

## Appendix 1: Examples of Offences<sup>1</sup>

---

1. These groups of typical offences are in ranked order and are intended to be followed normally by default, broadly matching the three ranges of penalties (see Appendix 2).
2. However, where the evidence exists, an alternative categorisation of an offence may be considered appropriate in the particular circumstances.

### Group 1 Minor or Technical Misconduct

3. This is essentially poor academic practice, which the initial training and test is designed to help eliminate, particularly in the early stages of a student's study career in the University. For this reason, further support to ensure clear understanding of the rules of good academic writing practice should always be offered where appropriate.
4. Typical instances would include where there is a very small and/or relatively insignificant case of:
  - poor referencing
  - incorrect (or an absence of) attribution for copied work inserted in an assignment
  - a small amount of work copied from another student
  - paraphrasing without adequate attribution.
5. The following case would not normally be considered Minor or Technical:
  - where the circumstances suggest that the student did intend to obtain unfair advantage.

### Group 2 'Moderate' Academic Misconduct

6. This heading covers misconduct which would, had it remained undetected, have resulted in the student's dishonesty misleading the assessor or others involved in setting or reviewing assessments and results.
7. The volume and significance of the unacceptable elements in the submission are key factors - but not necessarily the only factors in determining the level of the offence.
8. Examples would be an assignment that contains:
  - text, laboratory results, reported research etc. identical or with significant similarities to that of another student, whether the other student is aware, or not, of the copying (except for instance, where identical or very similar presentation of results such as in a complex table or graphic derived from the group's activity, is explicitly permitted in a group assignment brief)
  - ideas or concepts which appear to originate from the student but are in fact the work of others, e.g. are not fully referenced, cited or otherwise acknowledged, as required
  - text that is inappropriately paraphrased or directly quoted without speech marks and is not referenced
  - identical or closely related text and ideas to another assignment previously submitted by the student for which marks or credit have already been given and will

---

<sup>1</sup> Acknowledgement is made of the Codes of Practice/Regulations of the following institutions which were consulted in drawing together the relative ranking of these offences:

Aston University	Birkbeck College	University of Bristol	University of East London
University of Exeter	Imperial College	University of Keele	Loughborough University
Southampton University			

Report from [Plagiarismadvice.org](http://Plagiarismadvice.org) on HEIs views of importance and relative ranking of offences and appropriate penalties (Benchmark Plagiarism Tariff, P Tennant, G Rowell, 2009-2010).

contribute to the marks record for the student – but which the student fails to acknowledge to the assessor as previously submitted and assessed ideas/work

or

- a minor infringement of the examination rules as set out in [QA28 Conduct of Examinations](#) and University [Rule 2](#).

### Group 3: Severe Academic Misconduct

9. This heading includes second offences of academic misconduct or those involving evidence of extensive plagiarism or cheating, or clear evidence of intent to deceive or gain substantial advantage. **Cheating in examinations will almost always fall in this category** (see [QA28 Conduct of Examinations](#), University [Rule 2 and the Academic Integrity Statement for Remote Assessments](#)).

10. Typically (but not exhaustively):

- having or using any form of unauthorised reference material or device during an examination
- having or using any form of unauthorised communication during an examination submission window,
  - this includes face to face and electronic communications via email, messages, texts or other means, about assessment content during the submission window and as inadvertence is not accepted as mitigation, this can include receiving as well as sending unauthorised communications
- impersonating another person or being impersonated by another person in any examination or for any assessment
- plagiarism in *extensive* and/or *significant* portions of a submission, whether ideas, hypotheses, text, code, graphics, tabulated data or other elements e.g. failure to attribute every such incidence; significant portions of coursework reproduced in collusion with others
- a second offence of any form of plagiarism including collusion
- use of an 'essay mill', commercial organisation or the services of another person to commission or purchase work or to seek answers to exam questions, this includes study or homework help sites such as Chegg as well as individuals such as private tutors fabrication of laboratory results e.g. reporting on experiments never performed or data never collected
- plagiarism in work submitted for assessment as a thesis, dissertation, case study or other form of final submission required for any postgraduate research degree
- deliberate manipulation of sections of work presented for assessment, to avoid plagiarised elements being recognised as such by a plagiarism detection system
- collusion, i.e. the unauthorised co-operation of students working together to gain an unfair advantage over others