

# ITALIA CONTI

## Academic Misconduct Policy

Version	2526-2.0
Prepared by:	Head of Quality Assurance
Reviewed by:	Policy Steering Group
Approved by:	Policy Steering Group
Approval Date:	26 <sup>th</sup> May 2026
Next review due:	31 <sup>st</sup> August 2027

The Head of Quality Assurance owns this policy.

The Principal / Chair of Academic Quality Board, is accountable for academic assurance of its operation.

The Policy Steering Group reviews policy governance and may make recommendations to the Academic Quality Board. AQB approves this policy and monitors case themes, risks and improvement actions. Material academic standards, student interests or regulatory risks are escalated through AQB, SLT and Board reporting routes as appropriate.

## Contents

1. Policy Statement.....	3
2. Summary .....	3
3. Scope.....	3
4. Policy Aims .....	4
5. Definition of Academic Misconduct.....	5
6. Examples of academic misconduct .....	5
7. Plagiarism.....	6
8. Policy implementation and Preventative Measures .....	6
9. Investigation of Allegations .....	7
10. Academic Misconduct Hearing .....	8
11. Outcomes of the Academic Misconduct Hearing: .....	9
12 Criteria for determining the penalty for academic misconduct:.....	9
13 Appealing the decision of the Academic Misconduct Hearing .....	10
14 The Appeals Panel:.....	11
15. Final Stage and External Review.....	12
16. Recording and Monitoring .....	13
Appendix 1: Examples of academic misconduct (by Students):.....	14
Appendix 2: Examples of academic misconduct (by staff): .....	17
Appendix 3: Plagiarism .....	18
Appendix 4: Academic Misconduct Hearing Process Timelines .....	21

## 1. Policy Statement

- 1.1 Italia Conti is committed to maintaining the highest standards of academic integrity across all areas of teaching, learning and assessment. All members of our learning community are expected to understand and uphold the principles of academic honesty and good academic practice.
- 1.2 Italia Conti is determined to ensure that students are supported in understanding what constitutes appropriate academic practice and how to avoid academic misconduct. Any breaches of academic integrity will be treated seriously, and appropriate action will be taken to protect academic standards and the integrity of qualifications.
- 1.3 Italia Conti will take firm action against any student who breaches the regulations set out in this Policy. All students are responsible for ensuring that every element of their studies is their own work and that they are following the regulations for the proper conduct of assessments. No credit will be awarded for work which is found to have breached these Academic Misconduct Regulations.
- 1.4 The Academic Misconduct Policy operates in conjunction with the Italia Conti AI Policy to ensure that the use of artificial intelligence supports learning while maintaining academic integrity.

## 2. Summary

This policy explains:

- what academic misconduct is
- how allegations are investigated
- how decisions are made
- what penalties may apply
- how students can respond and appeal decisions

## 3. Scope

- 3.1 This policy and its associated procedures apply to all students (individually and collectively) registered on programmes delivered by Italia Conti, irrespective of awarding body. Where students are enrolled on programmes validated or awarded by partner institutions, the relevant awarding body regulations will also apply. Where an allegation of academic misconduct is made after a student has completed their programme, this policy will continue to apply, and appropriate action may be taken in relation to the graduate.

- 3.2 Students on Higher Education (HE) programmes are subject to the academic misconduct policies of their awarding body. Italia Conti ensures that students are informed of these requirements and are supported in understanding and navigating the relevant procedures.
- 3.3 For students studying with the University of East London (UEL), allegations of academic misconduct will normally be initially considered and managed by Italia Conti in accordance with institutional procedures, before being referred to UEL where required. These processes operate alongside the UEL Academic Integrity and Academic Misconduct Policy, which students should also refer to.
- 3.4 For students studying with the University of Chichester (UoC), allegations of academic misconduct will normally be initially considered by Italia Conti in accordance with institutional procedures, before being referred to the UoC academic malpractice procedure. These processes operate alongside the UoC Academic Regulations (Section 8E: Academic Malpractice), which students should also refer to.
- 3.5 These policies clarify the expectations for academic good practice and academic integrity for students registered on a course delivered by Italia Conti in conjunction with the respective partner university and outline the academic misconduct procedures that apply to students who have a suspected case of academic misconduct. Italia Conti will support students in understanding and navigating both processes.
- 3.6 Italia Conti ensures that
- students are informed of the relevant partner university policies
  - students are supported in understanding expectations and procedures
  - students are supported in navigating the relevant processes
- 3.7 While processes may differ depending on awarding body, Italia Conti ensures that all students have equitable access to fair and transparent procedures.

## 4. Policy Aims

The aims of this policy are to:

- identify and minimise the risk of academic misconduct by Students or staff.
- promote good academic practice and integrity
- provide clear procedures for investigation and decision-making
- ensure that allegations are managed fairly, consistently and transparently
- to apply appropriate and proportionate penalties where misconduct is proven
- to protect the integrity of qualifications and the interests of students

This policy forms part of Italia Conti's quality assurance framework and supports the maintenance of academic standards.

## 5. Definition of Academic Misconduct

5.1 For the purpose of this policy, the term "academic misconduct" is defined as "any action(s) or attempted action on the part of a student which leads to an unfair advantage over others or undermines the integrity of academic processes."

5.2 The use of any form of unfair or dishonest practice in assessment can be considered potential misconduct.

5.3 Academic misconduct may occur in any context where a student seeks to gain an advantage through dishonest or inappropriate means.

5.4 Although academic misconduct is frequently associated with assessments and the awarding of grades, for the purpose of this policy, it can also refer to any **activity** where the Student is planning to, or has obtained, an unfair advantage over others.

5.5 The use of Artificial Intelligence (AI) tools is governed by the Italia Conti AI Policy. AI-assisted work that complies with module guidance and is appropriately acknowledged does not constitute academic misconduct.

5.6 **Unauthorised use of AI** refers to any use that is not explicitly permitted within module or programme guidance or that breaches Italia Conti's AI Policy, including use that misrepresents authorship or compromises academic integrity.

## 6. Examples of academic misconduct

Examples include (but are not limited to):

- plagiarism
- duplication of material (self-plagiarism)
- use of unauthorised materials
- unauthorised or inappropriate use of Artificial Intelligence (AI) or other digital tools, including use that is not explicitly permitted, not appropriately acknowledged, or which misrepresents authorship
- collusion
- contract cheating or use of third-party services
- falsification of data or evidence
- impersonation
- failure to obtain Ethical/Research Approval where required

- misconduct in assessments
- attempting to influence a member of staff

Further examples and detail are provided in the appendices:

**Appendix 1** provides examples of academic misconduct by Students (please note that these examples are not exhaustive).

**Appendix 2** provides examples of academic misconduct by staff (please note that these examples are not exhaustive).

The examples above should be read in conjunction with the Italia Conti AI Policy, which defines appropriate and authorised use of AI tools. Misconduct arises where AI is used in ways that breach those requirements.

## 7. Plagiarism

Poor academic practice will normally be addressed through marking, feedback and academic support unless the evidence indicates academic misconduct. Where plagiarism is suspected, Italia Conti will consider the nature and extent of the issue, the student's level and prior guidance, any previous history, and whether the conduct appears to be accidental, reckless or deliberate when deciding the appropriate route and penalty.

**Appendix 3** provides examples of **plagiarism** (please note that these examples are not exhaustive).

## 8. Policy implementation and Preventative Measures

Italia Conti will take the following steps to minimise the risk of academic misconduct, including

- providing an appropriate induction on academic integrity
- explaining referencing and citation requirements, including informing Students of the appropriate formats for acknowledging primary and secondary research in their work so that plagiarism can be avoided;
- clarifying expectations for assessments,
- using detection tools such as Turnitin™ where appropriate
- requiring students to confirm that submitted work is their own
- clarifying the penalties for actual and attempted incidents of academic misconduct;

Guidance on the appropriate use of AI in learning and assessment will be provided at programme and module level. Students are expected to follow this guidance, which determines whether and how AI tools may be used.

Students are encouraged to retain evidence of their research and working process.

## 9. Investigation of Allegations

9.1 The procedures for considering allegations of academic misconduct consist of the following stages, as necessary:

- a) An informal investigation stage, which seeks to establish if there is a case to be considered. At this stage, where required, the matter will be referred to the relevant awarding body and will be considered in accordance with both Italia Conti's procedures and those of the awarding body.
  - For HE students, the Head of Quality Assurance and Academic Partnership Liaison will confirm at the outset whether the matter must be managed under the relevant awarding body procedure, Italia Conti's procedure, or both. The decision and rationale will be recorded. Where the awarding body procedure determines the outcome or penalty, Italia Conti will support the student and provide evidence to the awarding body, but will not substitute its own decision for the awarding body's decision.
- b) A formal review stage
- c) An Academic Misconduct Panel
- d) An appeal stage

### Initial (Informal) Investigation Stage

9.2 Where academic conduct has been suspected or alleged, Italia Conti will initiate a preliminary **investigation**. This will involve an initial investigation, undertaken by the relevant tutor (usually a marker or a module leader).

9.3 Where allegations involve the use of AI, consideration will be given to whether such use was authorised, appropriately disclosed, and consistent with institutional guidance and the AI Policy.

9.4 Similarity reports, AI-detection outputs or other digital indicators may be used as part of the evidence base but will not, on their own, determine that academic misconduct has occurred. The decision-maker must consider the assessment brief, permitted use guidance, declaration, authorship evidence, working process evidence and the student's response before reaching a finding.

9.5 For HE students, the Head of Quality Assurance and Academic Partnership Liaison will confirm at the outset whether the matter must be managed under the relevant awarding body procedure, Italia Conti's procedure, or both. The decision and rationale will be recorded. Where the awarding body procedure determines the outcome or

penalty, Italia Conti will support the student and provide evidence to the awarding body, but will not substitute its own decision for the awarding body's decision. This may include:

- No further action
- whether academic misconduct has taken place (on the balance of probabilities);
- any penalties (which might include resubmission of the relevant work; reduction of marks, etc).
- referral to an Academic Misconduct Hearing either at Italia Conti or at the relevant partner university.

9.6 The Course Leader will inform student(s) and staff of the outcome of the initial investigation in writing. The overall initial investigation process should take no more than 15 working days.

### **Formal Review Stage**

9.7 If the Course Leader determines that academic misconduct has taken place, the Student(s) will be informed in writing in a timely manner and informed of the next steps, as appropriate. This may be an appropriate penalty<sup>1</sup>, or the matter may be referred to an Academic Misconduct Panel, either at Italia Conti or at the relevant partner university.

9.8 The Student will be given 5 working days to respond to the decision.

9.9 All stages of the process will be documented.

## **10. Academic Misconduct Hearing**

10.1 Where a case is contested, or requires a formal review, an Academic Misconduct Hearing will be convened. This will be scheduled to take place no more than 20 working days after the initial 5 working day period. The **invitation** should include details of the alleged misconduct and the proposed penalty. *Note: if the partner university has its own procedures for investigating and determining the scope of penalties, these procedures will be followed instead).*

10.2 The Student is required to provide any additional statements or evidence **10 working days before** the date of the Academic Misconduct Hearing.

10.3 All paperwork which the Academic Misconduct Hearing will consider should be circulated to the members of the panel **5 working days** before the date of the hearing.

---

<sup>1</sup> The penalty might be determined by the regulations of the awarding body for the learner's course of study.

## Composition of the Hearing Panel

10.4 The **Academic Misconduct Hearing Panel** will consist of the following:

- a) A Chair;
- b) the student<sup>2</sup>;
- c) three (3) senior members of staff with no prior involvement;
- d) an official minute taker;
- e) a supporting person (if the student wishes to have someone supporting them, this can be a relative, friend, colleague. It **cannot** be a professional legal representative who has been employed to act on the Student's behalf, nor can they act in the capacity of a legal advisor; the accompanying person can comment, assist and help to present evidence but cannot answer questions on the student's behalf).;

*Note: The Chair of the meeting can demand that the accompanying person be removed from the meeting if their behaviour is deemed inappropriate.*

10.4 The hearing will determine:

- the facts of the case;
- whether academic misconduct has been proven (on the balance of probabilities);
- any penalties (which might include resubmission of the relevant work; reduction of marks, etc).

## 11. Outcomes of the Academic Misconduct Hearing:

11.1 The outcome of the Hearing shall be determined by a majority vote of the three (3) senior members of the teaching staff in attendance whether academic misconduct has been proven/not proven. The decision should be communicated to the Student within 10 working days of the hearing.

11.2 Should it be determined that Italia Conti member(s) of staff have been involved academic misconduct, staff member(s) should be referred to the Human Resources Department so that the appropriate investigation and measures can be taken.

11.3 Where staff conduct may affect assessment integrity, marks, awards, student outcomes or partner requirements, the matter will also be escalated to the Principal and Head of Quality Assurance for academic assurance. The Principal will determine, with the Head of Quality Assurance, whether AQB, the relevant Assessment Board, the awarding body, SLT or the Board require notification or action. HR processes will

---

<sup>2</sup> \* If, without good reason, the learner does not attend after having received clear notice of the hearing, the Chair may decide to proceed in their absence, adjourn, or accept written representations. The Panel must decide the case on the evidence available and must not treat non-attendance as acceptance of the allegation or proposed penalty. Where non-attendance is supported by evidence of illness, bereavement, disability-related need or another valid reason, the Chair will normally adjourn or make reasonable alternative arrangements.

not replace the academic standards, student interest or awarding body assurance route.

## 12 Criteria for determining the penalty for academic misconduct:

### 12.1 Outcomes may include:

- no case to answer
- requirement to resubmit work
- reduction of marks
- failure of an assessment or module
- other proportionate penalties

### 12.2 Any penalty imposed must be **reasonable** and **proportionate**. Penalties will be

- consistent with awarding body regulations
- reasonable and proportionate
- informed by factors such as:
  - seriousness of the offence
  - intent
  - previous history
  - impact on other students

### 12.3 Where prescribed penalties are not provided by the relevant awarding body, the following factors will be considered when determining the penalty to be imposed:

- **premeditation:** if the act of academic dishonesty was deliberate or intended, then the penalty will normally be greater.
- **previous history:** where the Student has committed previous acts of academic misconduct, then the penalty imposed will normally be more serious.
- **work purchased from third parties, falsification or theft of work:** where the Student has used third parties (essay websites) or has stolen or falsified work, this will be regarded as a more serious example of academic dishonesty than using the authorised, but unattributed, use of another person's work. This will lead to a more serious penalty.
- **effect on other Students:** where the Student's academic misconduct has an adverse effect on other Students, this will be regarded as more serious than an act which only affects the Student.

- **other factors:** the academic misconduct hearing can take into account miscellaneous other factors as well when determining the level of penalty.

## 13 Appealing the decision of the Academic Misconduct Hearing

13.1 An appeal is **not** a rehearing of the case.

13.2 There can be no appeal made against the decision of an academic misconduct hearing **except** on the following grounds:

- a) there is **new and relevant evidence which was not previously available**, and which the student was for exceptional reasons unable to present to the Academic Misconduct Hearing. This may include evidence for extenuation;
- b) **procedural irregularity**, i.e. the procedures were not complied with to the extent that it was questionable whether the outcome would have been different had the procedures been complied with;
- c) there is documented **evidence of bias or unfair treatment** on the part of the members of staff involved in the Academic Misconduct Hearing process;
- d) **disproportionate penalty**, i.e. the penalty imposed exceeded that available to the Academic Misconduct Hearing, i.e., that they were not reasonable or proportionate.

13.3 Any Student wishing to appeal a decision of the Academic Misconduct Hearing must do so within 20 working days of having received the decision.

13.4 The Student should make a written request for an appeal to the Chair of the original Academic Misconduct Hearing. The request should be considered with a response provided within 10 working days.

13.5 Providing that there is a legitimate ground for appeal, the Appeals Panel will be convened as quickly as practically possible; this should not normally be longer than one calendar month after the first decision.

## 14 The Appeals Panel:

14.1 The Appeals Panel should consist of the following members convened by the Course Leader:

- a) A Chair;

- b) the student<sup>3</sup>;
- c) three (3) senior members of staff with no prior involvement;
- d) an official minute taker;
- e) a supporting person (if the student wishes to have someone supporting them, this can be a relative, friend, colleague. It **cannot** be a professional legal representative who has been employed to act on the Student's behalf, nor can they act in the capacity of a legal advisor; the accompanying person can comment, assist and help to present evidence but cannot answer questions on the student's behalf).;  
*Note: The Chair of the meeting can demand that the accompanying person be removed from the meeting if their behaviour is deemed inappropriate.*

14.2 The Appeals Panel shall have the power to:

- i. uphold the original decision;
- ii. reduce the penalty;
- iii. uphold the appeal and overturn a decision to impose a penalty.

The Appeals Panel cannot impose a more severe penalty;

14.3 The A Student can elect not to appear in person before the Appeals Panel. In such cases the Appeals Panel will decide the appeal on the basis of written submissions. If, however, a written submission is not clear, the Appeals Panel will arrive at a decision on the basis of the evidence available to it.

14.4 The Appeals Panel, having regard to all of the written and oral evidence provided, will decide whether the decision being appealed was fair, reasonable and proportionate.

14.5 In the event of the Appeals Panel not being able to reach a unanimous decision, there will be a majority conclusion.

14.6 The following timelines apply to an Academic Misconduct Appeals Hearing:

- Parties concerned to be notified in writing a minimum of 14 working days before the Academic Misconduct Hearing.
- Submissions to the Appeals Panel by the Student should be no more than 10 working days before the Appeals Panel.
- All paperwork which will be considered by the Appeals Panel to be circulated to attendees 5 working days before.

---

<sup>3</sup> \*If, without good reason, the learner fails to attend the Academic Misconduct Hearing, they will be deemed to have accepted the proposed penalty (and will be notified of this in writing). If there are deemed to be valid reasons for non-attendance, e.g. medical grounds, bereavement, etc, which can be supported by the relevant documentation, the Academic Misconduct Hearing shall be adjourned to a later date. This new date shall be determined by the Chair of the Academic Misconduct Hearing.

- The decision of the Appeals Panel shall be communicated to the Student within 10 working days of the hearing and will be reported as required to the relevant Awarding Body.

The decision of the Appeals Panel will be final and there shall be no further right of appeal to Italia Conti.

## **15. Final Stage and External Review**

15.1 If a student has exhausted the relevant internal procedures, a Completion of Procedures Letter will be issued by the appropriate institution.

15.2 For students on Higher Education programmes, this will be issued by the awarding university in accordance with their procedures.

15.3 If the student is not satisfied with the outcome, they may request an independent review by the Office of the Independent Adjudicator (OIA).

15.4 For Further Education provision, the decision of the Appeals Panel is final within Italia Conti, with escalation routes available through awarding bodies where applicable.

15.5 The OIA provides an independent scheme for the review of student complaints about higher education providers. Eligibility, time limits and grounds for review are determined by the OIA Scheme Rules.

## **16. Recording and Monitoring**

Records of academic misconduct cases will be maintained by Quality Assurance in line with data protection, retention and awarding body requirements. Case data will be reviewed at least termly through AQB and used to identify themes, risks, consistency of penalties, partner referrals, appeal outcomes, completion timescales and required improvement actions. AQB will receive an annual summary and escalate material risks relating to academic standards, assessment integrity, student interests, equality themes, partner requirements or OfS compliance through SLT and Board reporting routes as appropriate.

## Appendix 1: Examples of academic misconduct (by Students):

### i) Assessments:

Common examples\* of academic misconduct in assessments include:

- failing to comply with the rules or regulations of the assessment;
- failing to cooperate with the staff who are supervising the practical assessment;
- taking into the practical assessment room materials or devices which are not permitted (regardless of whether they are used in providing an answer to the exam question);
- refusing to surrender on the invigilator's request any materials or devices;
- copying the work of another I assessment candidate;
- trying to obtain or obtaining question(s) prior to the assessment;
- disrupting the practical assessment;
- offering an inducement to the staff who are connected to the assessment;
- impersonating or attempting to impersonate another candidate or being knowingly impersonated;
- Communicating with other students during a timed assessment, unless clearly stated as collaborative or group work;
- Using generative artificial intelligence software in a manner that is not explicitly permitted, not appropriately acknowledged, or which misrepresents the student as the sole author of the work.

### ii) Coursework and assessments:

Common examples\* of academic misconduct in coursework and assessment activities include:

- submitting another person's work as the Student's own: the work is used without permission and/or appropriate referencing. (Note: the work submitted can be in any medium, e.g. written, visual or aural);
- paraphrasing the work of others, copying and pasting sections of text electronically or in hard copy format, or reusing previously submitted work (which may be the Student's own or the work of others) without acknowledging the source. (Note: Students should not normally resubmit work which has been previously submitted for a different assessment);
- **Collusion:** when work that has been created together is submitted as a person's own work, or one person shares their work with others who submit part or all of it as their own work.
- **Contract Cheating:** submitting work that has been purchased or otherwise obtained from others, including online services such as "essay writing", or using agents or intermediaries to obtain such work;

# ITALIA CONTI

---

- **Self-plagiarism:** Including in your own work material whether written, visual or oral without giving suitable acknowledgement to its creator and/or author including in your own work material whether written, visual or oral without giving suitable acknowledgement to its creator and/or author. entering into an arrangement where the work of one Student is submitted as another's;
- copying and pasting work into an assignment without acknowledging the source;
- for work not intended to be submitted as a collaborative assignment: producing work with one or more other students, using study practices that mean the submitted work is nearly identical, overall or in part, to that of other students.
- Attempts to circumvent the similarity-checking programmes that Italia Conti uses (including the use of spinning websites to rephrase text).

## **Other types of unfair practice**

- offering an inducement (which can take a number of forms) to staff involved with the assessment.
- Falsifying data and references in any assessment.
- Work placement fraud.

## **iii) General Examples:**

Common examples\* of academic misconduct which can occur at any point of the teaching and learning process include:

- plagiarism of any type, including self-plagiarism
- unauthorised or inappropriate use of generative AI tools
- copying (including the use of ICT or other technology to aid copying);
- colluding with others to produce work that is submitted as an individual Student's work;
- falsifying results;
- falsifying results evidence support activities;
- making a false declaration that the work the Student's own;
- impersonating another Student or arranging for someone else take the Students place in an assessment.

\*These lists are not exhaustive and other examples of academic misconduct can be considered by Italia Conti at its discretion.

## **Academic poor practice**

## ITALIA CONTI

---

Academic poor practice is work that the student has produced which is poorly referenced or incorrectly referenced resulting from misunderstanding or lack of confidence using academic conventions. Examples include (but are not limited to):

- Incomplete or incorrect citations.
- An attempt to show that the content/concepts were not the student's own.
- 1 or 2 sentences of direct copying without acknowledging the source.
- Over-reliance on references and sources.
- Inappropriate paraphrasing– which does not include the following:

(i) If a passage of text replicates a published source with only a few words having been altered, this will be treated as if the entire passage of text had been copied and is therefore Academic Misconduct, not poor academic practice.

(ii) If a substantial portion of the text mirrors the structure of a published source, with alterations to the wording but maintenance of the detailed sequence of information, this will be treated as not being the original work of the student practice.

Work that falls into the category of poor academic practice will normally be dealt with as part of the marking and feedback process and not through the academic misconduct process.

## **Appendix 2: Examples of academic misconduct (by staff):**

Common examples\* of academic misconduct by staff can include:

- providing improper assistance to Students;
- changing or inventing marks for coursework or portfolio(s) of evidence;
- recording assessment marks where there is insufficient and/or inadequate evidence to support the award;
- failing to keep coursework, portfolio or other types of assessment evidence secure and safe;
- claiming certificates fraudulently;
- retaining certificates without authority;
- improperly providing assistance to Students in assessment activities;
- falsifying witness statements;
- allowing work for assessment purposes to be submitted where the staff member knows it is not authentic;
- allowing or facilitating impersonation of Students;
- allowing the misuse of reasonable adjustments for assessment candidates;
- falsifying assessment records on certification claims;

\*These lists are not exhaustive and other examples of academic misconduct can be considered by Italia Conti at its discretion.

## Appendix 3: Plagiarism

### PLAGIARISM – A GUIDANCE NOTE FOR STUDENTS

#### 1) Definition of Plagiarism

In line with our academic partners, Italia Conti defines plagiarism and other academic malpractice as cheating, which is defined to “trick, defraud, deceive” (OED).

Plagiarism is to ‘take and use another person’s thoughts, writings, inventions as one’s own’ (OED). It involves the submission of material (written, visual or oral), originally produced by another person or persons or oneself, without due acknowledgement\*, so that the work could be assumed to be the student’s own. This includes incorporation of significant extracts or elements taken from the work of (an)other(s) or oneself, without acknowledgement or reference\*, and the submission of work produced in collaboration for an assignment based on the assessment of individual work. Such misconduct is typically described as plagiarism and collusion.

To avoid potential misunderstanding, any phrase that is not the student’s own or is submitted by the student for a different assessment should normally be in quotation marks or highlighted in some other way. It should also be noted that the incorporation of significant elements of (an) other(s) work or of one’s own work submitted for a different assessment, even with acknowledgement or reference, is unacceptable academic practice and will normally result in failure of that item or stage of assessment.

#### 2) Plagiarism in Greater Detail

Work that you submit for assessment will inevitably build upon ideas that you have read about or have learnt about in lectures. That is perfectly acceptable, provided that sources are appropriately acknowledged. It should be noted, however, that the wholesale reproduction of the ideas and words of others, however well referenced, is likely to lead to failure at assessment (see section 6 below).

The submission of work that borrows ideas, words, diagrams, or anything else from another source (or sources), without appropriate acknowledgement, constitutes plagiarism. Plagiarism is not limited to unattributed cutting-and-pasting; it includes the reproduction, without acknowledgement, of someone else’s work, taken from a published (or unpublished) article, a book, a website, a friend’s (or anybody else’s) assignment, or any other source.

When an assignment or report uses information from other sources, you must carefully acknowledge exactly what, where and how s/he has used them. If someone else’s words are used, they must be within quotation marks, and a reference must follow the quotation.

Where a concept or argument in another source is paraphrased (rather than directly quoted), quotations marks should not be used, but it will still be necessary to acknowledge the source.

Remember, however, that the making of simple changes to the wording of a source, while retaining the broad structure, organisation, content and/or phraseology of the source, is unacceptable academic practice and will probably be regarded as plagiarism. (For helpful tips on how to avoid plagiarism, see *The Study Skills Handbook* by Dr Stella Cottrell, pages 122-125.)

### 3) Collusion

Collusion is the term used to describe any form of joint effort intended to deceive an assessor as to who was actually responsible for producing the material submitted for assessment. Clearly, students are encouraged to discuss assignments with your peers, but you must always ensure that, where an individual assignment is specified, the report/essay submitted is entirely your own. You should, therefore, never lend work (in hard or electronic copy) to friends. If that work is subsequently plagiarised by a “friend”, an act of friendship might lead to a charge of collusion.

### 4) When to Reference

Our regulations do not distinguish between deliberate and accidental plagiarism, but you will not be accused of plagiarism, provided that you properly reference everything in your work that was said, written, drawn, or otherwise created by somebody else.

#### **You need to provide a reference:**

- when you are using or referring to somebody else's words or ideas from an article, book, newspaper, TV course, film, web page, letter or any other medium.
- when you use information gained from an exchange of correspondence or emails with another person or through an interview or in conversation.
- when you copy the exact words or a unique phrase from somewhere.
- when you reprint any diagrams, illustrations, or photographs.

#### **You do not need to reference:**

- when you are writing of your own experience, your own observations, your own thoughts, or insights or offering your own conclusions on a subject.
- when you are using what is judged to be common knowledge (common sense observations, shared information within your subject area, generally accepted facts etc.) As a test of this, material is probably common knowledge if:
  - you find the same information undocumented in other sources;
  - it is information you expect your readers to be familiar with.
  - the information could be easily found in general reference sources.

### 5) How to Reference

Our university has agreed on a single version of the Harvard referencing system (the School of Psychology uses the American Psychological Association (APA) referencing style) and this

(along with APA) can be found in Pears, R. and Shields, G (2008) *Cite Them Right*. Newcastle: Pear Tree Press

## **6) Plagiarism, or Unacceptable Academic Practice**

If work that you submit for assessment includes substantial and significant elements of other sources and all of those sources are appropriately acknowledged, you will not have plagiarised, but you will be culpable of unacceptable academic practice, because there will be too little of your “own voice” to allow your knowledge to be assessed.

Work that you submit for assessment must:

- use your own words.
- provide a critical commentary on existing literature.
- aim for novelty and originality.
- demonstrate your understanding of the subject area by paraphrasing.

Work that does not meet those criteria will fail.

## Appendix 4: Academic Misconduct Hearing Process Timelines

<b>Investigation Process:</b>	
(i) Relevant module/unit tutor investigates the alleged academic misconduct.	To be undertaken in a reasonable time.
(ii) Module/unit tutor submits a concise report to the Course Leader.	To be undertaken in a reasonable time.
(iii) Course Leader reviews evidence.	To be undertaken in a reasonable time.
(iv) Course Leader believes academic misconduct has taken place. Student(s) and relevant staff are notified of this decision.	Maximum 5 working days for Student(s) to respond to decision.
(v) If Student(s) do not accept they have committed academic misconduct they must make a formal submission to this effect stating the reasons/grounds. This should be submitted to the Course Leader.	Maximum 3 working days for Students to be notified that their submission has not been accepted, and that an Academic Misconduct Hearing will take place.
(vi) Parties concerned to be notified in writing of the date of the Academic Misconduct Meeting Hearing, and the proposed penalties.	No more than 20 working days after the end of the Student's 5-working-day response period, unless partner university procedures apply or an extension is recorded with reasons.
(vii) Student submits any additional evidence/paperwork to support their case to the Academic Misconduct Hearing.	10 working days <b>before</b> the date of the Academic Misconduct Hearing.
(viii) All paperwork to be considered by the Academic Misconduct Hearing to be circulated to Hearing attendees.	5 working days <b>before</b> the date of the Academic Misconduct Hearing.

## ITALIA CONTI

<b>Academic Misconduct Hearing:</b>	
(i) Decision of Academic Misconduct Hearing to be communicated to all parties.	Maximum of 10 working days after the Academic Misconduct Hearing.
(ii) Student can appeal the decision.	Parties concerned will be notified in writing of the date of the Appeals Panel hearing and the scope of the appeal.
(iii) Student informed whether their request for an appeal to be heard is successful.	Maximum of 10 working days after the Student's written request appeal has been received.
<b>Appeals Panel:</b>	
(i) Appeals Panel should normally convene.	Not normally* more than one calendar month of the original Academic Misconduct Hearing.  *This period may be extended depending on the operational commitments of the Appeals Panel members.
(ii) Parties concerned to be notified in writing of the date of the Academic Misconduct Meeting Hearing, and the proposed penalties.	Minimum 28 days <b>before</b> the date of the Academic Misconduct Hearing.
(iii) Student submits any additional evidence/paperwork to support their case to the Academic Misconduct Hearing	10 working days <b>before</b> the date of the Academic Misconduct Hearing.
(iv) All paperwork to be considered by the Academic Misconduct Hearing to be circulated to Hearing attendees.	5 working days <b>before</b> the date of the Academic Misconduct Hearing.
(v) Decision of Appeals Panel to be communicated to all parties.	Maximum of 10 working days after the Academic Misconduct Hearing.

# ITALIA CONTI

---

## Update log

26/5/26	Policy overall reviewed and updated for clarity, all links checked.  Reviewed for:  HE clarity and parity, consistency of terminology, referrals across to partner university systems and processes, student accessibility, consistency of structure and tone, regulatory precision (OIA, partner provision), supporting alignment with OfS conditions B2 and B4 and with relevant OIA good practice for academic disciplinary procedures. Condition E6 is only relevant where an academic misconduct case also involves harassment or sexual misconduct.
26/5/26	Timelines for investigation and appeals processes updated to be in line with other Italia Conti processes.

**END**