# Academic Misconduct Allegation Form

|  |
| --- |
| **Before completing this form:**  Please read the supplementary notes on Page 6.  All staff are advised to access and familiarise themselves with [Academic Misconduct Policy and Procedure 2024-25](https://student.londonmet.ac.uk/media/london-metropolitan-university/london-met-documents/professional-service-departments/academic-registry/Academic-Misconduct-Policy-and-Procedure-2024-25.docx)  Please send all allegations and evidence to: [academicmisconduct@londonmet.ac.uk](mailto:academicmisconduct@londonmet.ac.uk) |
| This form must be received no later than 30 working days from the standard submission deadline. If it is after this deadline, an allegation of Academic Misconduct may still be progressed against a student in exceptional circumstances and by prior agreement with the Student Casework Office. This can include delays with the marking process or staff absence.  Once mark entry is available, a mark of 0HM should be entered for the component concerned. This will temporarily defer the mark until the allegation has been fully considered and the student has been notified of the outcome.   |  |  | | --- | --- | | **Part A – Student Details** | | | Student Name: |  | | Student ID: |  | | School: | ☐ Art Architecture and Design  ☐ Computing and Digital Media  ☐ Guildhall School of Business and Law  ☐ Human Sciences  ☐ Social Sciences and Professions | | **Part B – Assessment or Exam Details:** | | | 1. **Assessment Details** | | | Assessment period: | ☐ SEM1 ☐ SEM2 ☐ YEAR  ☐ Summer ☐ Reassessment | | Module Code: |  | | Component: |  | | Weighting of Component: |  |  |  |  | | --- | --- | | 1. **Exam Details** | | | Time and Date of Exam: |  | | Time and Date of alleged incident: |  | | Location of Exam: |  | | Name of Senior Invigilator: |  |  |  |  | | --- | --- | | **Part C – Plagiarism (if applicable)** | | | Approximate percentage of work plagiarised: |  | | Is the plagiarised material cited in the bibliography? | ☐ Yes  ☐ No |  |  | | --- | | **Part D – Outline of alleged Academic Misconduct** | |  |      |  |  |  | | --- | --- | --- | | **Part E – Under Schedule 1 of the Academic Misconduct Regulations I consider the alleged academic misconduct to be under (tick the category most applicable).**  **Note- If you are unsure which category, it should fall under, please discuss with your course leader or line manager.** | | | | **Minor** | Plagiarism by moderate use of quotes or close paraphrasing without the use of quotation marks and incomplete or incorrectly cited bibliographies. | ​​☐​ | | Self-plagiarising an assessed piece of work submitted previously by the student either at London Met or another institution, or work submitted for assessment that has previously been published elsewhere. | ​​☐​ | | Collusion by submitting work produced in collaboration with another person or persons as the work of a single student. | ​​☐​ | | Cheating by performing any action in an examination room that is prohibited by an invigilator or examiner including; removing any script or unauthorised materials, possession of or use of device unless permitted in the rubric, communicating with any person other than the invigilator during the Examination. | ​​☐​ | | Cheating during an examination or copying or attempting to copy the work of another student, whether by overlooking his or her work, asking him or her for information, or by any other means. | ​​☐​ | | Collusion by making available work to another student, either intentionally or as a result of negligence that can be presented as another student. | ​​☐​ | |  |  |  | | **Moderate** | Collusion by representing work produced in collaboration with another person or persons as the work of a single student. | ☐ | | Falsification 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, including failure to secure appropriate ethical approval in advance of conducting research, an experiment or study. | ☐ | | Plagiarising another person’s work or ideas and submitting some or part of it as if it were the student’s own. Plagiarism by submitting AI generated output, as some or part of an assessment and claiming it as the student’s own work without appropriate citation or declaration. | ☐​ | | Plagiarism by the use of extensive use of quotes or close paraphrasing without the use of quotation marks and/or referencing, where the student has not cited the plagiarised material in the bibliography. | ​​☐​ | |  |  |  | | **Major** | Commissioning another person to complete an item of University assessment, which is then submitted as a student’s own work. This could include the use of professional essay writing services, essay banks,  ghost writing services etc. Plagiarism or contract cheating by submitting work that has been entirely another person’s, agency’s or AI’s work or ideas and submitting all of it as if it were the student’s own. | ​☐ | | Cheating in online exams, by manipulating or interfering with remote proctoring either through technology or person-assisted means. | ​☐ | | Cheating by taking into an examination a pre-written examination script for submission and exchanging it for a blank examination script. | ​☐​ | | Cheating by obtaining access to an unseen examination or test prior to the start of an examination/test. | ☐ | |  | |  |  | | **Severe** | | Collusion by to persuade another member of the University (student, staff or invigilator) to participate in actions that would breach these Procedures. | ​☐ | | Contract cheating by being party to any arrangement whereby a person other than the candidate represents, or intends to represent, the candidate in any examination or test. | ☐ |   Please read the following statements and sign or type your full name to indicate your agreement and understanding in accordance with the Regulations:   * The student shall be presumed innocent of the alleged academic misconduct until a decision or determination has been made * An allegation of misconduct shall only be proven, if it is found that it is more likely than not that the misconduct occurred (that is, on the balance of probabilities) * The person (whether the University or the student) making an allegation or stating a particular fact is responsible for proving it. There is no need to prove an allegation or a fact that has been admitted. * I have provided **all** the evidence that I wish to rely on in this allegation. * All the information provided on this form as well as any additional documentary evidence I have provided, is an accurate and true reflection of the situation that led to the allegation outlined above. * I consent to the University sharing the information on this form (and accompanying evidence) with such members of the University and external bodies as may be relevant for the investigation. * I am aware that, regardless of the outcome of this allegation, this paperwork will be retained by the University in accordance with the University’s Records Retention Schedule.  |  |  | | --- | --- | | **Part F – Declaration** | | | Allegation made by: |  | | Name of Module Leader |  | | Signature of Module Leader: |  | | Date: |  |  |  | | --- | | **Supplementary notes for completing this form**: |  |  | | --- | | **Part A – Student Details** |   Please complete the student details in full including Name, Student Number and the relevant School.   |  | | --- | | **Part B – Exam or Assessment Details:** |   All staff to complete all sections under Assessment Details, including the assessment period, the module code, the component and the weighting of the assessment or exam in question.  If the allegation refers to an exam, please complete details of the exam, the time and date of the alleged incident and details of the Senior Invigilator.   |  | | --- | | **Part C – Plagiarism (if applicable)** |   Completed forms that include more than one student will be returned and may cause delays in the procedure.  Plagiarism detection software such as Turnitin will usually identify matching text from other electronic sources of work already submitted elsewhere via that software and produce a similarity score.  A high similarity score does not necessarily mean that work was plagiarised. Decisions about whether the sections identified as matching (via Turnitin) are plagiarised involves academic judgment, for instance:   * Is the work similar to an assessment the student has submitted before, has self-plagiarism been explained? * Are the ideas the student is referring to in common usage across the subject area, can it be explained differently? * Are the ideas copied from someone else’s work, or is the similar work legitimately submitted as group work? * Is the standard of work so out of line with the student’s other assessment that it suggests plagiarism? This requires academic judgment.   When submitting a Turnitin Similarity Report, please provide an analysis, your academic judgment of the Turnitin report and the matching text. Where it is not possible to provide a Turnitin Similarity Report, please provide a copy of the assessment, highlighting the suspected plagiarism, evidence of the sources and your academic judgment of the matching text. Please also confirm if the student has cited the plagiarised material in the bibliography.   |  | | --- | | **Part D – Outline of alleged Academic Misconduct** |   In this section, please outline the nature of the allegation and the evidence on which the allegation is being made.  Your knowledge of the subject and academic judgement should be used when making decisions on proceeding with the allegation. Please consider the following when submitting this form:   * Has the student received warnings about plagiarism in respect of previous assessments (formative and summative) including drafts? * Is the student familiar with UK academic referencing conventions? * If plagiarism is suspected, has the student previously received clear guidance on how to avoid plagiarism? * Has the student attempted to reference the materials used i.e. is this a question of poor referencing rather than academic misconduct? * If the allegation relates to group work, was clear guidance and parameters given i.e. that the individual submissions should be written independently and not collaboratively?   **Documents to submit with this form**   * Turnitin Similarity Report or original item of assessed work annotated * The assessment or exam in question * Any information provided to the student concerning academic conventions and practices.   **Allegations of Collusion**  For cases of alleged collusion, please ensure the assessment and evidence of the alleged cases are clearly marked highlighting the similarities across the students’ work. form.  For cases of suspected collusion, all students involved in the allegation will need to be included on the same form. Please complete the student details in full including Name and Student Number.  **Allegations of Commissioning**  If you suspect a student of commissioning another person to complete an item of assessment using a professional essay writing service, an essay bank or a ghost writing service, or AI please contact [academicmisconduct@londonmet.ac.uk](mailto:academicmisconduct@londonmet.ac.uk) for further advice.  The evidence will need to demonstrate that, on a balance of probabilities; the piece of work was commissioned/created and not written by the student.  It may be advisable to conduct a Viva Voce. The Student Casework Office can only provide procedural guidance, should you require advice on how to conduct a Viva from an academic perspective please speak to your course leader or line manager.   |  | | --- | | **Part E – Type of Academic Misconduct** |   Please indicate by ticking the relevant box which type of academic misconduct you consider the allegation falls under. More than one box can be ticked if you consider that the allegation could potentially fall under more than one type of academic misconduct. Further details on the category of offence (Minor, Moderate, Major and Severe) as well as the associated Penalties is available under Schedule 1 of the [Academic Misconduct Policy and Procedure 2022-23](https://student.londonmet.ac.uk/your-studies/student-administration/rules-and-regulations/academic-misconduct/) below:  **Schedule 1.**  **Tables of Penalties**  **Minor category**   |  |  | | --- | --- | | **Type of academic misconduct** | **Penalty** | | 1. Plagiarism by moderate use of quotes or close paraphrasing without the use of quotation marks and incomplete or incorrectly cited bibliographies or where not cited in the bibliography.   .   1. Self-plagiarising an assessed piece of work submitted previously by the student either at London Met or another institution) or work submitted for assessment that has previously been published elsewhere 2. Collusion by submitting work produced in collaboration with another person or persons as the work of a single student. 3. Cheating by performing any action in an examination room that is prohibited by an invigilator or examiner including; removing any script or unauthorised materials, possession of or use of device unless permitted in the rubric, communicating with any person other than the invigilator during the Examination. 4. Cheating during an examination or copying or attempting to copy the work of another student, whether by overlooking his or her work, asking him or her for information, or by any other means. 5. Collusion by making available work to another student, either intentionally or as a result of negligence that can be presented as another student. | Failure in the item of assessment, with reassessment right where permissible.  The assessment component mark will be capped at a bare pass. |   **Moderate category**   |  |  | | --- | --- | | **Type of academic misconduct** | **Penalty** | | 1. Collusion by representing work produced in collaboration with another person or persons as the work of a single student. 2. Falsification 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, including failure to secure appropriate ethical approval in advance of conducting research, an experiment or study. 3. Plagiarising another person’s work or ideas and submitting some or part of it as if it were the student’s own. Plagiarism by submitting AI generated output as some or part of an assessment and claiming it as the student’s own work without appropriate citation or declaration. 4. Plagiarism by the use of extensive use of quotes or close paraphrasing without the use of quotation marks and/or referencing, where the student has not cited the plagiarised material in the bibliography. | Failure in the item of assessment, with reassessment right where permissible.  The module result will be capped at a bare pass. |   **Major category**   |  |  | | --- | --- | | **Type of academic misconduct** | **Penalty** | | 1. Commissioning another person to complete an item of University assessment, which is then submitted as a student’s own work. This could include the use of professional essay writing services, essay banks, ghost-writing services etc. Plagiarism or contract cheating by submitting work that has been entirely another person’s, agency’s or AI’s work or ideas and submitting all of it as if it were the student’s own. 2. Cheating in online exams, by manipulating or interfering with remote proctoring either through technology or person-assisted means. 3. Cheating by taking into an examination a pre-written examination script for submission and exchanging it for a blank examination script. 4. Cheating by obtaining access to an unseen examination or test prior to the start of an examination/test. | Failure in the module: the student must re-register for the same module at the next opportunity where the re-registered module result will be capped at a bare pass.    Where a re-registration of the same module, or suitable alternative, is not permissible the student will not be able to continue on the course. |   **Severe level**   |  |  | | --- | --- | | **Type of academic misconduct** | **Penalty** | | Collusion by to persuade another member of the University (student, staff or invigilator) to participate in actions that would breach these Procedures.  Contract cheating by being party to any arrangement whereby a person other than the candidate represents, or intends to represent, the candidate in an examination or test. | 1. Failure in the module: the student must re-register for the same module and the re-registered module will be capped at a bare pass. 2. Where a re-registration of the same module, or suitable alternative, is not permissible the student will not be able to continue on the course. Additionally, the following penalty will be applied to the student’s final award: 3. Undergraduate Honours - student’s final classification will be reduced by one level 4. Unclassified Bachelors to Diploma in Higher Education 5. Foundation Degree – Distinction to Merit; Merit to Pass; Pass to Certificate in Higher Education 6. Masters - Distinction to Merit; Merit to Pass; Pass to PG Dip. |   Please note that all imposed penalties are subservient to the undergraduate and postgraduate regulatory frameworks. Please refer to the penalties under paragraph for Research Degree.  **Schedule 2. Penalties for Research Degree Allocations**  In the case of a substantiated allegation of Academic Misconduct in a Research Degree, the Panel shall determine the appropriate penalty to be imposed from one of the following penalty options:   |  |  | | --- | --- | | **Penalty level** | **Penalty** | | Penalty (R) Minor: | Reprimand, a formally recorded warning kept on the student’s record. | | Penalty (R) Moderate: | Failure in the thesis, with the possibility of resubmission for a lesser award, as determined by the Research Degrees Sub-Committee. | | Penalty (R) Major: | Failure in the thesis, without resubmission right. | | Penalty (R) Severe: | Expulsion. |   N.B In the case of a Research Degree student, a penalty of expulsion may be imposed for a first offence.     |  | | --- | | **Part F – Declaration** |   This section should be signed by the staff member that is making the allegation. If the staff member making the allegation is not the Module Leader, Part E will also require a signature from the Module Leader. |
|  |
|  |