussion with their Personal Academic Tutor (or similar role) or PAU AIO about good academic practice and how to avoid plagiarism. The Student's Personal Academic Tutor or similar, or the PAU AIO will normally follow up with discussions with the Student to offer guidance. The PAU will determine the appropriate role to follow up with the student and make it clear in the letter to the student.

7. Identifying and Referring Plagiarism Related Concerns to the Academic Integrity Officer

- 7.1. Examples of concerns that should be investigated under the plagiarism process are set out below in Appendix A and are those that have normally been identified by:



- the marker, or in PGR cases Supervisor, or Internal Examiner or PAU AIO,
- through the checking of text-matching software or other similar software to assist in the detection of plagiarism,
- through checks carried out to see if Assessment questions and answers have been posted on websites.

- 7.2. Where concerns relate to the possibility that plagiarism has occurred, the matter should be referred to the relevant AIO to determine if an investigation is required and if so, to carry out that investigation. The relevant Academic Integrity Officer would normally be based in the PAU for the module in which the concerns have been raised.
- 7.3. Where it is suspected that plagiarism has occurred, or issues are suspected, in a project or thesis submitted by a Student on a postgraduate research Programme of study, examination of the project or thesis must be suspended until it has been established whether or not plagiarism has occurred.

8. Plagiarism Investigation

- 8.1. An AIO who suspects that plagiarism may have occurred will undertake an investigation, which would normally involve considering any evidence, which may include a report generated by text-matching software, or observations reported by the marker or invigilator.
- 8.2. Where, following the investigation, the AIO has a reasonable suspicion that plagiarism has occurred, the Student will be given the opportunity to respond to the allegation and will be invited to a meeting (the Academic Integrity Meeting).
- 8.3. The AIO will write to the Student notifying them of the concerns and inviting them to the Academic Integrity Meeting. The Student should normally be given at least five working days' notice of the Academic Integrity Meeting.
- 8.4. The AIO reserves the right to approve a meeting online, or by other means where it is deemed appropriate.
- 8.5. If the Student fails to confirm their attendance at the Academic Integrity Meeting, and/or confirms they will attend but fails to do so, the meeting may proceed in the Student's absence.
- 8.6. The Student can be accompanied to the Academic Integrity Meeting by a Friend, as defined in University Regulation 1. The Student is responsible for arranging for any Friend to accompany them to the meeting. The Student should, in advance of the AI Meeting, inform the AIO of the name and status of the Friend who will be accompanying them.
- 8.7. During or in advance of the Academic Integrity Meeting, the Student should bring to the AIO's attention and where appropriate provide evidence of, any mitigating factors that they want the AIO to consider. Mitigating factors will normally be considered in determining the sanction only and not whether or not plagiarism has occurred or the category of plagiarism. Where a Student has issues that have impacted them they will normally be expected to request an extension to their submission deadline in advance of the submission.
- 8.8. Following the Academic Integrity meeting, the AIO, in consultation with other appropriate members of staff at the Academic Integrity Meeting, will decide whether plagiarism has

occurred, if so, assign a category, and depending on the category apply an appropriate sanction.

- 8.9. This outcome should be communicated to the Student in writing (the Outcome Letter) normally within five working days of the Academic Integrity Meeting or the deadline for providing further information, if the AIO has asked the Student to provide any further information to assist them to make a decision. The Outcome Letter will include key points of the discussions which took place in the meeting, the reasons for the decision and should be retained on the Student's file.

9. Categories of Plagiarism – Following an Investigation

- 9.1. There are two levels of plagiarism: moderate plagiarism and serious plagiarism. Following an investigation the AIO will assign a category taking into consideration a number of factors, including those set out below:
- (a) the academic level (e.g. F, C, I, H, M, D as detailed in Regulation 6) of the Student;
 - (b) whether there is a reasonable expectation that the Student should have learned appropriate referencing skills and received sufficient guidance;
 - (c) the nature of the irregularity;
 - (d) the severity/ or proportion of the work affected;
 - (e) whether there have been any previous recorded instances of Plagiarism.

9.1.1 Moderate Plagiarism

Moderate plagiarism arises when a Student fails to follow guidelines on what is regarded as a Student's own original work, ignoring conventions and failure to follow acceptable academic practice.

9.1.2 Serious Plagiarism – Academic Misconduct

Serious plagiarism arises where there has been an occurrence of reasonably extensive quantities of unattributed or incorrectly attributed copying and/or self-plagiarism. Serious plagiarism also arises where there has been an attempt to deceive the marker by the Student passing off as their own, work which they have not done; including submitting work that has in full or in part been produced by a third party. This category also includes a case of repeated moderate plagiarism.

See Part C for Consequences of a Decision of Moderate or Serious Plagiarism

Part B – Examination Irregularity Concerns and Investigations

10. Identifying and Referring Examination Irregularity Concerns for Investigation

- 10.1. Where an investigation is required into Examination Irregularity concerns it will be carried out by Student Conduct, Complaints and Appeals (SCCA), or for students subject to Fitness to Practise requirements the relevant PAU. The person nominated in SCCA or the PAU to undertake the investigation will be the Investigating Officer.

- 10.2. Concerns that may be investigated as an Examination Irregularity are those that relate to a student's conduct during an in-person examination, online examination, take-home examination or class-test or other similar assessments (Examination). Concerns that are investigated as a possible Examination Irregularity are normally those where:
- the invigilator has observed unacceptable behaviour from a student during an Examination
 - evidence has been received that suggests a student has communicated with another party, or other student during an Examination,
 - evidence has been received that suggests a student may have been in possession of non-permitted items during an Examination
 - evidence has been received that suggests a student may not have observed the rules of an Examination, and the concerns are not appropriate to be investigated as a plagiarism related concern.
- 10.3. When a report of Examination Irregularity concerns is received the Investigating Officer will decide whether there is sufficient evidence and/or information to undertake an investigation.
- 10.4. Unauthorised items may be confiscated, inspected and retained as evidence until disciplinary proceedings and any related appeals are completed.
- 11. Minor Examination Irregularity Concerns – That Do Not Require a Formal Investigation**
- 11.1. A minor Examination Irregularity occurs when a Student has breached the rules of the Assessment, but it could reasonably be determined that this was accidental and was unlikely to have allowed them to gain an unfair advantage in the Assessment.
- 11.2. Where the PAU identifies concerns that could amount to an Examination Irregularity Minor Concern a referral should be made to SCCA, or the nominated person in the PAU for students subject to fitness to practise requirements. The Investigating Officer will decide whether a Minor Concern has occurred or if a formal investigation is required.
- 11.3. If it is decided that a Minor Concern has occurred, the Student will be sent an advisory letter. This letter is to inform the Student that concerns were raised about their Assessment, that they should re-familiarise themselves with resources on the rules of examinations and they may want to have a discussion with their Personal Academic Tutor about good conduct in examinations.
- 12. Examination Irregularity Investigations**
- 12.1. Where an investigation is commenced, the Student will be given the opportunity to respond to the allegation and will be invited to a meeting (the Examination Irregularity Meeting).
- 12.2. The Investigating Officer will write to the Student giving them a summary of the concerns raised and inviting them to the Examination Irregularity Meeting. The Student should normally be given at least five working days' notice of the Examination Irregularity Meeting.
- 12.3. The Investigating Officer reserves the right to hold a meeting online, or by other means where it is deemed appropriate.

- 12.4. If the Student fails to confirm their attendance at the Examination Irregularity Meeting and/or confirms they will attend but fails to do so, the meeting may proceed in the Student's absence.
- 12.5. The Student can be accompanied to the Examination Irregularity Meeting by a Friend, as defined in University Regulation 1. The Student is responsible for arranging for any Friend to accompany them to the meeting. The Student should, in advance of the Examination Irregularity Meeting, inform the Investigating Officer of the name and status of the Friend who will be accompanying them.
- 12.6. During or in advance of the Examination Irregularity Meeting, the Student should bring to the Investigating Officer's attention and where appropriate, provide evidence of any mitigating factors that they want the Investigating Officer to consider. Mitigating factors will normally be considered in determining the sanction only and not whether or an Examination Irregularity has occurred or the category of Examination Irregularity.
- 12.7. Following the Examination Irregularity meeting, the Investigating Officer will decide whether or not an Examination Irregularity has occurred, and if so, assign a category, and depending on the category, an appropriate sanction will be applied.
- 12.8. Once the category of the Examination Irregularity will be determined by the Investigating Officer, depending on the category an appropriate sanction will be determined by an academic member of staff. For students subject to fitness to practise requirements the sanction will be determined by the Investigating Officer or a nominated decision maker.
- 12.9. For students investigated by SCCA, the Investigating Officer will provide a summary report to the nominated person(s) in the PAU who will consider the matter and decide on the appropriate sanction. In deciding the sanction, consideration will be given to the circumstances of the Examination Irregularity and any mitigation provided by the Student.
- 12.10. The nominated person(s) in the PAU will provide to the Investigating Officer, their decision on the sanction and reasons for the decision within five working days of receiving the report from SCCA.
- 12.11. If following the Examination Irregularity Meeting the Investigating Officers need to carry out further investigation (e.g. request a report from the Marker or obtain technical information from the Virtual Learning Environment) they will inform the Student that further investigation is being carried out. The Investigating Officer may invite the Student to another Examination Irregularity Meeting, if needed following further investigation.

The outcome, including the sanction applied, should be communicated to the Student in writing (the Outcome Letter). The Outcome Letter will include key points of the discussions which took place in the meeting, the decision and the reasons for the decision will be retained on the Student's file.

13. Categories of Examination Irregularity

- 13.1. There are two levels of Examination Irregularity: a moderate Examination Irregularity and a serious Examination Irregularity. Following an investigation, the Investigating Officer will assign a category taking into consideration a number of factors, including those set out

below:

- (a) the academic level (e.g. F, C, I, H, M, D as detailed in Regulation 6) of the Student;
- (b) whether there is a reasonable expectation that the Student should have known and understood the Assessment rules and had received sufficient guidance;
- (c) the nature and/or severity of the irregularity;
- (d) whether there have been any previous recorded Examination Irregularities.

13.2. Moderate Examination Irregularity

A Moderate Examination Irregularity arises when sufficient guidance has been provided on the rules of the Assessment and:

- the Student fails to follow the rules of the Assessment, and/or
- their actions appear to be accidental or without intention, and/or
- the actions could have allowed them to gain some advantage in the Assessment.

13.3. Serious Examination Irregularity – Academic Misconduct

A Serious Examination Irregularity arises when sufficient guidance has been provided on the rules of the Assessment and:

- the Student fails to follow the rules of the Assessment, and/or
- their actions may not have been accidental, or there seems to have been an intention or some pre-mediation, and/or
- the actions may have allowed them to gain an unfair advantage in the Assessment.

See Part C for Consequences of a Decision of Moderate or Serious Examination Irregularities

Part C – Consequences of a Plagiarism and Examination Irregularities (Moderate and Serious findings)

14. Moderate Plagiarism or Moderate Examination Irregularity

14.1. Where following an investigation, the Investigating Officer determines that a Moderate Plagiarism or a Moderate Examination Irregularity has been found to have occurred a sanction shall be applied from the list below.

14.1.1 Taught Programmes or Modules

For Students on taught Programmes of study, or Students on research-based Programmes of study where Moderate Plagiarism or a Moderate Examination Irregularity has been found to have occurred on a taught module taken as part of that Programme:

- (a) the Assessment mark obtained to stand;
- (b) resubmission of/another attempt at the Assessment. The mark for this resubmission/attempt shall be capped at a mark deemed appropriate by the AIO and the cap shall be no lower than the pass mark. This resubmission/attempt counts as the same attempt under normal assessment regulations (Regulation 7);



- (c) reduce the Assessment mark to an appropriate level, including an award of zero. If this leads to failure of the module, and another attempt would be permitted under normal assessment regulations (regulation 7), a further attempt shall be permitted, with the overall module mark awarded capped at the pass mark;
- (d) reduce the Assessment mark to an appropriate level, including an award of zero, with no opportunity to resit.

14.1.2 Research Elements

- (a) For Students on research Programmes of study, where a Moderate plagiarism has been found to have occurred within a research Assessment that does not carry a numerical mark, the Student will be given one further opportunity to submit the Assessment at a date specified by the AIO, in the Outcome Letter.
- (b) For Students on research-based Programmes of study, where a Moderate plagiarism has been found to have occurred within the research element, the Student may resubmit, within a maximum of 20 working days' of the Outcome Letter, the dissertation/thesis for the original qualification with the offending sections/data edited and re-worked so that the plagiarism is removed. The extent of any additional work will be determined by the AIO and should normally be limited to ensuring that no sentences are incomplete due to the removal of offending sections/data. This resubmission counts as the same attempt for examination purposes.

14.2. Process for Determining the Sanction

Where following an investigation, the Investigating Officer determines that a Moderate Plagiarism or a Moderate Examination Irregularity has been found to have occurred a sanction shall be applied from the list above.

14.2.1 For Moderate Plagiarism cases, the sanction will normally be decided by the AIO.

14.2.2 For students on programmes with fitness to practise, for Moderate Plagiarism cases and Moderate Examination Irregularity cases the sanction will be decided by the Investigating Officer or designated decision-maker.

14.2.3 For Examination Irregularity cases involving students on programmes of study without fitness to practise requirements, the sanction will be determined by a nominated academic member of staff within the PAU associated with the affected module (Examination Irregularity Officer (EIO)).

14.2.4 Where the Investigating Officer determines that a moderate Examination Irregularity has occurred they will provide the EIO with a summary of the matter, including any aggravating or mitigating circumstances that have been identified during the investigation including those raised by the student. The EIO will be asked to provide the Investigating Officer with their decision on the sanction within 10 working days of receiving this summary.

14.2.5 Within five working days of receiving the EIO's decision on the sanction the Investigating Officer will send the student the Outcome Letter informing them of the decision that a Moderate Examination Irregularity has occurred and the sanction applied.



- 15. Serious Plagiarism, Serious Examination Irregularities and other reasons for referral to a College Misconduct and Fitness to Practise Committee**
- 15.1. If the sanction applied for Moderate Plagiarism or an Examination Irregularity, results in the Student failing the Programme of study, the case shall be referred to a College Misconduct and Fitness to Practice Committee to be heard in accordance with the Code of Practice on Misconduct and Fitness to Practise Committee.
- 15.2. Where following an investigation a decision is made that Serious Plagiarism or a Serious Examination Irregularity has occurred, the case shall become a case of Academic Misconduct under the University Regulations Section 8 - Student Conduct and will be referred to a College Misconduct and Fitness to Practise Committee to be heard in accordance with the Code of Practice on Misconduct and Fitness to Practise Committee.
- 15.3. Where a Student does not agree with the outcome of an Academic Integrity or Examination Irregularity Meeting, the Student may request that their case be considered by a College Misconduct and Fitness to Practise Committee in accordance with the Code of Practice on Misconduct and Fitness to Practise Committee. The request should be submitted to the Investigating Officer within 10 working days of the Outcome Letter. Requests received after the 10 working day deadline will only be considered in exceptional circumstances.
- 16. Relation to other Procedures**
- 16.1. A Student may not normally use other processes e.g. those under the Code of Practice on Extenuating Circumstances and/or the Code of Practice on Academic Appeals, to request an outcome that would change the outcome of an Academic Integrity Meeting, Examination Irregularity Meeting or College Misconduct and Fitness to Practise Committee.

Appendix A – Plagiarism Related Concerns

A.1 Plagiarism

In addition to the definition mentioned earlier, plagiarism includes the following:

A.1.1 Copying in Coursework, Online Examinations and Take-Home Examinations

Presenting as their own, work done by others, including the copying of the work of another Student (past or present, from this or another institution), the reproduction of course materials, including lecture notes, presentations or data, the cutting and pasting of material derived from the internet and the direct transcription of the contents of a textbook or journal. This includes using answers derived from 1. Websites which have study documents and assessments shared by other students (whether from the university or other institutions), or 2. Websites that will provide answers to questions posted by students. It may include inadequate or misleading referencing and paraphrasing.

A.1.2 Self-plagiarism (also called auto-plagiarism)

The reproduction in full, or in part, of work the Student has previously submitted, including work submitted as part of the same Programme or any previous Programme at this or another institution. This would also include reproduction of articles, publications, software produced by the Student, without appropriate referencing.

A.1.3 Collusion

Collaboration between two or more Students in preparing a piece of work that is then presented as their own individual work. This does not include permitted collaboration as part of group work.

A.1.4 Fabrication or misrepresentation

A Student claiming to have done work submitted, which was never undertaken by that Student. This includes the negligent, false or misleading representation by a Student of evidence, results or data which forms part of their submitted work. This constitutes an attempt to deceive the marker.

A.1.5 Commissioning work/ buying essays & Software ¹/ using generative AI

Submitting as all or part of their Assessment, work they have not done themselves which has been; bought from an essay writing company/website, downloaded from an essay repository, or prepared/generated by someone or something, other than the Student. This would normally constitute a deliberate attempt to deceive the marker.

A.1.6 Unacceptable proof-reading

Rewriting or editing of text with the purpose of improving the Student's research arguments or contributing new arguments or rewriting computer code is not acceptable, whether undertaken by a person, by generative AI or by any other means, and may be deemed to be plagiarism.

In particular, generative AI or other editorial assistance must not be used to:

- Alter text to clarify and/or develop the ideas, arguments, and explanations.
- Correct the accuracy of the information.
- Develop or change the ideas and arguments presented.

¹ The Skills and Post-16 Education Act 2022 came into effect on 28th April 2022 and made it illegal for 'cheating services' to be provided to students.

- Translate text into, or from, the language being studied.
- Or for the purpose of reducing the length of the submission so as to comply with a word limit requirement.

Generative AI or other editorial assistance may only be used to offer advice and guidance on:

- Correcting spelling and punctuation.
- Ensuring text follows the conventions of grammar and syntax in written English.
- Shortening long sentences or reducing long paragraphs without changes to the overall content.
- Ensuring the consistency, formatting and ordering of page numbers, headers and footers, and footnotes and endnotes.
- Improving the positioning of tables and figures and the clarity, grammar, spelling and punctuation of any text in table or figure legends.

Exceptions to these restrictions and what is permitted may exist, e.g. for English language study programmes. The PAU will advise students on the exceptions for specific modules and/or Assessments.

For postgraduate research theses written in English, proof-reading by a member of the supervisory team, a professional or non-professional proof-reader is acceptable to the extent that it involves the rewriting of some of the text originating from the Student for the purposes of clarifying written English only.

Appendix B – Examination Irregularity Related Concerns

B.1. Practical Examinations, Class Tests and Written Examinations

This section sets out guidance about conduct and examples of irregularities in Practical Examinations, Class Test and Written Examinations:

B.1.1 Possessing or Accessing Non-Permitted Materials during an Examination or Class Test

The rubric will inform Students of items that they are permitted to have during an examination or class test. Students must not have in their possession, or access to, non-permitted items during a Practical Examination, Class Test or Written Examination, whether or not they have been used, or were unintentionally or intentionally retained. Such items include:

- (a) communication devices and other unauthorised electronic, mobile, technical or computer equipment capable of accessing the internet, email and/or storing data, including notes and photographs e.g: mobile phone or smart-watch;
- (b) all papers;
- (c) notes; e.g. on paper, in permitted text, on hand or other body part
- (d) textbooks;
- (e) bags;
- (f) coats, jackets, body warmers and hats with the exception of religious headwear;
- (g) correctional/removal fluid or tape.

B.1.2 Copying from another Student

Students must not copy or attempt to copy from another Student's work.

B.1.3 Obtaining, or attempting to obtain, access to an unseen Assessment

Students must not obtain or access, or attempt to obtain or access, an unseen Assessment e.g. Written Examination questions, or Class Test question(s), except where this has been expressly agreed with the PAU. This includes saving, replaying or taking screenshots of examination questions posted electronically, such as on social media or similar platforms.

B.1.4 Personation and Impersonation

Students must not be involved in an arrangement whereby another party undertakes the Assessment on behalf of the Student.

B.1.5 Non-Permitted Communication

Students must not communicate, or attempt to communicate, with another party (except Invigilators) inside or outside of the Practical Examination, Class Test or Written Examination venue during the Practical Examination, Class Test or Written Examination.

B.1.6 Non-Permitted Communication in Online and Take-Home Examinations

Students must not communicate about the content of online examinations or take-home tests during the examination window. (The examination window is the time period during which the examination can be commenced by any student and not just the amount of time to complete the examination once it has been commenced, e.g. where there is a 24 hour time-frame to start the examination and two hours to complete once started.) This includes, and is not limited to sharing information about the content of the examination questions and answers when a Student has completed their own examination but those they are communicating with have not started or completed the examination.

B.1.7 Non-Permitted Use of Automatic Solvers in Online and Take-Home Examinations

Students must not use online/automatic solvers in their examination unless specifically permitted.

B.1.8 Causing a Disturbance

Students must not cause a disturbance to those in the Practical Examination, Class Test or Written Examination venue.

B.1.9 Pencil Cases and Other Containers

All containers left on a Student's desk during the examination, including pencil cases or boxes, spectacle cases or drinks containers must be transparent and should not contain any notes or other non-permitted materials.

B.1.10 Dictionaries

Students whose first language is not English will be permitted to use a standard paper, non-technical, un-annotated and un-marked dictionary, except where the rubric specifically state this is not permitted.

B.1.11 Student ID

Where there is uncertainty over the identity of the Student undertaking a Practical Examination, Class Test or Written Examination, the Student's identity, will be verified after the Student has concluded the Assessment.