

# Section 17C

Nottingham Trent University

---

## **Quality Handbook**

### **Part E: Regulations**

### **Section 17C: Academic Integrity Policy**

# Section 17C

## Contents

1.	Introduction.....	2
2.	Principles .....	3
3.	Definitions.....	4
4.	Scope – who is covered by this policy?.....	5
5.	Developing good academic practice .....	5
6.	Identification of potential academic misconduct .....	6
7.	Improving academic integrity .....	7
8.	Academic misconduct investigation.....	8
9.	Serious academic misconduct investigation .....	10
10.	Composition of the Serious Academic Misconduct Panel .....	12
11.	Conduct of the Serious Academic Misconduct Panel .....	12
12.	Investigating complex academic misconduct cases.....	13
13.	Penalty framework.....	14
14.	Right of appeal.....	15
15.	Appeal Hearing.....	17
16.	Role of the Board of Examiners .....	18
17.	Support for students .....	18
18.	Reconsidering the same offence.....	19
19.	Misconduct that is identified after the student has graduated .....	20
20.	Independent external review .....	20
21.	Appendix one: definitions.....	22

# Section 17C

## 1. Introduction

**This policy sets out the standards of behaviour expected from students with respect to academic integrity and the procedures that will be followed if these standards are not met.**

### Requirements

- 1.1 The standards of the University's awards are underpinned by the commitment to and demonstration of the shared values and behaviours of honesty, trust, fairness, respect, and responsibility which constitute academic integrity.
- 1.2 Academic integrity is an essential part of your studies and you can demonstrate this through good academic practices by:
  - a. using information appropriately.
  - b. acknowledging what's your own work, and where ideas or contributions came from others.
  - c. not presenting others work as your own, whether that work was produced by a person or machine.
  - d. conducting research ethically.
  - e. reporting truthfully on your research.
  - f. acting in an ethical manner in your academic studies.
- 1.3 Failure to abide by the values and behaviours of academic integrity has the potential to give you an unfair advantage in your studies which poses a threat to the academic standards of the University's qualifications, and to the integrity of the qualifications awarded to students who achieve their qualifications by entirely legitimate means.
- 1.4 Anyone not demonstrating academic integrity will be subject to investigation and potential action under this policy.
- 1.5 The Academic Integrity Policy is one of several policies and processes designed to support students in their studies. These include:
  - a. Notification of Extenuating Circumstances;
  - b. Variation to Study;
  - c. Break in Study;
  - d. Support to Study;
  - e. Fitness to Practice; and
  - f. The Student Code of Behaviour.

# Section 17C

- 1.6 Students who are encountering difficulties in their studies should seek guidance and support from their School, and, as appropriate, from Student Support Services.
- 1.7 The Academic Integrity Policy has three categories for investigating suspected breaches, which are:
  - a. Improving Academic Integrity;
  - b. Academic Misconduct; and
  - c. Serious Academic Misconduct.

## 2. Principles

**This policy is designed to ensure that all students are treated fairly.**

### Requirements

- 2.1 The policy is primarily designed to promote positive behaviours by supporting and developing students to engage in good academic practice and act with academic integrity.
- 2.2 Principles of fairness include, but are not limited to:
  - a. setting out expected standards of behaviour and detailing how the University will respond where these standards are not met;
  - b. ensuring a proportionate response to allegations, both in the process undertaken and the outcome;
  - c. avoiding potential bias by ensuring independent consideration at each stage of the process;
  - d. giving reasons for actions and decisions made by the University;
  - e. operating reasonable timescales for investigations, which includes providing reasonable notice of attendance at any meetings;
  - f. ensuring that the policy is applied consistently to all students;
  - g. providing a right of appeal against the outcome of an investigation;
  - h. ensuring an appropriate level of confidentiality, only releasing information to those who need it for the purposes of investigating.
- 2.3 At all times the principles of 'natural justice' are used to ensure procedural fairness, in that:
  - a. Decision makers will review cases without bias or a reasonable perception of bias;
  - b. Each party has a fair hearing;
  - c. The process is completed without undue delay;
  - d. Decision makers make reasonable decisions and give reasons for these.

# Section 17C

- 2.4 The University will ensure that students with protected characteristics, as defined under the Equality Act 2010, are treated fairly and without discrimination.
- 2.5 This policy is designed on the basis of strict liability, in that a student's intentions are not relevant as to whether or not they have committed academic misconduct.
- 2.6 The processes in this policy are internal to the University and do not have the same degree of formality as a court of law. As such legal representation is not deemed to be necessary or appropriate in the circumstances.
- 2.7 The University reserves the right to transfer cases of alleged academic misconduct to another policy or procedure if we deem it to be necessary, for example to be investigated via the Student Code of Behaviour.
- 2.8 The policy allows for matters to be dealt with summarily where a student admits any misconduct.

## 3. Definitions

**This policy provides clear definitions to enable students to understand what is expected of them and the consequences of any breaches.**

## Requirements

- 3.1 **Academic integrity** is defined as the commitment to, and demonstration of fundamental values and behaviours including honesty, fairness, respect, and responsibility.
- 3.2 **Good academic practice** is defined as a commitment to, and demonstration of essential academic skills such as accurate referencing, using information appropriately, acknowledging where information comes from, not representing the work of others as your own, reporting truthfully on research findings, and acting in an ethical manner.
- 3.3 **Needing to improve academic integrity** is defined as an intentional or unintentional failure to uphold the values and behaviours of academic integrity.
- 3.4 **Academic misconduct** is defined as any action by a student which gives, or has the potential to give, an unfair advantage or might assist someone else to gain an unfair advantage, or any activity likely to undermine the integrity essential to scholarship and research.
- 3.5 **Serious academic misconduct** is defined as continued academic misconduct offences, or practices involving evidence of extensive plagiarism or cheating, or clear evidence of intent to deceive or gain substantial advantage.
- 3.6 The following are examples of breaches / potential breaches of academic integrity which might constitute academic misconduct. Definitions of these are set out in appendix one.
  - a. Multiple, non-concurrent breaches of academic integrity;
  - b. Collusion;

# Section 17C

- c. Fabrication, falsification or misrepresentation;
  - d. Minor breach of examination regulations or conduct;
  - e. Misuse of the Notification of Extenuating Circumstances policy;
  - f. Plagiarism;
  - g. Software-based text modification;
  - h. Academic dishonesty.
- 3.7 The following will always be considered to be serious misconduct. Definitions of these are set out in appendix one
- a. Serious breach of examination regulations;
  - b. Conducting research without favourable ethical opinion;
  - c. Contract cheating
  - d. Personation

## 4. Scope – who is covered by this policy?

**The Academic Integrity policy applies to all Nottingham Trent University students with the exception of those named in the explanatory notes below.**

## Requirements

- 4.1 This policy applies to all students currently enrolled with the University, including on part-time and distance learning courses, credit only courses and apprenticeships; except for research degree students for whom a separate policy applies.

### Explanatory notes

- Research Degree Students are subject to Quality Handbook Section 17D: Procedure for Investigating Alleged Research Misconduct
- Students studying on courses with a collaborative partner are subject to the policy of the institution undertaking the assessment.

## 5. Developing good academic practice

- 5.1 All students have a responsibility to develop and engage in good academic practices so that they can act with academic integrity.

# Section 17C

- 5.2 The University will support you to develop these practices, and to understand what constitutes academic misconduct, this includes (but is not limited to):
- a. [NTU online course on Plagiarism](#) and other sessions provided by Libraries and Learning Resources;
  - b. The opportunity to check Turnitin reports before final submission of assessment and to amend the work to take account of any issues flagged;
  - c. Formative assessment opportunities;
  - d. Resources produced by your School.
- 5.3 You are expected to engage with these and any development opportunities provided to you.

## 6. Identification of potential academic misconduct

**Where a module leader, or nominee, identifies that assessment or other behaviours do not meet expected academic integrity standards proportionate action is taken.**

### Requirements

- 6.1 A Module Leader, or nominee, may suspect that your assessment, or other behaviours, do not meet expected academic integrity standards.
- 6.2 Where this is the case, they will produce a factual written statement, supported by any evidence such as Turnitin reports within **15 working days** of the assessment deadline, assessment submission or breach (whichever is later). This is then provided to the relevant Academic Integrity Lead, or nominee, for further investigation.
- 6.3 The School Academic Integrity Lead, or nominee, will review the statement and supporting evidence and determine any further action that needs to be taken under this policy, which might be:
- a. The need to improve academic integrity;
  - b. An academic misconduct investigation; or
  - c. A serious academic misconduct investigation.

The School Academic Integrity Lead will determine an outcome within **five working days** of receiving the report. The action taken in each case is detailed below.

# 17C

## Section

### 7. Improving academic integrity

**You may, on occasion, breach academic integrity standards, for example, by not referencing the sources you have used in your work appropriately. The improving academic integrity aspect of this policy is designed to support you to improve your academic practice in future assessments.**

- 7.1 The Improving Academic Integrity policy can be applied at any level of study and is used to manage more limited, potentially accidental forms of poor academic practice, which might include:
- a. A lack of understanding of scholarly practice and appropriate academic attribution, such as unattributed quotations, limited paraphrasing, reproducing an existing concept or idea unintentionally, missing or incorrect citations, paragraphs of word for word copying without source acknowledgement, unacknowledged help with linguistic components of assessments, reproducing an existing creative output or design, work that is overly derivative in terms of form, content or presentations, or unacknowledged use of digital resources in any form.
  - b. Violations of the NTU Turnitin policy.
- 7.2 The Improving Academic Integrity process is the only one used for all first summative assessments on a course except where there is clear evidence of serious academic misconduct.
- 7.3 Where the Academic Integrity Lead, or nominee, deems that you need to improve your academic integrity, you will receive an Improving Academic Integrity notice within **five working days** of the School Academic Integrity Lead decision which outlines the areas that require improvement and why.
- 7.4 You will be invited to attend a discussion with your Personal Tutor, or nominee, within **ten working days** of the date the Improving Academic Integrity notice was sent, at which you will have the opportunity to respond to the points raised and to agree a support plan which might include, but is not limited to,
- a. Engaging with developmental materials;
  - b. Undertaking an academic practice development course provided by the School or a Professional Service; and/or
  - c. A referral to Student Support Services.
- 7.5 If you choose not to attend the discussion, the Personal Tutor, or nominee, will determine a support plan in your absence and a copy will be sent to you.
- 7.6 The Improving Academic Integrity notice and details of the support plan will be recorded on the Student file. Because this is a developmental process, this information will not be used in any subsequent written academic references.
- 7.7 All students have a responsibility to complete the support plan provided. Should you choose not to engage with the support plan, this will be noted on your Student file and may inform the outcome of any future allegations of academic misconduct.



# Section 17C

- 7.8 If you received a pass grade on the original assessment, this grade will stand and there will be no penalties applied. If you received below a pass grade for your original assessment (marginal fail or below) you may be required by the Board of Examiners to resubmit the work, and the grade will capped at a low 3<sup>rd</sup> or pass.
- 7.9 Where concurrent requirements to improve academic integrity are identified on more than one assessment submitted within a ten working day window, these will be considered as a single case, and will inform the support plan.
- 7.10 Where two or more separate and non-concurrent breaches of academic integrity are identified during the course of your studies this will automatically require an academic misconduct investigation.
- 7.11 You have the right to appeal an Improving Academic Integrity notice (see section 14 below).

## 8. Academic misconduct investigation

**An academic misconduct investigation takes place when a student has two or more non-concurrent cases of Improving Academic Integrity or where there is evidence of misconduct beyond needing to improve Academic Integrity.**

- 8.1 Academic misconduct can apply to all levels of study but there is an assumption of increasing seriousness as you progress through your studies on the basis that you should have developed awareness of good academic practice and be able to act with academic integrity.
- 8.2 Where potential academic misconduct is identified on more than one assessment submitted within a ten working day window, these will be investigated as a single case, and will inform the outcome accordingly.
- 8.3 Where the School Academic Integrity Lead, or nominee, determines that an academic misconduct investigation is required you will be sent a notification within **five working days** of the School Academic Integrity Lead decision inviting you to attend an interview with the School Academic Integrity Lead, or nominee within **five working days** of the date the notification is sent.
- 8.4 You are allowed to provide a written statement and any supporting evidence regarding the allegation to be considered at the interview. This should be submitted to the School Academic Integrity Lead, or nominee, at least **two working days** before the interview.
- 8.5 You are permitted to bring one person with you to the interview for support. This person may be a friend, partner, representative of Nottingham Trent Student's Union Information Advice Service or other appropriate person. You are not allowed legal representation at the interview.
- 8.6 You may decide to admit the allegations of misconduct. Where this is the case, you should submit your admission in writing to the School Academic Integrity Lead, or nominee, at least **two working days** before the interview. The Academic Integrity Lead will take your admission into consideration when determining any penalty to be applied, and this may result in a lesser penalty.

# Section 17C

- 8.7 Where you admit the allegation in advance, you may choose not to attend the interview, and the matter will be dealt with summarily.
- 8.8 An administrator will be present at your interview to take minutes and record decisions.
- 8.9 At the interview you will be given the opportunity to discuss the allegations of misconduct and to present any evidence you may have.
- 8.10 If you are unable to attend the interview date for valid reasons, such as illness, you should contact the meeting convenor at least **two working days** before the original interview date and request an alternate date. The University will agree to an alternate date on a single occasion.
- 8.11 If you do not attend the interview, and do not request an alternate date, the School Academic Integrity Lead, or nominee, will determine an outcome on the basis of the evidence available.
- 8.12 Outcomes are determined on the balance of probabilities.
- 8.13 The School Academic Integrity Lead, or nominee, will determine one of the following outcomes withing **five working days** of the interview. The academic misconduct allegation is:
- a. not upheld as there is no case to answer;
  - b. not upheld and deemed to be a case of Improving Academic Integrity;
  - c. admitted and upheld;
  - d. not admitted and upheld;
  - e. deemed to be serious academic misconduct.
- 8.14 Where the academic misconduct allegation is **not upheld and there is no case to answer** all record of the investigation will be removed from your file and minutes produced at the meeting will be destroyed. There will be no impact on your assessment grade.
- 8.15 Where the academic misconduct allegation is **not upheld and deemed to be a case of Improving Academic Integrity** a support plan will be produced and shared with you. The Improving Academic Integrity outcome will be recorded on your Student file.
- 8.16 Where the academic misconduct allegation is **admitted and upheld** the School Academic Integrity Lead, or nominee, will recommend an appropriately reduced penalty from the Penalty Framework to the Board of Examiners. The outcome will indicate what the penalty would have been had the misconduct not been admitted. The outcome will be recorded and you may be required by the Board of Examiners to retake the assessment at the next available opportunity.
- 8.17 Where the academic misconduct allegation is **not admitted and upheld** the School Academic Integrity Lead, or nominee, will recommend a penalty from the Penalty Framework to the Board of Examiners. The outcome will be recorded and you may be required by the Board of Examiners to retake the assessment at the next available opportunity.

# Section 17C

8.18 Where the investigation determines that the case should be considered as **Serious Academic Misconduct**, it will be referred to a Serious Academic Misconduct Panel, regardless of whether you admitted the misconduct or not.

## 9. Serious academic misconduct investigation

**Where a case is determined to be serious academic misconduct, either at the outset or as a result of an academic misconduct investigation, a panel of independent academic colleagues is formed to investigate.**

- 9.1 Serious academic misconduct is determined either by the extent of the misconduct, evidence of clear intent to deceive or gain substantial advantage, or where there is a second allegation of non-concurrent academic misconduct, having previously had an upheld outcome.
- 9.2 Where potential serious academic misconduct is identified on more than one assessment submitted within a ten working day window, these will be investigated as a single case, and will inform the outcome accordingly.
- 9.3 Where the School Academic Integrity Lead, or nominee, determines that a serious academic misconduct investigation is required you will be sent a notification within **five working days** of the School Academic Integrity Lead decision outlining the allegations made and inviting you to attend a Serious Academic Misconduct Hearing within **ten working days** of the date the notification is sent.
- 9.4 You are allowed to provide a written statement and any supporting evidence (including witness statements) regarding the allegation to be considered at the hearing. This should be submitted to the Panel Chair, at least **two working days** before the hearing.
- 9.5 You are permitted to bring one person with you to the hearing for support. This person may be a friend, partner, relative, representative of Nottingham Trent Student's Union Information Advice Service or other appropriate person. You are not allowed legal representation at the hearing.
- 9.6 You may decide to admit the allegations of serious misconduct. Where this is the case, you should submit your admission to the Panel Chair at least **two working days** before the hearing. The Panel will take your admission into consideration when determining any penalty to be applied, and this may result in a lesser penalty. You still need to attend the hearing regardless of your admission.
- 9.7 An administrator will be present at your hearing and will record who was present, a brief outline of the proceedings, and the reasons for the decisions taken, including any penalty applied.
- 9.8 At the hearing you will be given the opportunity to discuss the allegations of misconduct and to present any evidence you may have. The Panel has the right to ask questions and to seek verification of any evidence presented.
- 9.9 Both you and the School are able to invite witnesses to give evidence at your hearing. Details of any witness you intend to invite must be provided to the Panel Convenor at least **five working days** before the hearing. You will be informed in

# Section 17C

writing **five working days** in advance of the details of any witnesses the School intends to invite.

- 9.10 The Chair of the Panel has the discretion to include any written statements, evidence or witness received outside of the specified timeframes.
- 9.11 You are normally expected to attend the hearing in person. If you are unable to do so for valid reasons you should inform the Chair of the Panel at least **two working days** before the hearing. The Chair may allow the hearing to take place via alternative means, for example MS Teams.
- 9.12 If you are unable to attend the hearing date for valid reasons, such as illness, you should contact the meeting convenor at least **two working days** before the original hearing date and request an alternate date. The Chair will determine whether your reasons for non-attendance are accepted and if so, will reconvene the hearing within **ten working days**. The University will only reconvene a hearing on a single occasion.
- 9.13 If you do not attend the hearing, and do not request an alternate date, the Panel will proceed in your absence and will determine an outcome on the basis of the evidence available.
- 9.14 Outcomes are determined on the balance of probabilities.
- 9.15 The Panel, will determine one of the following outcomes within **five working days** of the hearing. The serious academic misconduct allegation is:
- a. not upheld as there is no case to answer;
  - b. not upheld and deemed to be a case of Improving Academic Integrity;
  - c. not upheld and deemed to be a case of academic misconduct;
  - d. admitted and upheld;
  - e. not admitted and upheld.
- 9.16 Where the serious academic misconduct allegation is **not upheld and there is no case to answer** all record of the investigation will be removed from your file and minutes produced at the hearing will be destroyed. There will be no impact on your assessment grade.
- 9.17 Where the serious academic misconduct allegation is **not upheld and deemed to be a case of Improving Academic Integrity** a support plan will be produced and shared with you. The Improving Academic Integrity outcome will be recorded on your Student file.
- 9.18 Where the serious academic misconduct allegation is **not upheld and deemed to be a case of academic misconduct** the Panel will recommend a penalty from the Penalty Framework to the Board of Examiners. The outcome will be recorded and you may be required by the Board of Examiners to retake the assessment at the next available opportunity.
- 9.19 Where the serious academic misconduct allegation is **admitted and upheld** the Panel, will recommend an appropriately reduced penalty from the Penalty Framework to the Board of Examiners. The outcome will indicate what the penalty would have been had the serious misconduct not been admitted. The outcome will

# Section 17C

be recorded and you will be required by the Board of Examiners to retake the assessment at the next available opportunity.

- 9.20 Where the serious academic misconduct allegation is **not admitted and upheld** the Panel, will recommend a penalty from the Penalty Framework to the Board of Examiners. The outcome will be recorded and you will be required by the Board of Examiners to retake the assessment at the next available opportunity.

## 10. Composition of the Serious Academic Misconduct Panel

**The Serious Academic Misconduct Panel shall be formed of suitably independent and trained members of academic staff.**

### Requirements

- 10.1 Membership of the Serious Academic Misconduct Panel is determined by the Executive Dean of your School, or nominee, and shall comprise:
- a. A Head of Department, or suitably experience nominee, as Chair;
  - b. A minimum of two other academic colleagues from a list of trained people in the School; and
  - c. An administrator from the School.
- 10.2 Chairs must be drawn from a different department to the one you are studying in and must not be the Chair of the Board of Examiners for your course.
- 10.3 Panel members must have had no previous direct contact with you, the module in question or the Board of Examiners for your course.
- 10.4 All panel members must receive appropriate training from Academic Registry prior to being on a panel. They must also be up to date with equality and diversity, unconscious bias, and white privilege essential learning at the time of the panel.
- 10.5 You will be informed in advance of who will be on the Panel.
- 10.6 Where it is not possible to convene a panel of people who are suitably independent, panel members may be drawn from other Schools.

## 11. Conduct of the Serious Academic Misconduct Panel

**Panels will conduct hearings fairly and in accordance with defined processes.**

### Requirements

- 11.1 The panel will meet privately before the hearing starts to consider the evidence and to agree any questions that will be asked to you and any witnesses attending.

# Section 17C

11.2 The panel will conduct the hearing in accordance with standard processes which include:

- a. Introduction: outlining the reasons for the hearing and the format;
- b. Presentation by School representatives;
- c. Questions from the panel to School representatives;
- d. Questions from you to School representatives;
- e. Statement from you;
- f. Questions from the panel to you;
- g. Questions from the School representatives to you;
- h. Closing statement from you.

11.3 The panel will conduct its deliberations in private and will agree on formal outcomes on the basis of all of the evidence provided.

11.4 An outcome letter will be sent to you within **five working days** of the hearing.

## 12. Investigating complex academic misconduct cases

**In some cases establishing academic misconduct may require the evidential basis for a case to be established prior to an interview or Serious Academic Misconduct Panel taking place**

### Requirements

- 12.1 Establishing academic misconduct or serious academic misconduct can be more complex in some cases, for example where the allegations are as a result of suspect software-based text/image modification or contract cheating.
- 12.2 In such cases, the School reserves the right to undertake investigative meetings ahead of interviews or Serious Academic Misconduct Panels taking place.
- 12.3 Investigative meetings are designed to establish the evidential basis on which the allegations are made and may include, for example, detailed scrutiny by an independent expert into your understanding of issues, or linguistic understanding of syntax, grammar and vocabulary used in an assessment.
- 12.4 Investigative meetings result in a report which is then presented as evidence as part of the investigation.
- 12.5 Where investigative meetings need to be held, the timelines for any subsequent investigation will be adjusted accordingly, and you will be provided with revised timescales in writing.

# Section 17C

## 13. Penalty framework

**The University has a transparent, fair and proportionate penalty framework for cases of upheld academic and serious academic misconduct which are applied consistently.**

### Requirements

13.1 The following penalties may be recommended to the Board of Examiners by the School Academic Integrity Lead in cases of upheld academic misconduct.

Penalty
The assessment is capped at low 3 <sup>rd</sup> or pass (where there are multiple elements/sub-elements of assessment)
The module is capped at low 3 <sup>rd</sup> or pass (where there is a single element of assessment)
The assessment is capped at zero (where there are multiple elements/sub-elements of assessment)
The module is capped at zero (where there is a single element of assessment)

13.2 Assessment that has been subject to an academic misconduct investigation will not be graded until after the investigation process has been completed. In cases of upheld academic misconduct, where the work is deemed to have passed, the recommended penalty will be applied. Where the work is deemed not to have passed, the Board of Examiners may allow reassessment at the next opportunity, where appropriate. The penalty will then be applied to any reassessed work that has subsequently passed.

13.3 The following are the penalties that may be applied in cases of upheld serious academic misconduct. In all cases of upheld serious academic misconduct the assessment is deemed to have failed. Where reassessment is permitted by the Board of Examiners this will be at the next available opportunity.

Penalty	Reassessment
Overall module grade is capped at zero	Reassessment may be permitted by the Board of Examiners, where appropriate.  If passed at reassessment the credit for the module will be awarded in recognition of the achievement of the learning outcomes but a zero-module grade is recorded, regardless of the grades

# Section 17C

	achieved in any other elements/sub-elements of assessment.
Placement Certificate / Diploma is not awarded	Reassessment or retaking of the placement is not permitted.
No credit given for the module (including credit bearing placement modules)	Reassessment is not permitted. It will not be possible to achieve the credit required for the award. A suitable interim award will be determined, where applicable.
Termination of studies	Reassessment is not permitted. The final award will not be achieved and a suitable interim award will be determined, where applicable.

- 13.4 When determining a penalty, the decision maker (either the School Academic Integrity Lead or the Panel) will take into account the following:
- The number and outcome of any previous upheld cases of improving academic integrity or academic misconduct;
  - The nature and extent of the alleged misconduct/serious misconduct.
  - The stage you are at in your studies.
- 13.5 In all cases the decision maker should give reasons for the penalty selected, including why a lesser penalty was not suitable in the particular case.
- 13.6 There may be times when a particular case does not fit with the penalty framework. In such cases an alternate penalty may be deemed appropriate. The decision to use an alternate penalty should be referred to the Board of Examiners for approval.
- 13.7 For some courses, Professional, Statutory and Regulatory Bodies may require adjustments to the penalty framework. These changes must be approved by the School Academic Standards and Quality Committee, and be communicated to all affected students, staff and to Academic Registry for the purposes of appeals.
- 13.8 To ensure consistent decision making, anonymised summary records of offences and the penalties applied will be kept by Academic Registry and made available to decision makers for reference.

## 14. Right of appeal

**All students have the right to appeal an upheld outcome and/or the penalty applied.**



# 17C

## Section

### Requirements

- 14.1 You can appeal the outcome of an Improving Academic Integrity, academic misconduct or serious academic misconduct outcome on the following grounds:
- a. That the University failed to follow the procedures set out in this policy at any stage in the process;
  - b. You now have new and relevant evidence that was not available for consideration at an earlier stage in the process; or
  - c. The decision was unreasonable in the circumstances or the penalty imposed was disproportionate or not permitted under the penalty framework.
- 14.2 To submit an appeal you must do this in writing via the NTU Appeals Portal within **five working days** of the date on the outcomes letter. You must clearly outline the reasons for your appeal, the grounds you are appealing on and submit any supporting evidence you have. Appeals without a clear explanation of grounds or where no new evidence has been provided alongside the submission will be rejected.
- 14.3 If your appeal is received later than five working days of the date on the outcome letter without good reason the appeal will be rejected and you will be issued with a Completion of Procedures letter.
- 14.4 If you have valid reasons for late submission of your appeal you should outline these in your submission and provide supporting evidence. The Academic Registrar, or nominee, will review your reasons and evidence and determine whether the late appeal can be accepted. Where the appeal is rejected you will be informed of the reasons and issued with a Completion of Procedures letter.
- 14.5 The Academic Registrar, or nominee, will review the appeal and determine whether it meets one or more of the grounds for appeal.
- 14.6 Where it is determined that the appeal **does not** meet one or more of the grounds for appeal, you will be informed within **15 working days** of submission and will be issued with a Completion of Procedures letter. This decision is final and there is no further right of appeal within the University's procedures.
- 14.7 If your appeal is deemed to meet one or more of the permitted grounds the Academic Registrar, or nominee, will refer the submission back to the School for reconsideration and action.
- 14.8 The School will then either:
- a. ask the Academic Integrity Lead, or nominee, or Chair of the Serious Academic Misconduct Panel to review the appeal and to take Chair's action as appropriate; or
  - b. convene a new Serious Academic Misconduct Panel with new membership to consider the case again.
- 14.9 Reconsideration by the School does not guarantee a change in the original outcome or penalty. You will be informed of the outcome of the reconsideration within **10 working days** of Chairs Action being taken or within **five working days** of a reconvened Serious Academic Misconduct Panel. The decision at this stage is final and there is no further right of appeal within the University's procedures.

# Section 17C

## 15. Appeal Hearing

**In exceptional circumstances, the Academic Registrar, or nominee, may deem that there have been considerable failings in the Schools processes and that it is appropriate to convene an Appeal Hearing to consider the appeal.**

### Requirements

- 15.1 The Appeal Hearing will be convened by Academic Registry within **15 working days** of the decision.
- 15.2 The Appeal Panel shall comprise three members; an Executive Dean or other suitably experienced member of staff as Chair, a member of trained academic staff from a different School, and a representative of the NTSU Executive.
- 15.3 A member of Academic Registry staff will be present at the hearing to record who was present, provide a brief outline of the proceedings, and the reasons for the decisions taken, including any changes to the original decisions.
- 15.4 You will receive **10 working days'** notice of the hearing date and will receive copies of all documentation associated with your case, including a copy of the minutes taken at earlier stages in the process.
- 15.5 You are normally expected to attend the hearing in person. If you are unable to do so for valid reasons you should inform Academic Registry at least **two working days** before the hearing. The Chair may allow the hearing to take place via alternative means, for example MS Teams.
- 15.6 If you are unable to attend the hearing date for valid reasons, such as illness, you should contact Academic Registry before hearing is due to start and request an alternate date. The Chair will determine whether your reasons for non-attendance are accepted and if so, will reconvene the hearing within **ten working days**. The University will only reconvene a hearing on a single occasion.
- 15.7 If you do not attend the hearing, and do not request an alternate date, the Panel will proceed in your absence and will determine an outcome on the basis of the evidence available.
- 15.8 You are permitted to bring one person with you to the hearing for support (see paragraph 16.1).
- 15.9 The Appeal Panel will not reinvestigate the allegations of academic misconduct or serious academic misconduct but will review the original outcomes on the basis of the grounds for appeal.
- 15.10 At the hearing, you will be invited to present your grounds for appeal. A representative of the School will attend for part of the hearing to present the grounds on which the original outcomes were based.
- 15.11 The Panel, will determine one of the following outcomes withing **five working days** of the hearing. The appeal is:

# Section 17C

- a. not upheld and the original outcome stands;
- b. upheld and the original outcome is overturned; or
- c. upheld and the School is required to convene a new investigation of the case.

You will receive the outcome in writing with reasons for the decisions made.

15.12 The decision of the Appeal Panel is final and there is no further right of appeal within the University's procedures.

## 16. Role of the Board of Examiners

**The Board of Examiners receives the outcome of all upheld academic misconduct and serious academic misconduct cases and makes decisions in the context of your overall academic profile.**

### Requirements

- 16.1 The Board of Examiners will not revisit the outcome of the original investigation but will consider the penalty in the context of your overall academic profile.
- 16.2 The Board of Examiners can determine whether reassessment is permitted.
- 16.3 Where a penalty results in you not being able to achieve sufficient credit to meet the intended award, the Board of Examiners will agree a suitable interim award, where applicable.
- 16.4 The Board of Examiners will take into account any substantial mitigating circumstances that it is aware of, for example through a notification of extenuating circumstances submission. The Board has the right to apply mitigation in such circumstances where appropriate.
- 16.5 Where there is upheld academic misconduct or serious academic misconduct on a final attempt at an assessment, and the work has not passed, the Board of Examiners will not permit reassessment. The consequences of this will be considered by the Board.

## 17. Support for students

**Students are encouraged to seek support with any stage of this policy should they need it.**

# Section 17C

## Requirements

- 17.1 You have the right to be accompanied to any meeting or hearing arranged as part of an investigation. This person may be a fellow student, friend, partner, relative or NTSU Information Advice Service Advisor. This person is known as a supporter.
- 17.2 The role of a supporter is to provide support and advice to you. You are expected to engage with the process yourself and there is no automatic right for a supporter to communicate on your behalf. The University reserves the right not to engage with your supporter if, in the view of the university, they do not behave in an acceptable manner, respect the nature of the role, or attempt to disrupt or delay the process.
- 17.3 You can seek independent advice from the Students' Union [Information and Advice Service](#) at any stage in this policy.
- 17.4 You may seek advice from academic or other members of staff at the University.
- 17.5 If you are under 18 years of age and subject to an allegation of serious academic misconduct, the University will notify the parent/guardian of this and will keep them informed of progress unless the student expressly asks us not to.
- 17.6 NTU provides a number of support services. You are encouraged to engage with these services and take up any appropriate support available. Students can:
  - a. find out what support is available from [Student Services](#)
  - b. [speak with a support adviser](#)
  - c. get support from the [NTSU advice centre](#).
- 17.7 The NTSU [peer-support scheme](#) offers support from students to students with similar experiences, problems or conditions. It is free, confidential and independent from NTU.

## 18. Reconsidering the same offence

**An allegation of academic misconduct or serious academic misconduct may be reconsidered if new evidence emerges which, for good reason, could not have been considered at the time.**

## Requirements

- 18.1 In making a decision whether or not to reconsider a case, the following should be taken into account:
  - a. Whether the new evidence is likely to materially change the original outcome;
  - b. The length of time that has elapsed and the effect of this on the reliability of any evidence;
  - c. The severity of the original misconduct;

# Section 17C

- d. The impact on the student of undergoing a second investigation;
  - e. Whether leaving the matter unaddressed would impact on matters of fitness to practice or PSRB requirements.
- 18.2 Where it is determined that the case should be reinvestigated on the basis of new evidence, the procedures in sections 8 or 9 of this policy should be followed.

## 19. Misconduct that is identified after the student has graduated

**Potential academic misconduct or serious academic misconduct may be investigated up to one year after conferment of the award**

### Requirements

- 19.1 In making a decision whether or not to investigate alleged misconduct after conferment, the following should be taken into account:
- a. Whether the new evidence is likely to materially change the original outcome;
  - b. The length of time that has elapsed and the effect of this on the reliability of any evidence;
  - c. The severity of the alleged misconduct and the potential impact of the outcome on the student's award or classification;
  - d. Whether leaving the matter unaddressed would impact on matters of fitness to practice or PSRB requirements.
- 19.2 Where it is determined that the case should be investigated the procedures in sections 8 or 9 of this policy should be followed.

## 20. Independent external review

**In the event that you are not satisfied with the outcome of an appeal you can make a complaint to the Office of the Independent Adjudicator (OIA).**

### Requirements

- 20.1 In order to submit a complaint to the OIA you must have first completed all of the University's appeal procedures for alleged academic misconduct/serious academic misconduct.
- 20.2 At the conclusion of our appeal procedures we will issue you will a Completion of Procedures Letter.

# Section 17C

- 20.3 A complaint must be submitted to the OIA within 12 months of the date of your Completion of Procedures Letter from the University and must be submitted using the OIA's form. The Completion of Procedures Letter must be included with the submission.
- 20.4 Further information can be found on the OIA's website at [www.oiahe.org.uk](http://www.oiahe.org.uk).

# Section 17C

## 21. Appendix one: definitions

### 21.1 The following are definitions of potential academic misconduct

Academic misconduct type	Definition
<b>Collusion</b>	Working with other students on an assessment meant for individual submission  Sharing your work with other students enabling them to plagiarise your ideas
<b>Fabrication, falsification or misrepresentation</b>	Fabrication, falsification or misrepresentation of data, results or other outputs or aspects of research  Fabrication, falsification or misrepresentation of a placement or work-like experience
<b>Minor breach of examination regulations and conduct</b>	Action designed to seek an unfair advantage in an examination, including: <ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>a. Attempting to communicate with another candidate during an examination (either in-person or by electronic means)</li><li>b. Communicating with anyone other than the invigilator or another authorised member of staff during an examination</li></ul>
<b>Misuse of the Notification of Extenuating Circumstances policy</b>	The falsification of evidence submitted in support of a Notification of Extenuating Circumstances.
<b>Plagiarism</b>	Presenting someone else's ideas as your own in a substantial proportion of your work, with or without consent, by incorporating it into assessment without full acknowledgement, including: <ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>c. Self-plagiarism: reproducing or representing work for assessment without proper attribution and attempting to gain credit for this work where credit has already been received</li><li>d. Paraphrasing: rephrasing a source's ideas without proper attribution</li></ul>

# Section 17C

	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>e. Mosaic plagiarism/patchworking: weaving phrases and text from several sources into your own work; and/or adjusting sentences without quotation marks or attribution</li> <li>f. Source-based plagiarism: providing inaccurate or incomplete information about sources such that they cannot be found</li> <li>g. Computer code plagiarism: copying or adapting source code without permission from and attribution to the original creator</li> </ul>
<b>Software-based Text or Image Modification</b>	<p>Taking content written by another and running it through a software tool (text spinner, translation engine) to evade plagiarism detection.</p> <p>The use of Google Translate or any other multilingual machine translation service for written assessments, where the use of the translation service is intended to provide a false indication of linguistic ability.</p> <p>Use of Artificial Intelligence agents to the extent that the ideas are no longer your own</p>
<b>Academic dishonesty</b>	Any other form of dishonest academic practice not identified within the above categories and definitions.

## 21.2 The following are definitions of potential serious academic misconduct

Academic misconduct type	Definition
<b>Breach of exam regulations and conduct</b>	<p>Action designed to seek a considerable unfair advantage in an examination, including:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>a. Bringing any written or electronic materials into the examination, unless expressly permitted</li> <li>b. Unauthorised annotation of authorised materials</li> <li>c. Gaining access to unauthorised material relating to an examination before or during the exam</li> </ul>



# Section 17C

	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>d. Obtaining a copy of an examination paper in advance of the date and time for its authorised release</li> <li>e. Sharing exam answers both in an exam room or in an online exam</li> </ul>
<b>Conducting research without favourable ethical opinion</b>	<p>Failure to seek and obtain, where required, favourable ethical opinion from a recognised research ethics committee</p> <p>Failure to carry out research in line with a proposal reviewed and approved by the research ethics committee</p>
<b>Contract cheating</b>	Engaging a third party (for free, for pay, or in-kind) to complete an assessment or part thereof and representing that as your own work.
<b>Personation</b>	<p>The assumption by one person of the identity of another person with the intent to deceive, or to gain unfair advantage, including:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>a. in an examination or other timed or in-person assessment</li> <li>b. in a placement or other work-like experience</li> </ul>
<b>Extensive misconduct</b>	Significant levels of plagiarism, collusion, falsification, or software-based text modification such that less than 50% of the substantive work is your own.

# Section 17C

<b>Policy owner</b>
Academic Registry

<b>Change history</b>			
<i>Version:</i>	<i>Approval date:</i>	<i>Implementation date:</i>	<i>Nature of significant revisions:</i>
Sept 2023	14.09.23	01.10.23	New policy

<b>Equality Analysis</b>		
<i>Version:</i>	<i>EA date:</i>	<i>Completed by:</i>