

# Academic Integrity and Misconduct Policy

## Introduction

1. As part of the University of London, Birkbeck shares the University's academic standards and awards University of London degrees. The University of London degree is rightly valued for its high quality and good reputation. In order to maintain this high quality, the College has a duty to maintain the standards of its awards by ensuring the integrity of all aspects of the assessment process. The College has signed up to the [Academic Integrity Charter](#) and is committed to upholding academic integrity across the Birkbeck community.
2. Birkbeck expects that when completing work for assessment, you will adhere to the College's Academic Integrity and Misconduct Policy and not commit any action that has the potential for you to gain an unfair advantage in assessment.
3. The purpose of the policy is to outline:
  - 3.1. what constitutes academic integrity and academic misconduct;
  - 3.2. some examples of academic misconduct and how they are categorised;
  - 3.3. how allegations of academic misconduct will be considered;
  - 3.4. what outcomes students can reasonably expect;
  - 3.5. how students can appeal a finding of academic misconduct; and
  - 3.6. where students and panels can find further information, advice and guidance.
4. This policy applies to any piece of work submitted for formal assessment towards a College or University award at Birkbeck, University of London.
5. Where applicable for undergraduate students, this policy takes precedence over paragraph 21 of the [Common Awards Scheme Regulations for Taught Programmes of Study](#) relating to reassessment arrangements. This means, for example, that the outcome for an upheld offence might mean that you have to retake a module, even if you were only on your first attempt. In this case you will in effect have forfeited the capped, in-year reassessment usually offered at second attempt.
6. This policy also takes precedence over paragraph 24 of the [Common Awards Scheme Regulations for Taught Programmes of Study](#) relating to compensated credit. This means that you will not be eligible for compensated credit if you fail a module due to an upheld offence. If the upheld offence is committed on your second or subsequent attempt at the module, you cannot revert to an earlier failed attempt in order to claim compensated credit.

## Why is academic integrity important?

7. The advancement of academic knowledge relies on integrity in both research and academic practice. Academic integrity is crucial to developing key skills such as critical thinking, evaluating evidence, and developing your academic writing. Ensuring that academic integrity is observed at all times means that marks and academic credit are awarded for work which accurately demonstrates your true efforts and abilities, and prevents students who have produced work by unfair means from being advantaged for doing so. It means that employers and members of the public can have confidence that everyone who holds a University of London award has undergone a rigorous assessment process and has achieved an award that reflects their true knowledge and ability.
8. Birkbeck has a 'whole community' approach to academic integrity. This means that every member of Birkbeck College, whether a student or a member of staff, has a responsibility to maintain academic integrity.
9. For staff, this means that the College has a responsibility to support you in your learning and to provide you with the tools to avoid academic misconduct. It also means that where a tutor responsible for marking work suspects that a student has produced work that breaches the Academic Integrity and Misconduct Policy, they have an obligation to report it for investigation.
10. For students, this means that you must:
  - 10.1. properly acknowledge all sources of information, knowledge, and ideas that have contributed to your own studies, research or publications by consistently and correctly using an acceptable referencing system;
  - 10.2. produce work that is the product of your own, individual efforts (although see below);
  - 10.3. where an assessment brief specifically requires a single piece of work be submitted on behalf of a group of students, you should ensure that each student's contribution to group work is represented honestly;
  - 10.4. encourage others to behave with academic integrity;
  - 10.5. comply with all assessment instructions;
  - 10.6. adhere to and comply with all applicable regulatory, legal and professional obligations and follow any relevant ethical requirements;
  - 10.7. present accurate information and data that has been obtained appropriately and represent honestly the results of research or experimental data, and
  - 10.8. avoid any action which would give you an unfair advantage over others.
11. If you fail to adhere to these principles of academic integrity, you may be guilty of academic misconduct. The remainder of this policy will cover what happens if you are accused of academic misconduct.
12. Some types of academic misconduct are listed below. This list is not exhaustive, and the Academic Integrity Policy might be breached in ways not specifically referred to here:

- 12.1. 'Collusion' means presenting work as your own that has been done in unauthorised partnership with someone else, where this is not permitted by the requirements of the assessment.
- 12.2. 'Contract cheating', also known as 'essay mills', 'ghost writers' or 'third-party cheating', means submitting work as your own that has been purchased or commissioned from someone else. A fee does not have to be paid for contract cheating to have taken place. This might include using generative artificial intelligence tools such as ChatGPT to create content and/or argument for your assessment which you then present as your own intellectual work. If you are permitted to use generative AI tools to create content, this will be included in the assessment brief with guidance.
- 12.3. 'Exam offences' can include using the wrong or unauthorised equipment in an exam, such as a calculator or earpieces; accessing an exam paper or questions ahead of an assessment; and taking unauthorised notes or material into an exam.
- 12.4. 'Fabrication' means creating false data or other aspects of research or assessed work.
- 12.5. 'Falsification' means falsely claiming to have carried out part of an assessment, such as experiments, observations, interviews, or any form of research and/or data collection.
- 12.6. 'Impersonation' means assuming the identity of another student, or allowing someone to assume your identity, in an assessment.
- 12.7. 'Plagiarism' is when you present work as if it is your own, without full, accurate, and appropriate referencing. This can include paraphrasing someone else's work without citing the original source, or copying taking credit for someone else's argument even if you put it into your own words.
- 12.8. 'Poor referencing' means that when you have used someone else's ideas, you have not adequately cited where those ideas came from, or the citations you have provided are incomplete, unclear, or inaccurate.
- 12.9. 'Self-plagiarism' involves submitting the same work for credit more than once, where this is not permitted by the requirements of the assessment. This could mean duplicating work:
  - a. that you submitted on a previous attempt at the same assessment;
  - b. that you submitted on another module;
  - c. that you submitted when studying towards another programme or at another institution;
  - d. that you have had published elsewhere, for example in an academic journal (copying extensive passages or without proper citation); or,
  - e. that you created outside of your studies but which is now in the public domain, for example on a blog or other online content.
13. The College discourages the use of professional third-party proofreading or editing services, including online services such as paraphrasing and grammar software other

than those promoted by the College. Proofreading is an essential skill in the academic writing process. You should proofread your own work, and should always allow plenty of proofreading time before submitting your work to correct any typographical, grammatical and spelling errors. [Study Skills](#) support is available to help you in this process.

14. If you plan to use professional proofreading or editing services, you should exercise caution and ask advice from your tutor or from the [Learning Development](#) team before you do so. Unscrupulous companies frequently masquerade as online tutoring, study support, or proofreading services, as well as often improperly using their clients' personal data. Relying on these services could expose you to the risk of conducting academic misconduct yourself, or of your work being used, copied or stolen without your permission, resulting in detection by text matching software such as Turnitin.
15. In order to maintain academic integrity standards, you should be aware that proofreaders should not make any changes but merely identify, highlight or draw attention to changes to improve the quality of the work. Where a proofreader or proofreading service is used, the proofreader must **not** alter the academic content, arguments or conclusions of your work in any way. They also must not:
  - 15.1. rewrite passages of text to clarify the meaning or improve the argument;
  - 15.2. change any words or figures, except to correct spelling;
  - 15.3. correct facts, figures, calculations, formulae, equations or computer code;
  - 15.4. re-arrange or re-format content;
  - 15.5. contribute any additional material to the original;
  - 15.6. re-label diagrams, charts or figures;
  - 15.7. implement or alter a referencing system or add to references;
  - 15.8. translate your work into English from another language; or
  - 15.9. reduce content so as to comply with a specified word limit.
16. For more information on avoiding plagiarism and for additional support, please see the College's [Plagiarism Guidelines](#). You can also:
  - 16.1. [visit the Birkbeck Library and Information skills Moodle module](#), which includes online tools on how to reference, and how to avoid plagiarism;
  - 16.2. explore the [Study Skills](#) support available;
  - 16.3. book a place on one of the Learning Development workshops that run throughout the year. These are listed in [My Birkbeck](#).

## How we determine whether misconduct has taken place

17. If the College suspects academic misconduct has occurred, it is the responsibility of the College to prove the allegation against you. The standard of proof required is that of a balance of probabilities. A balance of probabilities means that it is more likely than not that academic misconduct has occurred.

18. The College considers academic misconducts using the concept of strict liability. This means that your intention or negligence is not considered when determining whether or not academic misconduct has taken place. These factors may be considered when determining an outcome.
19. Mitigating circumstances will not be considered when determining whether or not academic misconduct has occurred.
20. Identifying suspected academic misconduct will often, but not always, involve academic judgment. This is based on the scholarly and/or professional knowledge and expertise which academic staff and external examiners draw upon in reaching academic decisions about assessment. Examples of academic judgment might include deciding the extent of the plagiarism or other academic misconduct (for example by interpreting the Turnitin similarity report, or by assessing whether content has been appropriately or inappropriately paraphrased); in cases of alleged collusion, determining whether identical answers across more than one student's assessments is outside of common usage in the subject area; or deciding whether the standard of work is out of line with your other assessments, or whether your notes and drafts support a case that the submitted work is your own.
21. Where a marker suspects that plagiarism, collusion or contract cheating has been committed, they will inform the Sub-Board. You may be required to undergo a 'viva voce' examination, to test your knowledge of the subject in relation to the knowledge displayed in the piece of work concerned.
22. A viva voce examination is conducted by two members of academic staff, at least one of whom has not been involved in marking the originally submitted work. A note taker is present for the viva; the report they write may be used by a panel at either Stage 2 or Stage 3 hearings as described in this policy, as evidence when considering if in their judgment you committed an academic misconduct.
23. The viva is not the same as an academic misconduct hearing and will not require you to respond to an allegation of misconduct. The viva should seek to establish your awareness of the knowledge and understanding covered by the assessment, and the procedure by which you undertook the work. The viva should not extend to areas of the course not covered by the assessment under suspicion.
24. If you fail to attend the viva or request an alternative date, then you will be offered one further date. If you do not respond or fail to attend the College will conclude that you have chosen not to contest the allegation, where no reasonable explanation has been provided.
25. If you do not engage with the request to attend a viva or provide a reasonable explanation, the College may refer the matter under other policies, for example the Student Discipline, for failure to engage.

### **Joint programmes and shared modules**

26. The College offers programmes that are taught in collaboration between departments and where a module(s) from one department may form part of the programme offered by another department. In cases where alleged academic misconduct has been committed, the department that 'owns' the module concerned will be responsible for

dealing with the academic misconduct. The Head of Department or nominee where the programme is principally based will also be informed that an investigation is underway and of the outcome. If the department that identifies the misconduct is not the student's home department, they should inform the home department immediately.

### Exams (in-class tests/online exams)

27. If a suspected academic misconduct occurs during an examination, the invigilator will complete a report which will be provided to the Registry team. The Registry team will confirm whether the matter is progressed at Stage 2 or 3 of the Policy.

### Standard Outcome Stage

28. First cases are dealt with under the Standard Outcome Stage of this policy, unless they fall under a "Serious Academic Misconduct" category as outlined in Appendix 2. Serious Academic Misconduct allegations should always be dealt with at Stage 3 of this policy.
29. If an allegation of poor academic practice or academic misdemeanour is brought against you in your first year of study at the College, this first allegation will not be "counted" towards your total number of offences, **provided** you undertake and pass academic integrity training run by the Learning Development team within 14 days of being notified of the Standard Outcome being applied. A meeting will also be held between you and your personal tutor, to discuss the misconduct and establish whether further academic support is needed.
30. If more than one instance of misconduct is committed during the same assessment period, before you are made aware that an allegation has been brought against you, this will be considered as one incident under this policy. In another words, if more than one instance of misconduct is committed concurrently but only discovered subsequently, this would only be considered as one allegation.
31. If you complete and pass the training, your work will be marked and the marker will set aside plagiarised components and award a mark for the remainder of the content (in some instances this might lead to a fail mark being awarded). The allegation will would be recorded but will be considered as expended when determining an outcome for any further misconduct.
32. If you fail the academic integrity training or do not attempt it, the allegation will be processed at Stage 1 or Stage 2 and an outcome applied, as appropriate and as outlined in Appendices 1 and 2.
33. Further allegations of academic misconduct, or allegations brought against you in your second or subsequent year of study, will be considered under Stages 1-3 of this policy and will be considered as unexpended.
34. In order to be considered under the Standard Outcome Stage of this policy, the offence **must** meet all of the below criteria:

- 34.1. It must be your first offence during your period of enrolment at Birkbeck (including any previous periods of study on another programme from the date at which this policy was implemented onwards);
- 34.2. You must be in your first year on a programme of study at Birkbeck;
- 34.3. It must not be a serious enough offence to be categorised as “Serious Academic Misconduct”, according to Appendix 2 of this policy.

## Stage 1

35. Allegations of misconduct fitting a category of Poor Academic Practice (see Appendix 2) may be dealt with at a departmental level under Stage 1, providing that you do not have any unexpended allegations of misconduct.
36. In cases of plagiarism, collusion and other offences where, in the judgment of the marker, the misconduct is minor, they may apply an Outcome 1 or Outcome 2 sanction as outlined in Appendices 1 and 2.
37. In addition, you may be asked to undertake specific tuition in relation to academic misconduct, for example by attending a study skills session or having a meeting with a tutor.
38. All Stage 1 offences dealt with at department level must be recorded by the department.

## Stage 2

39. The second unexpended allegation against you and allegations of misconduct fitting a category of Academic Misdemeanour (see Appendix 2) may be dealt with at a departmental level under Stage 2, unless the application of the indicative outcome would lead to the termination of your registration. In those cases, the misconduct should be heard under Stage 3.
40. Where a case is dealt with under Stage 2, an Head of School or nominee will nominate a panel consisting of a minimum of two academic members of staff one of whom shall be Chair to consider the case. The panel should not consist of any member of staff associated with the allegation or any previous investigation involving the student concerned. The diversity of the panel will be considered when the panel is convened.
41. You will be informed of the allegation including the alleged category/categories of misconduct and details of any investigation undertaken, and will receive copies of any evidence to be used to support the allegation. You will then be offered, in writing, the opportunity to make representations to the panel. You may choose to attend the panel and speak to them in person.
42. If you admit to the misconduct, no panel hearing will take place. You will be informed of the applied outcome in writing, within 14 calendar days. Possible outcomes are listed in Appendix 1 of this policy.
43. If you contest the allegation, a panel hearing will take place. If you wish to attend the hearing, you will be offered a date. If you do not respond within 14 calendar days

without good reason, or decline the date, the panel may decide the outcome of the case in your absence.

44. You may choose to be accompanied by a companion, who should be a member of the College, for example a fellow student, member of staff, or the Student Union Advice Manager. The role of the companion is to provide support to you, anyone acting in this role is not a member of the panel and should not be involved in determining the outcome. Companions should not contribute to any hearing unless invited to do so by the panel. Companions shall not be professional legal representatives.
45. Where the finding is that misconduct has occurred, the panel will determine the category of offence which they believe has occurred and will apply the outcomes stipulated in Appendix 1. Cases at Stage 2 can result in any outcome ranging from Outcome 1 to Outcome 4 inclusive. See below for how outcomes are applied. In addition, you may be asked to undertake specific tuition in relation to academic misconduct.
46. The panel will inform you of its decision within 14 calendar days.
47. Where the panel are unable to come to a clear decision or consider that the misconduct potentially merits a more severe outcome than that which can be authorised under Stage 2 of this policy, then the alleged offence will be referred to Stage 3 of this policy.

### **Stage 3**

48. A written request for Stage 3 proceedings should be made to the Student Complaints, Conduct and Appeals team in the following cases:
  - 48.1. It is your third or subsequent unexpended offence;
  - 48.2. The allegation is of misconduct fitting a category of Serious Academic Misconduct as outlined in Appendix 2;
  - 48.3. The allegation (including for a first or second offence) may lead to the termination of your registration, for example because you are on your final permissible assessment attempt.
49. Where a case is dealt with under Stage 3, Student Complaints, Conduct and Appeals team will nominate a panel consisting of two members of academic staff, one of whom shall be Chair, and a representative from the Students' Union to consider the case. The panel will not consist of any member of staff who has been involved in the progression of the academic misconduct. The diversity of the panel will be considered when the panel is convened.
50. You will be informed of the allegation and investigation, and will receive copies of any evidence to be used to support the allegation. You will then be offered, in writing, the opportunity to make representations to the panel. you may choose to attend the panel and speak to them in person.
51. If you admit to the misconduct, no panel hearing will take place. You will be informed of the applied outcome in writing, within 14 calendar days. Possible outcomes are listed in Appendix 1 of this policy.



52. If you contest the allegation, a panel hearing will take place. If you wish to attend the hearing, you will be offered a date. If you do not respond within 14 calendar days without good reason, or decline the dates, the panel may decide the outcome of the case in your absence.
53. You may choose to be accompanied by a companion, who should be a member of the College. The role of the companion is to provide support to you. Anyone acting in this role is not a member of the panel and should not be involved in determining the outcome. Companions should not contribute to any Hearing unless invited to do so by the panel. Companions shall not be professional legal representatives.
54. Where the finding is that misconduct has occurred, the panel will determine the category of offence which they believe has occurred and will apply the outcomes stipulated in Appendix 1. Cases at Stage 3 can result in any outcome. See below for how outcomes are applied. In addition, you may be asked to undertake specific tuition in relation to academic misconduct.
55. The panel will inform you of its decision within 14 calendar days.

## How outcomes are applied

56. In the event that a student has multiple cases brought against them, any previous offences will be considered as either expended or unexpended for the purposes of determining an appropriate outcome. Offences that are expended (i.e., the Standard Outcome was applied, and academic integrity training was attempted and passed) **will not** be considered as factors when determining an outcome for any further breaches of the Academic Integrity and Misconduct Policy.
57. Any subsequent offences after the first case considered under the Standard Outcome Stage, or cases where academic integrity training was failed or not attempted, will count as unexpended and will be considered as factors when determining an outcome for any further breaches of the Academic Integrity and Misconduct Policy.
58. Each category of offence, as stipulated in Appendix 2, has two options for the possible outcome. The higher of these two outcomes will always be the default. The more lenient of these outcomes should only be selected when one or more of the following criteria is met:
  - 58.1. You have no unexpended offences on your record;
  - 58.2. You admit to the allegation when first advised of the allegation; or
  - 58.3. You have appealed on the basis of compelling mitigating circumstances for which you can provide evidence, and this appeal has been upheld.
59. If your third or more unexpended offence proceeds to a Stage 3 panel hearing, the outcome will normally be one outcome level higher than that suggested in Appendices 1-2, or one level higher than the previously imposed outcome, whichever is higher. This decision is taken at the discretion of the Stage 3 panel. Outcomes should not be raised as the outcome of a Stage 2 panel.

## Appeal

60. You can appeal decisions made under any stage of this policy by submitting an appeal form, as per the Appeals Policy and Procedure.

## Reporting of Offences

61. Where an allegation of an academic misconduct has been made and the case is being investigated, you will not be disadvantaged unless there is evidence to substantiate an offence with an associated outcome. Where an alleged academic misconduct is under investigation the relevant Board of Examiners will not defer a decision on your progression or classification until the investigation is completed.
62. In the instance that an allegation of academic misconduct is brought against you, you should continue with your studies while the investigation is ongoing, including by continuing to attend teaching and submitting work for assessment. If you stop attending or submitting work, you may be subjected to the College's usual procedures in relation to attendance and to satisfactory academic progress; see the [Common Awards Scheme Regulations for Taught Programmes of Study](#), the [Student Attendance and Engagement Policy](#), and the [Termination Policy](#) for more information.
63. Marking of the work in question, progression and enrolment should be processed in the normal way where an alleged academic misconduct is under investigation.
64. In the event you are in the final year of your programme and about to graduate but an alleged academic misconduct is under investigation the relevant Board of Examiners will not confirm and confer your final award until the outcome (and where appropriate appeal) have reached a conclusion.
65. Your academic transcript does not include reference to academic misconduct allegations, whether proven or otherwise; transcripts solely provide details on the final marks awarded for modules taken, together with the class of award made (where appropriate).

## Academic misconduct after a mark of module result has been assigned or an award has been made

66. If evidence of an academic misconduct is produced after a mark has been awarded, the mark, module result or an entire award can be revoked.
67. Consideration of whether to revoke a mark, module or degree result as a result of an academic misconduct should be dealt with in accordance of Stage 2 or Stage 3 of this policy. The result of any hearing should be communicated to the relevant Sub-Board Chair; where a decision is made to revoke a degree the Chair of the relevant College Board of Examiners will also be informed.

68. The list below outlines terminology used throughout this policy:
- 68.1. 'Birkbeck' or 'the College' refers to Birkbeck, University of London.
  - 68.2. 'You' means 'the student/students', i.e. a person/people registered to study at Birkbeck.
  - 68.3. 'Academic integrity' means being honest in your academic work, taking responsibility for the contents of the work that you produce, and making sure that you formally recognise and reference the existing knowledge and ideas on which your work is based.
  - 68.4. 'Academic judgment' is a judgment that is made about a matter where the opinion of an academic expert is essential: for example, a judgment about marks awarded, degree classification, research methodology, whether feedback is correct or adequate, and the content or outcomes of a course.
  - 68.5. 'Academic misconduct' means a breach of academic integrity, through actions which could lead you to gain an unfair academic advantage in an assessment; for example by taking credit for someone else's work, words, or ideas. Academic misconduct can be broken down into three categories:
    - a. 'poor academic practice': this refers to minor instances where it is clear you have attempted to reference sources but have failed to do so correctly.
    - b. 'academic misdemeanour' covers poor study skills, medium-level plagiarism, and minor exam offences.
    - c. 'serious academic misconduct' is the most serious category of offences and suggests intention to deceive. Students committing these offences do not have a sufficient understanding of the course content or study skills to progress.
  - 68.6. An 'academic misconduct panel' or 'panel hearing' is a body of academic staff tasked with deciding whether an instance of academic misconduct has taken place and what outcome should be imposed, if applicable. Panels can be held at Faculty-level for more minor cases of misconduct, or for more serious cases, panels will be run by the College's Student Discipline team.
  - 68.7. 'Essay mills' are businesses that complete work in exchange for money, for a student who then submits it to an education provider as their own. This is known as ghostwriting or contract cheating and is illegal in England. Essay mills are frequently involved in other forms of cybercrime and are known to blackmail students and to whistle blow on students to their academic institution.
  - 68.8. An 'outcome' is the sanction applied to a student if academic misconduct is found to have been committed.
  - 68.9. 'Paraphrasing' means putting someone else's work into your own words. When you paraphrase someone else in your academic writing, you must still acknowledge the source of the idea: you should not pass off someone else's ideas as your own. As with direct quotation, the full details of the source should be given in your footnotes and bibliography (as applicable).

- 68.10. 'Proofreading' is the final stage of producing a piece of academic writing. It is the process of checking your work to make sure it is of a high academic standard and quality.
- 68.11. 'Turnitin' is the College's text-matching software, which detects any similarities between submitted coursework and work published on the internet and provides an indicative similarity report. This is a tool for alerting markers to high levels of similarity but is not a substitute for academic judgment in detecting a breach of this policy. A low similarity score is not a guarantee that no academic misconduct has taken place.
- 68.12. A 'viva voce' is a meeting held to test your subject knowledge and gain more information on how you completed your assessment. It differs from oral presentations in that you are required to respond to unknown questions around a specified topic.

## Appendix 1: Table of academic misconduct outcomes

Standard Outcome	Issue a formal warning and the student will be required to complete academic integrity training within two weeks of being notified of the outcome. The Module Convenor shall mark the work, but where extensive plagiarism has occurred, the marker will set aside the plagiarised components and award a mark for the remainder of the content. In some instances this might lead to a fail mark being awarded; in this case the marker should make this clear in their feedback to the student.
Outcome 1	Issue a formal warning. The Module Convenor shall mark the work, but the mark may be reduced by a maximum of ten marks to reflect a student's failure to address the assessment criteria in areas of collation of sources and their citation. In some instances this might lead to a fail mark being awarded; in this case the marker should make this clear in their feedback to the student.
Outcome 2	Award a mark of zero for the element of assessment in question, with reassessment right where permissible. The reassessment element mark will be capped at a bare pass.
Outcome 3	Award a mark of zero for the element of assessment in question, with reassessment right where permissible. The module mark will be capped at a bare pass.
Outcome 4	Award a mark of zero for the module in question, the student must retake the same module and the module result will be capped at a bare pass. Where the module in question is an option module, the cap should be applied to any optional module attempted by the student as a substitute. Where a retake of the same module, or suitable alternative, is not permissible the student will be allowed to complete the academic year and to obtain an exit award, if available, but will not be able to continue on the programme in the next academic year.
Outcome 5	<p>Award a mark of zero for the module in question, the student must retake the same module and the module result will be capped at a bare pass. Where the module in question is an option module, the cap should be applied to any optional module attempted by the student as a substitute. Where a retake of the same module, or suitable alternative, is not permissible the student will not be able to continue on the programme. Additionally the following outcome will be applied to the student's final award:</p> <p>Undergraduate Honours - student's final classification will be reduced by one level</p> <p>Unclassified Bachelors to Diploma in Higher Education</p> <p>Foundation Degree – Distinction to Merit; Merit to Pass; Pass to Certificate in Higher Education</p> <p>Masters - Distinction to Merit; Merit to Pass; Pass to PG Dip</p>
Outcome 6	<p>Terminate a student's registration and enrolment on the programme of study immediately with permission granted to exit with an intermediate award, provided the student has satisfied the requirements for that award.</p> <p>Where academic misconduct has been substantiated for a student who has completed their studies and on whom a final award has been conferred, the most serious outcome that may be applied shall be withdrawal of the relevant final award previously conferred on the student.</p>

## Appendix 2: Categories of academic misconduct

### Poor academic practice

Category	Type of academic misconduct	Outcome to be imposed
PP1	Making available work to another student, either intentionally or as a result of negligence that can be presented as another student's.	Standard Outcome
PP2	<b>Isolated</b> inadequate paraphrasing or use of quotes without the use of quotation marks and/or referencing.	Outcome 1 and Outcome 2
PP3	Self-plagiarism where the duplication concerned is uncited but <b>isolated</b> (i.e. submission of work submitted previously by the student, which has contributed to the student's mark on the current or any previous programme, either at Birkbeck or another institution; or work submitted for assessment that has previously been published elsewhere, including online). <sup>1</sup>	Outcome 1 and Outcome 2
PP4	General indebtedness to the ideas, arguments, and work of others, which are presented as the student's own and not sufficiently referenced, but where the student's own argument is still predominant.	Outcome 1 and Outcome 2

### Academic misdemeanour

Category	Type of academic misconduct	Outcome to be imposed
AM1	Removing any script, paper, or other official stationery (whether completed or not) from the examination room, unless specifically authorised by an invigilator or examiner.	Outcome 1 and Outcome 2
AM3	Possession or use of devices or hardware of any kind other than those specifically permitted in the rubric of the paper, without inappropriate usage having been detected.	Outcome 1 and Outcome 2
AM4	Communicating with another student or with any third party other than the invigilator/examiner during an in-person examination or test, where there is <b>no attempt made</b> at copying the other person's work.	Outcome 1 and Outcome 2

<sup>1</sup> Note that reworking material that has previously been submitted at Birkbeck but which received a failing mark (i.e. has not contributed to an overall grade) will not be considered self-plagiarism.

AM5	Communicating with another student or with any third party about the contents of a remote examination or test prior to the conclusion of the assessment, including over social media or WhatsApp, where there is <b>no attempt made</b> at copying the other person's work.	Outcome 1 and Outcome 2
AM6	<b>Extensive</b> use of quotes or close paraphrasing without the use of quotation marks and/or referencing, where the student <b>has</b> cited the plagiarised material in the bibliography.	Outcome 2 and Outcome 3
AM7	<b>Extensive</b> use of quotes or close paraphrasing without the use of quotation marks and/or referencing, where the student <b>has not</b> cited the plagiarised material in the bibliography.	Outcome 3 and Outcome 4
AM8	Self-plagiarism where the duplication concerned is uncited and <b>extensive</b> (i.e. submission of work submitted previously by the student, which has contributed to the student's mark on the current or any previous programme, either at Birkbeck or another institution; or work submitted for assessment that has previously been published elsewhere, including online). <sup>2</sup>	Outcome 3 and Outcome 4
AM9	General indebtedness to the ideas, arguments, and work of others, which are presented as the student's own and either not sufficiently or nowhere referenced, and where the arguments taken from other sources predominate over the student's own argument.	Outcome 3 and Outcome 4
AM10	Duplicating diagrams, computer programs, hypotheses, text, code, graphics, tabulated data or other elements from books or journals; from unpublished sources such as lecture notes and handouts; or from the web, without suitable acknowledgement and referencing.	Outcome 3 and Outcome 4
AM11	Fabricating references.	Outcome 3 and Outcome 4
AM12	Possession of crib sheets or revision notes (including, for example, those held on digital media devices) in an in-person examination or test; accessing the internet in contravention of the examination rubric.	Outcome 3 and Outcome 4
AM13	Using another student's work and submitting some or all of it as if it were the student's own.	Outcome 3 and Outcome 4
AM14	The presentation of data in laboratory work, projects etc based on work purporting to have been carried out by the student but which has been invented, altered or falsified.	Outcome 3 and Outcome 4
AM15	During an examination or test, copying or attempting to copy the work of another student, whether by overlooking their work, asking them for information, or by any other means including over social media or WhatsApp.	Outcome 3 and Outcome 4

<sup>2</sup> Note that reworking material that has previously been submitted at Birkbeck but which received a failing mark (i.e. has not contributed to an overall grade) will not be considered self-plagiarism.

## Serious academic misconduct

Category	Type of academic misconduct	Outcome to be imposed
SM1	Commissioning another person or service to complete an item of College assessment, where the commissioned work is <b>not</b> submitted. This could include the use of professional essay writing services, essay banks, homework assistance sites, ghostwriting services or other tools/services.	Outcome 3 and Outcome 4
SM2	The use of proofreading services to alter, add to or improve the argument or academic quality of the work submitted, in line with the guidelines stipulated in paragraphs 14-17 of this policy.	Outcome 4 and Outcome 5
SM3	Using technological aids, including translation software, paraphrasing tools, text generation software (essays bots), and tools to generate text, graphics or artwork, without citation or specific authorisation.	Outcome 4 and Outcome 5
SM4	Where an assignment is required to be written in English, writing in a language other than English and then using translation software or assistance from a third party to convert into English.	Outcome 4 and Outcome 5
SM5	Falsifying a mitigating circumstances claim or evidence.	Outcome 4 and Outcome 5
SM6	Commissioning another person or service to complete an item of College assessment, which <b>is</b> then submitted as a student's own work. This could include the use of professional essay writing services, essay banks, homework assistance sites, ghostwriting services or other tools/services.	Outcome 4 and Outcome 5
SM7	Failure to secure appropriate ethical approval in advance of conducting research, an experiment, study or similar.	Outcome 4 and Outcome 5
SM8	Being party to any arrangement whereby a person other than the candidate impersonates, or intends to impersonate, the candidate in an examination or test.	Outcome 4 and Outcome 5
SM9	Stealing another student's work and submitting it as the student's own work (where the originator <b>is not</b> denied the opportunity of submission).	Outcome 4 and Outcome 5
SM10	Stealing another student's work and submitting it as the student's own work (where the originator <b>is</b> denied the opportunity of submission).	Outcome 5 and Outcome 6
SM11	Taking into an examination a pre-written examination script / answer book for submission and exchanging it for a blank examination script / answer book.	Outcome 5 and Outcome 6
SM12	Obtaining access to an unseen examination or test prior to the start of an examination/test.	Outcome 5 and Outcome 6



## All other misconduct

Category	Type of academic misconduct	Outcome to be imposed
All other misconduct	Being party to any other arrangement that would constitute a breach of this Policy; or agreeing, assisting, encouraging, advising or attempting to persuade another member of the College (student or staff) to participate in actions that would breach this Policy.	Outcome to correspond to the nature of the misconduct according to outcomes outlined above

