



Document Version Number	Version 3
Last Reviewed Date	December 2025
Next Review Date	December 2026

## Academic Misconduct Policy

### 1. Policy Statement

This policy establishes the framework for addressing academic misconduct, ensuring fair and consistent processes to uphold academic integrity. It applies to all students enrolled at The Language Gallery (TLG) and covers all assessment activities.

### 2. Definition of Academic Misconduct

Academic misconduct includes any act that gains an unfair academic advantage, either intentionally or unintentionally. Misconduct includes, but is not limited to:

- 2.1 *Plagiarism* – Using another’s work without proper citation, including AI-generated content unless explicitly permitted.
- 2.2 *Self-plagiarism* – Resubmitting previously assessed work that has not been authorised.
- 2.3 *Collusion* – Unauthorised collaboration to produce work that is falsely presented as the students own work.
- 2.4 *Cheating* – Using unauthorised materials during assessments, including the use of notes, electronic devices, or pre-written responses.
- 2.5 *Personation* – Impersonating another student or having someone else complete their assessment.
- 2.6 *Fabrication or Falsification* – Altering or inventing data, evidence, or citations.
- 2.7 *Contract Cheating* – Paying for or commissioning academic work.
- 2.8 *Breach of Ethics* – Violating ethical research guidelines, including conducting research without appropriate approvals.
- 2.9 *Use of AI in an Unauthorised Manner* – Submitting AI-generated work as original or using AI tools without disclosure where not permitted.

### 3. Classifications of Academic Misconduct

Misconduct is classified into three categories:

#### 3.1 Minor Academic Misconduct

- 3.1.1 Small-scale plagiarism due to poor referencing.
- 3.1.2 Minor collusion with no intent to deceive.
- 3.1.3 A first-time unintentional breach of academic standards.
- 3.1.4 Poor academic practice resulting from inadequate knowledge of referencing conventions.

#### Potential Outcomes:

- 3.1.5 Formal written warning.
- 3.1.6 Mandatory academic integrity training.



- 3.1.7 Reassessment with penalty (with student's marks being capped at the pass mark).

### **3.2 Major Academic Misconduct**

- 3.2.1 Large-scale plagiarism or collusion.
- 3.2.2 Repeated minor misconduct.
- 3.2.3 Cheating in assessments, including accessing unauthorised materials.
- 3.2.4 Falsification of research data or results.
- 3.2.5 Getting someone else to produce the student's assessments

#### **Potential Outcomes:**

- 3.2.6 Failure of the assessment.
- 3.2.7 Suspension from TLG.
- 3.2.8 Referral to a disciplinary panel.

### **3.3 Gross Academic Misconduct**

- 3.3.1 Submitting purchased work (contract cheating).
- 3.3.2 Repeated major misconduct.
- 3.3.3 Severe breaches of ethics or research integrity.
- 3.3.4 Examination malpractice (e.g., impersonation, bringing unauthorised materials, or systematic cheating).
- 3.3.5 Intentional large-scale falsification of data.

#### **Potential Outcomes:**

- 3.3.6 Termination of enrolment.
- 3.3.7 Permanent academic record annotation.
- 3.3.8 Notification to relevant professional bodies.
- 3.3.9 Disqualification from receiving the intended award.

## **4. Procedure for Investigating Academic Misconduct**

### **4.1 Stage One: Preliminary Investigation**

- 4.1.1 Throughout marking, markers are aware to highlight any concerns of potential academic misconduct.
- 4.1.2 If a marker believes a script shows evidence of misconduct, they consult with the Module Leader for a second opinion.
- 4.1.3 If both agree, the student is recorded on the Academic Misconduct Log, with supporting details provided.
- 4.1.4 Once the marking window opens, Student Success Tutors (SSTs) check the log regularly.
- 4.1.5 The SSTs attempt to contact the student by phone and email as needed.



- 4.1.6 Once contact is made, they discuss the script and the evidence with the student.
- 4.1.6 If the student admits misconduct, this outcome is recorded on the Academic Misconduct Log, the feedback of the submission itself (with a score of 0) and the student is sent a follow-up email confirming the outcome. If eligible, the student can resubmit on a subsequent attempt with a capped mark.
- 4.1.7 A weekly meeting is held to review progress in contacting students.
- 4.1.8 Students who cannot be contacted within a reasonable timeframe, or who do not agree with the suspected misconduct, progress to Stage Two.

## **4.2 Stage Two: Formal Investigation**

For students who dispute the findings from Stage One, aren't reachable or there is evidence of major or gross academic misconduct:

- 4.2.1 The Course Directors recheck any applicable students, to confirm if the case needs to progress further to the panel. Students are notified if no further investigation is required.
- 4.2.2 However, if applicable, the case is escalated to the Academic Misconduct Panel.
- 4.2.3 The student is formally notified and provided with evidence.
- 4.2.4 A hearing is scheduled, and the student may be accompanied by a representative.
- 4.2.5 If upheld, the panel deliberates and issues a verdict and penalty as appropriate.
- 4.2.6 The student has the opportunity to submit a written defence and provide supporting evidence.
- 4.2.7 Panel members may request additional documentation, conduct oral verification (viva), or request further information.

## **5. Academic Misconduct Panel**

- 5.1 The panel consists of three members of academic staff unconnected with the student's programme.
- 5.2 One member is designated as Chair, and a faculty representative presents the case.
- 5.3 The student is allowed to bring a support person who is not a legal representative.
- 5.4 The panel follows due process, ensuring the student understands the allegations and has an opportunity to respond.
- 5.5 Decisions are reached based on the balance of probabilities, with outcomes recorded in the student's academic file.

## **6. Stage Three Appeals**

6.1 A student who wishes to appeal the outcome of an academic misconduct decision must submit their appeal in writing within 20 calendar days of receiving the outcome of the misconduct case.

6.2 Student may appeal on the following grounds.

- Procedural irregularities
- New evidence unavailable at the time of the case being reviewed.

6.3 Appeals must be sent to: [complaints@thelanguagegallery.com](mailto:complaints@thelanguagegallery.com)



6.4 All appeals will be considered in accordance with the Academic Appeals Policy and Procedure. The appeals process, grounds for appeal, and review arrangements will align fully with the provisions set out in that policy.

## **7. Record-Keeping and Reporting**

7.1 All cases are recorded on the student's academic file.

7.2 Repeated offences result in stricter penalties.

7.3 Annual reporting ensures policy effectiveness and fairness.

7.4 Data on academic misconduct cases will be reviewed for trends and policy adjustments.

## **8. Responsibilities**

8.1 Students must uphold academic integrity and seek guidance if they are unsure about ethical conduct.

8.2 Faculty and Staff must detect, report, and address misconduct fairly.

8.3 The Academic Misconduct Panel ensures impartial review and decision-making.

## **9. Policy Review**

This policy is reviewed annually or as required to maintain alignment with academic regulations and institutional requirements.