

Academic Misconduct Procedures

Approved by:	Effective date:	Next review:
Education and Student Experience Committee (ESEC)	01 August 2024	31 July 2026

Academic Misconduct Procedures

The Academic Misconduct Procedures outlines the University's approach to considering allegations of academic misconduct. The Procedures apply to all modes of assessment and all students (undergraduate and postgraduate). This Procedure outlines the steps the University (and its Partners) will take to investigate allegations of academic misconduct at the University, explains the stages of the procedural process and the potential outcomes at each stage.

Who needs to know about the procedure?

- Deans of Faculty and Pro Vice-Chancellors (PVC)
- Heads of School
- Course Directors
- Module Leaders
- Personal Academic Tutors (PAT)
- Staff with a Partnership responsibility (both academic and administrative)
- All teaching staff
- Faculty Professional Services
- Course Administrators
- Registry Services Staff
- Faculty Registrars
- Students

Purpose of the Academic Misconduct Procedure

The Academic Misconduct Procedures outline the University's approach to considering alleged breaches of Schedule 2: Categories and Sanctions. This Procedure informs students, staff and the Student's Union of the stages within the Procedure, the potential penalties and the options available to students to respond to an allegation of academic misconduct including submitting a complaint to the Office of the Independent Adjudicator of Higher Education (OIA) following the completion of our internal procedure, also known as the Completion of Procedures (CoP).

Academic Misconduct Procedures

Contacts

The Early Resolution & Case Handling Team within the Directorate of Student Resolution and Student Protection is responsible for:

- Monitoring implementation of the Procedure across the University and its Partner Institutions.
- Procedural advice.
- Providing templates for enacting the Procedure.
- Procedural training.
- Institutional level annual reporting.

The Early Resolution & Case Handling Team can be contacted by emailing: casehandling@canterbury.ac.uk

Learning and Teaching Enhancement (LTE) is responsible for:

- Academic Integrity Policy.
- Providing advice and assistance on academic practices and assessment design.
- Delivering training on academic practices.

The LTE Team can be contacted by emailing: LTE-ADMIN@canterbury.ac.uk.

Faculty/School and Partner Institutions are responsible for:

- Operational implementation of the Procedure.
- Providing advice and assistance to students.
- Operational training for staff.

The relevant contacts are:

- Faculty of Arts, Humanities & Education: FAHE.ExecutiveServices@canterbury.ac.uk
- Faculty of Medicine, Health & Social Care: apq.health@canterbury.ac.uk
- Faculty of Science, Engineering & Social Sciences: fsess.coursesupport@canterbury.ac.uk

The Students' Union is responsible for:

- Providing independent support, advice, and advocacy for students at the University's home campuses through the Students' Union Advice Centre. The Students' Union Advice Centre can be contacted by emailing: advice@ccsu.co.uk.

The Directorate of Student Resolution and Student Protection is responsible for the operation and management of the Academic Misconduct Procedures.

Academic Misconduct Procedures

Contents

Part 1 – General Provisions.....	4
1. Introduction	4
2. Scope of the Procedure	4
3. Early Resolution	5
Part 2 – The Procedures.....	6
4. Initiating Academic Misconduct	6
5. Stage 1 Academic Misconduct	8
Minor and Moderate Academic Misconduct.....	8
Major Academic Misconduct and Academic Misconduct Panel.....	9
First Offence of Academic Misconduct.....	13
Previous Substantiated Academic Misconduct	13
Mitigating Factors and Reasonable Adjustments.....	13
6. Stage 2 Academic Misconduct Appeal.....	14
7. Office of the Independent Adjudicator of Higher Education (OIA)	15
8. Records, Monitoring and Confidentiality.....	15
Part 3 – Schedules.....	16
Schedule 1: Definitions of Types of Academic Misconduct.....	16
Schedule 2: Categories and Sanctions	17

Academic Misconduct Procedures

Part 1 – General Provisions

1. Introduction

- 1.1. This Procedure outline how the University will consider allegations of Academic Misconduct and breaches of the principles outlined in the [Academic Integrity Policy](#). The Procedure should be read in conjunction with the Academic Integrity Policy.
- 1.2. For the purpose of this Procedure, the term ‘Academic Misconduct’ includes all breaches of integrity (e.g., examination misconduct, contract cheating, plagiarism, duplication and collusion). This Procedure outlines definitions of types of academic misconduct, contained in Schedule 1, defines what may constitute Minor, Moderate and Major forms of academic misconduct and the possible sanctions associated with each level and category, contained in Schedule 2 of this Procedure.
- 1.3. All students should familiarise themselves with the academic conventions and practices applicable to their course of study.
- 1.4. The standard of proof to be adopted when considering allegations of academic misconduct is on the balance of probabilities. An allegation of academic misconduct shall only be substantiated where it is more likely than not that the academic misconduct has occurred.
- 1.5. For the purpose of this Procedure, the burden of proof principally rests with the University to prove that the student or former student of the University has, on the balance of probabilities, breached the principles set out in the Academic Integrity Policy and Schedule 2 of this Procedure.
- 1.6. Where it has been established that work has been submitted that may not be a breach of the definitions of academic misconduct, but it may be considered to be Poor Academic Practice (PAP), the University allows for the opportunity for students to receive guidance on what constitutes poor academic practice, including but not limited to, referencing conventions and study skills.

2. Scope of the Procedure

- 2.1. This Procedure applies to.
 - 2.1.1. All current and former students registered with the University.
 - 2.1.2. Where a student has withdrawn from their studies, this Procedure can be initiated for a period of 20 working days from the assessment or reassessment submission deadline that the allegation of academic misconduct may relate to.
 - 2.1.3. Both undergraduate and postgraduate courses of study, including both taught and research postgraduate courses of study.

Academic Misconduct Procedures

- 2.1.4. All forms of assessment, including but not limited to coursework, examinations, group assessment, research and/or any work submitted for what is considered to be a formal, summative assessment. This Procedure does not apply to draft or formative submissions.
- 2.1.5. First or subsequent (re)submission attempts of any assessment.
- 2.2. The University's Partner Institutions are required to follow Procedures consonant with this Procedure when considering allegation(s) of academic misconduct.
 - 2.2.1. Where the University's Partner Institution is a member of the Office of the Independent Adjudicator for Higher Education (OIA) scheme, the Partner Institution shall complete all stages of this Procedure (or their equivalent) where relevant, and the student shall be issued with a Completion of Procedures (CoP) letter by the Partner Institution.
 - 2.2.2. Where the University's Partner Institution is not a member of the Office of the Independent Adjudicator for Higher Education's (OIAHE) scheme, the Partner Institution shall complete Stage 1 of this Procedure (or their equivalent). The student will have the option of submitting a Stage 2 Academic Misconduct Appeal to the University, Canterbury Christ Church University.
 - 2.2.3. In such circumstances, the University will request the relevant case file from the Partner Institution and will be considered under Section 6 of this Procedure.
- 2.3. Where an allegation is made relating to a student on a course which may lead to eligibility (or contributing towards eligibility) to apply for or achieve registration with a professional, statutory and/or regulatory body (or students registered with such a body), the University may:
 - 2.3.1. Notify the relevant regulatory body of the matter;
 - 2.3.2. Undertake separate action (in addition to any sanctions applied under this procedure) under [Low Level Concerns and Fitness to Practice Procedures](#) for the Faculty of Medicine, Health and Social Care or [Professional Suitability Procedures](#) for the Faculty of Arts, Humanities and Education.
- 2.4. Sanctions contained in Schedule 2 in this Procedure may be applied where academic misconduct has been substantiated for a former student who has completed their studies, and a final award has been conferred. As in paragraph 2.3, the University may be required to notify the relevant regulatory body in such cases.

3. Early Resolution

- 3.1. This Procedure acknowledges that at the early stages of a student's academic journey, proficiency in academic writing and/or conventions are still being developed and instances of Poor Academic Practice (PAP) may occur as defined in Schedule 1 of this Procedure.
- 3.2. Where Poor Academic Practice (PAP) has been identified, and the Poor Academic Practice does not constitute a potential breach of the categories of academic misconduct contained in Schedule 2, this

Academic Misconduct Procedures

Procedure allows for the concerns to be resolved by way of Early Resolution without the need for action under Part 2 of this Procedure.

- 3.3. Where Poor Academic Practice (PAP) has been identified, the student can have the opportunity to meet with a relevant member of academic staff, such as their Personal Academic Tutor (PAT), to develop their academic skills. They may also be referred to the University's Learning Skills Hub (or equivalent within a Partner Institution) to access appropriate learning modules and/or academic skills resources, where relevant.
- 3.4. Where Poor Academic Practice has been identified, the marker shall reflect any Poor Academic Practice (PAP) that may have taken place in the marking process. If established, the item of work can be failed on pedagogic grounds.

Part 2 – The Procedures

4. Initiating Academic Misconduct

- 4.1. Each Faculty (or relevant department) shall establish Academic Integrity Officers.
- 4.2. Where a marker, module leader or invigilator suspects academic misconduct may have occurred, they should refer the case to an Academic Integrity Officer of the Faculty (or relevant department) responsible for the module concerned for an initial assessment within 5 working days of identifying the suspicion of academic misconduct.
- 4.3. Where a referral has been made, no provisional mark or feedback should be returned to the student(s) for the assessment in question.
- 4.4. Where a referral is made to an Academic Integrity Officer for an initial assessment, all relevant information and evidence that gave rise to the initial suspicion should be made available. This may include, but is not limited to;
 - 4.4.1. Turnitin reports.
 - 4.4.2. Statement from invigilators/incident reports.
 - 4.4.3. Examinations booklets.
 - 4.4.4. Academic judgement.
- 4.5. Where the University is made aware of a potential allegation of academic misconduct from any person(s) outside of the University, the most appropriate member of internal academic staff can refer the matter to the Academic Integrity Officer for consideration in accordance with paragraphs 4.2 and 4.4. In such instances, details of the case or outcome will not be provided to the external notifying party.
- 4.6. Where a student at the University suspects a fellow student may have committed potential academic misconduct, they can disclose the matter to an appropriate member of academic staff, who can refer the

Academic Misconduct Procedures

case to an Academic Integrity Officer in accordance with paragraphs 4.2 and 4.4. In such instances, details of the case or outcome will not be provided to the notifying student.

- 4.6.1. Where the notifying student does not wish to disclose their identity, there may be limited action the University can take in response.
- 4.7. The Academic Integrity Officer shall review the information provided by the marker, module leader or invigilator and determine whether the case should be referred to Stage 1 of the Academic Misconduct Procedure. It is expected that their initial assessment shall be completed within 5 working days of receiving the referral.
- 4.8. Where the Academic Integrity Officer determines that, based on the information and evidence provided, Stage 1 of this Procedure is not required, the case shall be referred back to the staff member raising the concern and they will be advised to mark the work and no further action will be taken under this Procedure.
 - 4.8.1. Where Poor Academic Practice (PAP) has been identified, the student(s) will be provided with any relevant feedback to assist with academic development as per paragraph 3.3.
- 4.9. Where the Academic Integrity Officer determines that the case should be referred to Stage 1 of this Procedure, they must complete a Stage 1 Academic Misconduct Allegation Report form and submit the form to the relevant Faculty (or relevant department) and the Early Resolution & Case Handling Team.
- 4.10. A Stage 1 Academic Misconduct Allegation Report form must include the following:
 - 4.10.1. Details of the student(s) and student number(s) to whom it relates to;
 - 4.10.2. The facts on which the allegation has been made, accompanied by all the relevant evidence.
 - 4.10.3. The category of academic misconduct that is considered to be in breach;
 - 4.10.4. Details of the assessment, including copies of the coursework or examination the allegation relates to and any information provided to students on the course concerning academic conventions and practices.
 - 4.10.5. All relevant supporting evidence from similarity or detection tools that are endorsed by the University.

Academic Misconduct Procedures

- 4.11. The determination that Stage 1 of this Procedure should be initiated does not represent a decision that a breach of academic misconduct has occurred.
- 4.12. Academic Misconduct proceedings can only be initiated by way of submitting a formal Stage 1 Academic Misconduct Allegation Report form to the relevant Faculty (or relevant department) and the Early Resolution & Case Handling Team. It is expected that a Stage 1 Academic Misconduct Allegation Report form shall be submitted within 20 working days from the assessment or reassessment submission deadline.

5. Stage 1 Academic Misconduct

Minor and Moderate Academic Misconduct

- 5.1. The Faculty (or relevant department) shall appoint an Investigating Officer to consider the case. The Investigating Officer shall not be a member of staff who identified the suspicion, the Academic Integrity Officer that referred the case, or any member of staff involved in the initial assessment, that is subject to the academic misconduct.
- 5.2. The Faculty (or relevant department) shall notify the student that is subject to the academic misconduct investigation within 10 working days of raising the Stage 1 Academic Misconduct Allegation Report form.
- 5.3. The written notification to the student shall include the following:
 - 5.3.1. The allegation and any relevant evidence that is being considered as part of the academic misconduct investigation,
 - 5.3.2. The likely penalties that may be applied under Schedule 2,
 - 5.3.3. A copy of the Academic Misconduct Procedures,
 - 5.3.4. Options available to the student to respond to the allegation and any timeframes that should be adhered to,
 - 5.3.5. Information relating to relevant student support departments and the Student's Union.
- 5.4. Where a student has been notified of an allegation of Academic Misconduct, they will be invited to respond to the allegation and provide written representations which may include the following:
 - 5.4.1. Dispute the allegation,

Academic Misconduct Procedures

- 5.4.2. Accept the allegation, and/or
- 5.4.3. Provide evidence to be considered by the Investigating Officer.
- 5.5. Where a student does not respond to the allegation and chooses not to provide written representations to the Investigating Officer for consideration, the Investigation will proceed on the information and evidence available, and the student will be provided with a decision and outcome within 15 working days of the deadline provided to the student for option of submission of written representations.
- 5.6. The Investigation Officer can determine one of the following decisions:
 - 5.6.1. The allegation is unsubstantiated, that is, based on the evidence available, no academic misconduct has been proven to have occurred on the balance of probabilities.
 - 5.6.2. The allegation is substantiated, that is, on the balance of probabilities, a Minor or Moderate Academic Misconduct has occurred and apply a permissible sanction contained in Schedule 2.
 - 5.6.3. The case may represent Major Academic Misconduct, that is, the available evidence demonstrates the case could be considered as Major Academic Misconduct, and it will be referred to an Academic Misconduct Panel. An Investigation Officer cannot substantiate a case as Major Academic Misconduct, this can only be carried out by a Panel.
- 5.7. The Investigating Officer shall inform the relevant Faculty (or relevant department) of their decision and outcome.
- 5.8. Where the academic misconduct allegation has been unsubstantiated under paragraph 5.6.1, the marker will be informed of the outcome and advised to mark the work and where relevant, reflect any Poor Academic Practice (PAP) that may have taken place in the reduced mark. If established, the item of work can be failed on pedagogic grounds.
- 5.9. The Faculty (or relevant department), shall notify the student of the outcome within 15 working days of the submission of written representations, or the deadline date provided to the student for the option of submission of written representations. Where paragraph 5.6.3 applies, the student should be notified of the next steps.
- 5.10. The Investigating Officers decision shall also be shared with the Early Resolution & Case Handling Team.

Major Academic Misconduct and Academic Misconduct Panel

- 5.11. Where alleged Major Academic Misconduct is identified in paragraph 4.9 or 5.6.3, the Faculty (or relevant department) will establish an Academic Misconduct Panel to consider the case.

Academic Misconduct Procedures

- 5.12. The indicative Panel composition under this Procedure, shall comprise of the following:
- 5.12.1. One Senior Member of academic staff (or nominee) to act as Chair of the Panel,
 - 5.12.2. Two academic members of staff, one of which with relevant subject expertise.
- 5.13. In respect of any Panel that takes place under this Procedure, it is expected that the Panel members will usually be located within the Faculty responsible for the course in question. The Panel members shall not have had any prior involvement in the assessment(s) in question or in raising and/or investigating the suspicion of alleged Academic Misconduct.
- 5.14. A member of the Early Resolution and Case Handling Team (or nominee) will act as a clerk to the Panel.
- 5.15. The Faculty shall notify the student subject to the academic misconduct allegation within 10 working days' of raising the Stage 1 Academic Misconduct allegation report form or a referral from the decision by the Investigating officer pursuant to paragraph 5.6.3.
- 5.16. The Faculty shall notify the student with an invitation letter to attend the Academic Misconduct Panel Hearing in person or via Microsoft (MS) Teams. The student shall be provided with the following:
- 5.16.1. Date, time and location of the Panel.
 - 5.16.2. Names and job titles of the Panel members.
 - 5.16.3. Any witnesses the Chair of the Panel intends to call.
- 5.17. In respect of any Panel that takes place under this Procedure, the student shall be provided with at least 5 working days' notice and shall be provided with the following:
- 5.17.1. The allegation and any relevant evidence that is being considered by the Panel;
 - 5.17.2. The likely sanction that may be applied under Schedule 2 of this Procedure;
 - 5.17.3. Options available to the student to respond to the allegation and the relevant timeframes that should be adhered to, should the student wish to respond to the allegation by way of written representations.
 - 5.17.4. A copy of the Academic Misconduct Procedures.
- 5.18. Where the student does not wish to attend the Panel Hearing, they will be provided with the opportunity to submit written representations for consideration by the Panel. Where the student does not wish to attend the Panel or submit written representations, the Panel may make a decision in the student's

Academic Misconduct Procedures

absence, provided that the Chair of the Panel is satisfied that the student was informed of the date of hearing with the relevant timeframe stated in paragraph 5.17 has been adhered to.

- 5.19. Where the student does not wish to attend the Panel Hearing and submits written representations, this may include, but is not limited to:
- 5.19.1. A statement disputing the allegation, with accompanying evidence they wish to be considered by the Panel.
 - 5.19.2. A statement accepting the allegation and/or
 - 5.19.3. Provision of any additional information or evidence to be considered by the Panel.
- 5.20. The Chair of the Panel can postpone the Panel Hearing on one occasion at the request of the student in exceptional circumstances. This may include:
- 5.20.1. The proposed date and/or time conflicts with a pre-existing exam or assessment requirement.
 - 5.20.2. The proposed date and/or time conflicts with a medical appointment that can be evidenced by the student.
- 5.21. Where a student attends a Panel Hearing, they have the right to be accompanied by a “Friend” should they wish to do so. A “Friend” will normally be a fellow student of the University, a member of the Student’s Union, or a member of staff of the University (or Partner Institution). The student will be responsible for arranging the Friend’s attendance at the Panel Hearing and confirming the details of the “Friend” that they intend to be accompanied by with no less than 2 working days’ notice of the date of the intended Academic Misconduct Panel Hearing.
- 5.22. It is expected that the Friend will not be any person that is involved in the allegation, in identifying the alleged academic misconduct, or a fellow student who is also subject to academic misconduct that may be linked to the allegation that is being investigated.
- 5.23. The Chair of the Panel can refuse the attendance of the “Friend”, should they have reason to believe that paragraph 5.21 and/or paragraph 5.22 applies.
- 5.24. The Chair may permit the “Friend” to speak on behalf of the student subject to the academic misconduct allegation if doing so would assist the Panel Hearing. The student is responsible for arranging the “Friend’s” attendance at the Panel Hearing.
- 5.25. It is not usually permitted to be represented by a legally qualified solicitor or barrister, however the University may allow legal representation at an Academic Misconduct Panel in exceptional

Academic Misconduct Procedures

circumstances, such as where the academic misconduct may result in a sanction that could effect the student's registration at the University, in the interest of fairness or where the consequences for the student may result in a conferred award being revoked retrospectively and/or where it may lead to preventing a student practising in a regulated profession.

- 5.26. The Panel Hearing shall be conducted in accordance with the directions of the Chair of the Panel, who may also determine the order of proceedings. Such directions may include:
 - 5.26.1. Hearing of related allegations relating to two or more students at the same hearing;
 - 5.26.2. Adjourning the hearing to another time or place; and/or
 - 5.26.3. May ask questions of the student and/or witnesses.
- 5.27. The Panel shall deliberate in private, following the Panel Hearing and reach its decision by majority vote. In the event of a split decision, the Chair of the Panel shall have the casting vote if there is no majority decision.
- 5.28. In respect of a Panel convened under this Procedure, once concluded and all evidence has been considered by the Panel members at the Hearing, the Panel shall determine one of the following outcomes:
 - 5.28.1. The allegation is unsubstantiated. i.e. that, based on the evidence available, no academic misconduct has been proven (on the balance of probabilities) to have occurred.
 - 5.28.2. The allegation is substantiated. i.e. that the evidence available demonstrates it is more likely than not that the alleged academic misconduct has occurred and therefore the case has been proven, and one or more of the sanctions set out in Schedule 2 is applied, as appropriate to the case.
- 5.29. A written record of the Panel Hearing will be taken and shared with the student with their Stage 1 Academic Misconduct outcome.
- 5.30. It is expected that Stage 1 of this Procedure will usually take place within 35 working days of a duly completed Stage 1 Allegation of Academic Misconduct Report form.

Academic Misconduct Procedures

First Offence of Academic Misconduct

- 5.31. **Minor Academic Misconduct:** For the purposes of this Procedure, where a first case of Minor academic misconduct is substantiated, the sanction that will be applied will be a Formal Reprimand which will be retained in the student's record for the duration of their course of study.
- 5.32. Where a student subsequently has an allegation of Minor academic misconduct substantiated after application of the Formal Reprimand, they will then be subject to higher sanction as outlined in Schedule 2 appropriate to the relevant misconduct category.
- 5.33. **Moderate or Major Academic Misconduct:** First substantiated cases of academic misconduct that is Moderate or Major will be subject to the sanction(s) outlined in Schedule 2 appropriate to the relevant misconduct category.

Previous Substantiated Academic Misconduct

- 5.34. A previously substantiated case of academic misconduct that has occurred in a previous academic year shall be taken into consideration when determining the appropriate sanction for any future substantiated case when determining the appropriate sanction.
 - 5.34.1. A previous substantiated case of academic misconduct occurring in the same semester or trimester, shall not be considered for the purposes of this Procedure in the application of the sanctions contained in Schedule 2.
- 5.35. It is expected that there is a progressive increase in the potential sanctions applied under this Procedure, that is, the sanction to be applied where there is a previous substantiated case of academic misconduct, will usually be equivalent to, or of a higher level than the most recent substantiated case of academic misconduct.

Mitigating Factors and Reasonable Adjustments

- 5.36. The University will make reasonable adjustments and anticipatory reasonable adjustments to arrangements under this Procedure where a student has disclosed a disability or is in the process of obtaining a diagnosis for a health condition requiring a reasonable adjustment. In such cases, the University shall refer to the Learning Support Plan (LSP) or Interim Learning Support Plan (ILSP) to consider what is reasonable. This may include, but not limited to, varying the mode of attendance at a meeting or Panel Hearing to enable to the student to respond to the academic misconduct allegation.

Academic Misconduct Procedures

5.37. Mitigating factors are not usually considered as a reason for why the academic misconduct took place or as part of a consideration under this Procedure. The University has provisions and resources available to support students experiencing difficulty through the [Exceptional Circumstances Procedure](#), Temporary Learning Agreements (TLA) and Learning Support Plans (LSP). Students are expected to make use of this and/or any other provision available to the student and therefore, mitigating factors will not usually be considered under this Procedure.

6. Stage 2 Academic Misconduct Appeal

- 6.1. A student who has received a substantiated decision and associated sanction under Stage 1 of this Procedure may submit a Stage 2 Academic Misconduct Appeal form if they wish to appeal the outcome and/or the sanction applied.
- 6.2. A Stage 2 Academic Misconduct Appeal can only be made by way of submitting a Stage 2 Academic Misconduct Appeal form.
- 6.3. The Stage 2 Academic Misconduct Appeal form shall be submitted within 10 working days of the date the student was notified of the outcome and/or sanction applied at Stage 1. Where the student submits a Stage 2 Academic Misconduct appeal form outside of the 10 working days timeframe stipulated in this Procedure, it will not usually be considered, and will be deemed invalid unless there is good reason for the delay and is accompanied by supporting evidence for the delay.
- 6.4. A Stage 2 Academic Misconduct appeal may only be made on one or more of the following ground(s):
 - 6.4.1. There has been a demonstrable procedural error or irregularity that occurred resulting in substantial unfairness to the student; and/or
 - 6.4.2. There is new material evidence that could not reasonably have been provided during Stage 1, and which would have had a material influence on the outcome and/or the sanction applied; and/or
 - 6.4.3. The sanction applied is manifestly disproportionate and/or not permitted under the Procedures.
- 6.5. Where a Stage 2 Academic Misconduct Appeal form has been submitted, the case shall be referred to a Head of School (or nominee) for consideration. It is expected that the Head of School (or nominee) will not have had any prior involvement in the case.
- 6.6. The Head of School (or nominee) shall consider the appeal on the basis of the written appeal papers and the information and/or evidence provided by the student.
- 6.7. After considering the Stage 2 Academic Misconduct Appeal, the Head of School (or nominee) may:

Academic Misconduct Procedures

- 6.7.1. Reject the appeal and uphold the original decision and sanction applied; or
 - 6.7.2. Uphold the appeal and provide a new decision and/or sanction; or
 - 6.7.3. Partially uphold the appeal and provide a new decision and/or sanction.
- 6.8. The student can expect to receive their Stage 2 Academic Misconduct Appeal outcome usually within a total of 15 working days of submitting their completed Stage 2 Academic Misconduct Appeal form.
 - 6.9. After receiving their Stage 2 Academic Misconduct Appeal outcome, the student has completed the University's internal procedure and can submit a complaint to the Office of the Independent Adjudicator (OIA) for Higher Education, should they remain dissatisfied with the outcome.
 - 6.10. The University shall endeavour to provide an outcome associated with Stage 1 and Stage 2 within the procedural timeframes contained within this procedure. Where the student is subject to an allegation of academic misconduct and is awaiting a decision either at Stage 1 or Stage 2 of this Procedure, the most recent Board of Examiners decision stands regarding progression decisions.

7. Office of the Independent Adjudicator of Higher Education (OIA)

- 7.1. The Stage 2 Academic Misconduct Appeal outcome represents the final decision of the University. At this point, students have completed the University's internal Procedures, following which, the University will issue a Completion of Procedures (CoP) letter. Details on next steps and submitting a Complaint to the Office of the Independent Adjudicator (OIA) will be provided. A complaint must be submitted to the OIA within 12 months of the date of the Stage 2 Academic Misconduct Appeal outcome.

8. Records, Monitoring and Confidentiality.

- 8.1. The Directorate of Student Resolution and Student Protection monitors academic misconduct cases across the University and Partner institutions to identify trends, undertake preventative work and improvements that may be required.
- 8.2. The University will process information in accordance with the Data Protection Act and UK General Data Protection Regulations (GDPR) 2018. Further information regarding how the University collects, processes and stores personal data can be found in the University's [Student Privacy Policy](#). The Directorate will retain information related to academic misconduct matters in accordance with the [Retention Schedule](#).
- 8.3. Academic misconduct cases and outcomes will be handled with an appropriate level of confidentiality with information only released to those who need to know for the purposes of considering the allegation of academic misconduct and processing and responding to an academic misconduct appeal. No third

Academic Misconduct Procedures

party will be told more than what is considered necessary regarding the circumstances of the allegations and any outcome.

- 8.4. The Senior Management Team (SMT) and relevant University committees such as Academic Board are provided with anonymised data, reports concerning academic misconduct cases considered under this Procedure for purpose of identifying trends, areas of good practice and improvements to processes and practices.

Part 3 – Schedules

Schedule 1: Definitions of Types of Academic Misconduct

This Procedure acknowledges that at the early stages of a student’s academic journey, proficiency in academic writing and/or conventions are still being developed and instances of Poor Academic Practice may occur. Poor Academic Practice is when a student submits any form of assessment that does not properly reference or cite the sources of their research, ideas, data and words used in their assessment.

The table below, is a non-exhaustive list of the types of Academic Misconduct and their definitions. The following are designed to be illustrative examples of academic misconduct:

Type of Academic Misconduct	Definition
Examination Misconduct	Examination Misconduct is when someone acts dishonestly or unfairly before, during, or after an examination or a time-constrained assessment which may result in one student gaining or potentially gaining an unfair advantage over another.
Collusion	Collusion can occur when two or more students collaborate in the production of work, and this is submitted as the efforts of an individual. The assessed work is therefore falsely being presented as the individual’s own work. This can occur knowingly, or unknowingly through negligence by one student sharing their own work with another student, and where one or more of the students then submit similar items of work.
Contract Cheating (also referred to as Commissioning)	Contract cheating (also known as assessment outsourcing, commissioning or ghost writing) occurs when a student(s) seeks out another party (including generative AI) to produce work for the purposes of submitting that work for assessment and it is, either wholly or in part, not the student’s own work.

Academic Misconduct Procedures

	Contract cheating may involve payments made which can either be financial or payments in kind but can also occur without payment.
Duplication (also referred to as Self-Plagiarism)	Duplication (also referred to as self-plagiarism) is the submission of work that has previously been submitted by the student for assessment purposes to the University or another institution. This may involve a significant amount of identical or substantially similar material.
Falsification or Fabrication	Falsification is where someone fabricates, manipulates, invents or distorts data, evidence, sources and/or citations.
Plagiarism	Plagiarism relates to the act of presenting the material, ideas, and/or arguments of another person as one's own in work submitted for assessment without acknowledgement. It is done in a way that may deceive the reader as to the source. Plagiarism can take various forms, including close paraphrasing without citation, and neglecting to cite referenced materials in the bibliography.

Schedule 2: Categories and Sanctions

This schedule provides definitions of each of the main categories (levels) of Academic Misconduct and an indication of the sanction(s) likely to apply.

(H) – denotes a Higher Sanction which can only be applied when considering previous substantiated cases of Academic Misconduct.

Category	Type of Academic Misconduct	Sanction
Minor	<p>Plagiarism including close paraphrasing without the use of citation, neglecting to cite references materials in the bibliography, incomplete or incorrectly cited bibliography.</p> <p>Duplication (also known as self-plagiarism) of an assessed piece of work submitted previously by the student either at the University or another institution.</p>	<p>Formal Reprimand:</p> <p>To be entered against the students record and retained for the duration of their registration on the current course of study. The assessment component is marked on its academic merits.</p>

Academic Misconduct Procedures

	<p>Examination Misconduct by performing any action in an examination room or time-constrained assessment that is prohibited by an invigilator or examiner including:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • making use or attempting to make use of unauthorised items during the examination, • removal of or attempting the removal of an examination script, • receiving or providing help to another student during the examination, • copying or attempting to copy from the script of another student during the examination whether by overlooking their work, asking for information or by other means. 	<p>(H) Failure of the assessment or reassessment attempt in question:</p> <p>Where a student is eligible for reassessment, having failed the attempt in question, the Board may offer this in line with the relevant Regulations.</p>
Moderate	<p>Plagiarism by use of substantial work taken from published material, internet sources or another student's submission without due acknowledgment of the material or the source.</p> <p>Plagiarism by submitting Artificial Generated (AI) generated output, as some or part of an assessment submission and claiming it as the student's own work without appropriate citation or declaration.</p> <p>Collusion by representing work produced in collaboration with another person or persons as the work of a single student.</p>	<p>Failure of the assessment or reassessment attempt in question:</p> <p>Where a student is eligible for reassessment, having failed the attempt in question, the Board may offer this in line with the relevant Regulations.</p> <p>(H) Overall module mark capped at the pass mark for the Level of study.</p> <p>The above sanction would apply in addition to failure of the attempt in question and would be applied only where the student otherwise passes the module.</p>
Major	<p>Examination Misconduct by way of access to, or attempting access to an unseen examination paper, that is</p>	<p>Failure of the module at the attempt in question and, where (re) assessment is then completed</p>

Academic Misconduct Procedures

	<p>considered to be the property of the University, prior to the start of an examination or test.</p> <p>Examination Misconduct by way of impersonating or attempting to impersonate another student or asking another person to impersonate a student, including generative AI to impersonate the student, in any assessment.</p> <p>Examination Misconduct by taking into an examination a pre-written examination script for submission and exchanging it for a blank examination script.</p> <p>Examination Misconduct by way of use of technology, manipulating or interfering with remote proctoring during an examination, including online exams to gain an advantage or attempt to gain an advantage.</p> <p>Contract cheating or commissioning another person to complete an item of university assessment, which is then submitted as a student's own work. This could include the use of professional essay writing services, essay banks, ghost-writing services and generative AI.</p> <p>Falsification or Fabrication of data laboratory work, projects etc. based on work purporting to have been carried out by the student but which has been invented, altered or falsified, including failure to secure appropriate ethical approval in advance of conducting research, an experiment or study.</p>	<p>for the module, the module will be capped at the pass mark.</p> <p>Where a student is eligible for reassessment in the module, having failed the attempt in question, the Board may offer this in line with the relevant Regulations.</p> <p>(H) Reduction of Award and/or Classification:</p> <p>Regardless of the students' overall modules results, they will receive one of the following as appropriate to the circumstances:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • to one of the validated exit awards for the course (or, where appropriate, with institutional credit) • to a lower classification. <p>(H) Expulsion:</p> <p>Recommendation to the Pro-Vice Chancellor (PVC) Education and Student Experience that the student be expelled from the University including consideration about whether an exit award / institutional credits can be awarded.</p>
--	--	---

Academic Misconduct Procedures

Document information	Description of document information
Document title	Academic Misconduct Procedures
Department owner	Directorate of Student Resolution and Student Protection
Document category	<p>Academic - Documents directly affecting research, assessment or teaching within the University.</p> <p>Administrative practice - Documents of an administrative or operational nature.</p> <p>Equality and diversity - Documents relating to the promotion of equality and diversity.</p> <p>Ethics and compliance - Documents concerning appropriate conduct or compliance with legal or regulatory requirements and safety of staff, students and visitors.</p> <p>Information Technology - Documents relating to IT systems, data, and related issues.</p> <p>Students - documents directly affecting student life at the University.</p>
Document owner	Deputy Vice Chancellor
Document manager	Head of Early Resolution and Case Handling
Related University policies	<p>Regulations and Credit Framework</p> <p>Regulations for Taught Awards</p> <p>Regulations for Research Awards</p> <p>Academic Integrity Policy</p> <p>Marking Procedures</p> <p>Research and Enterprise Integrity Framework, (includes the Research and Enterprise Misconduct Policy).</p>
Related University procedures	<p>Exceptional Circumstances Procedure</p> <p>Low Level Concerns and Fitness to Practise Procedure</p> <p>Professional Suitability Procedure</p> <p>Temporary Learning Agreement (TLA) Procedure</p>

Academic Misconduct Procedures

Document information	Description of document information
Approved by	Education and Student Experience Committee (ESEC).
Date approved	17 July 2024
Date of commencement	1 August 2024
Review date	31 July 2026
Version	Version 4.0
History of revisions of the document	Version 1.0 – 28 June 2021 Version 2.0 – 19 July 2021 Version 3.0 – 4 August 2023
Web address	Staff - https://cccu.canterbury.ac.uk/Student-Resolution-and-Student-Protection/Student-Resolution-and-Student-Protection.aspx Students - https://www.canterbury.ac.uk/our-students/ug-current/academic-services/assessments/plagiarism