





- (f) plagiarism in any assessed work as defined below (including self-plagiarism – see 2.6)
- (g) falsification or misrepresentation of data, results, references, evidence, or other information
- (h) ghost writing, essay writing services or other sources
- (i) editing by a third party of assessed/examined work to a degree whereby the work may not be considered the candidate's own work
- (j) any other conduct likely to give an unfair advantage to the candidate.

## 2.2 Referencing

Students must always follow appropriate referencing guidelines when producing work for assessment. Direct quotations from the published or unpublished work of others must always be clearly identified as such by being placed inside quotation marks, and a full reference to their source must be provided in proper form. A series of short quotations from several different sources, if not clearly identified as such, constitutes plagiarism just as much as does a single unacknowledged long quotation from a single source. Equally, if students summarise another person's ideas and judgements, they must refer to that person in their text as the source of the ideas and judgements, and include the work referred to in their bibliography. Failure to observe these rules may result in an allegation of plagiarism. Students should consult their lecturer, advisor, or Academic Skills Coordinator if they are in any doubt about what is permissible.

## 2.3 Plagiarism definition

All work submitted must be the student's own work and expressed in their own words and incorporate their own ideas and judgements. Plagiarism, that is, the presentation of another person's thoughts or words as though they were the student's own, must be avoided and all work must be referenced using approved referencing guidelines. Students must also be aware of self-plagiarism (see 2.6).

Plagiarism includes but is not limited to the following:

- (a) The verbatim (word for word) copying of text from a source without appropriate referencing
- (b) The paraphrasing of text from a source without appropriate referencing
- (c) Unacknowledged quotation or paraphrases from a source
- (d) Self-plagiarism - Unacknowledged re-use of work written for one module (either at the IIS or another institution) for another module. This would result in a student gaining credit twice for the same piece of work (See 2.6).



(e) Collusion – this occurs when two or more students collaborate in the preparation and production of work which is submitted by one or more of the students as their own work (unless this is permitted, i.e., a group assignment)

(f) Contract cheating – the use of essay writing services etc. (See 2.9)

## 2.4 Major and minor plagiarism

The categories of plagiarism include, but are not limited to, the following:

### (a) Minor Plagiarism

– A student copies or paraphrases text from a source, without citation or adequate attribution. If the plagiarised sections contain critical ideas which are key to the assignment, then this would constitute a major case.

### (b) Major Plagiarism

– A student copies or paraphrases text from a source

– A student copies or paraphrases text from a source directly from a text of other source the cited material should normally be demarcated with quotation marks and the source should be cited).

– Cheating: The use of essays from essay banks, either downloaded from the internet or obtained from other sources such as essay writing services

– A student copies or paraphrases text from a source

– A student copies or paraphrases text from a source despite warnings having been given to the student concerned

– A student copies or paraphrases text from a source

## 2.5 Poor academic practice

The IIS distinguishes Academic Misconduct from poor academic practice, which can often be the result of inexperience or lack of knowledge. Poor academic practice is an incorrect, inadequate, or confused citation that is not intended to be a contravention or an attempt to gain unfair advantage and is likely to be caused by a student who is inexperienced or lacks knowledge. Markers shall use their judgement to decide if poor academic practice or academic misconduct has occurred, and where it is the former, should follow the process below:

(a) In instances where the marker decides that the student work displays poor academic practice rather than academic misconduct, the marker will handle the matter in accordance with the normal assessment and feedback processes. Depending on the circumstances and the application of their



academic judgement, the marker may decide that because of the poor academic practice there should be a reduction of the mark awarded or that the affected parts of the assessment are disregarded, and the remaining work marked as normal. The marker must inform the student of the poor academic p





(c) If the concerns are shared a meeting should be arranged involving:

- The student

- A student representative, fellow IIS student or a member of the IIS student support team if they wish)

- An officer from Student Services, or an appointed deputy, to take notes of the meeting

(d) The student should be asked to bring their notes used in the preparation of the assignment, any draft versions of the assignment and any readings they have used so that they can demonstrate how they worked on the assignment

(e) The meeting will be held informally and will not be adversarial. It is an information gathering exercise

(f) In the meeting the student can be asked questions about:

- The student's work

- The student's understanding of the assignment

- The student's progress

- The student's understanding of the assignment

- The student's understanding of the assignment

- The student's understanding of the assignment

- The student's understanding of the assignment

(g) If at the end of the meeting the marker is satisfied that the student's work is their own, no further action should be taken. The student should be written to by the nominated person in the IIS to confirm that the matter will not be taken further.

(h) Where, following the meeting, the marker still suspects that contact cheating may have occurred the notes of the meeting and the findings should be passed to the QAE Department to administer the formal investigation as set out in Section 3 of this procedure.

## 2.11 Equality and



The IIS will comply with its obligations under current UK Data Protection Law and treat all correspondence and documentation relating to any proceedings as confidential and will only discuss the information with third parties where this is a necessary part of the investigation process.



### 2.13 Retrospective investigation of allegations

Allegations of academic misconduct will be investigated as soon as it is practical to do so. Investigations can be conducted after a mark has been formally published or an award made if credible evidence comes to light which suggests misconduct may have taken place at the time of the assessment. IIS may recommend to SOAS that it rescind a mark or revoke an award in accordance with the SOAS General and Admissions Regulations for Students if, upon completion of this procedure, misconduct is proven.

## 3. Procedure for Investigating Academic Misconduct

### 3.1 Status of allegation

In all proceedings in relation to academic misconduct, a student will be presumed innocent of the charge until the contrary is proved on the balance of probabilities or the candidate admits culpability.

### 3.2 Investigation of academic misconduct

Where a candidate is suspected of academic misconduct, the following procedure should be followed.





## QAE Department Level

(a) Stage 1 – The QAE Department will confirm that the required paperwork and evidence have been correctly submitted and will then forward the case to the student for comment within ten working days. Once this period has passed, the case moves to Stage 2.

(b) Stage 2 – The Head of the QAE Department to review within ten working days. If there is a conflict of interest, another senior member of academic staff who does not have any previous involvement in the case will act in place of the Head of the QAE Department. The Head of QAE, or their appointed alternate, may consult with any key staff involved if necessary. Once the outcome is confirmed, the case moves to Stage 3.

(c) Stage 3 – The student is informed of the outcome and given 10 calendar days to accept or deny the outcome. A non-response will be treated as an acceptance of the outcome. If the student disagrees with the outcome, they can request a hearing with the Academic Malpractice Committee (AMP) and the case moves to Stage 4.

(d) Stage 4 – An Academic Misconduct Panel (AMP) will be convened to hear the case. The student will be informed beforehand that the AMP involves a re-investigation of the case, and the original outcome may be upheld or a less/more severe penalty may be applied.

(e) Stage 5 – The student may ask for a review of the decision under the appeals process in Section 7 below. This does not involve a re-investigation of the case and the review will only be permitted on limited grounds as defined in the appeals process below.

### 3.3 Deadlines for completing cases

The IIS aims to complete the academic misconduct process in a timely manner. The IIS will endeavour to respond to allegations of misconduct and to process cases within the stated timescales. However, on occasions it reserves the right to vary the process it follows in the interests of fairness or extend these deadlines in particularly busy periods or when there are circumstances beyond the IIS control that inhibit us from investigating the allegation within the stated timescales.

## 4. Academic Misconduct Panel (AMP)

4.1 Under Stage 4 of the Academic Misconduct investigation procedure, students have the right for their case to be heard by an AMP.

4.2 The Academic Misconduct Panel will consist of a minimum of three members of academic staff, with no prior involvement in the case, from the pool of staff nominated annually by academic Heads of







## 5.2 Allocation of penalties for taught degrees

	1 <sup>st</sup> Offence	2 <sup>nd</sup> Offence
Minor	2-4	3-5



