

# Section 17C



Nottingham Trent  
University

## Quality Handbook

Part E: Regulations

### Section 17C: Academic Integrity - Requirements

# Section 17C

## Contents

1. Introduction.....	2
2. Principles.....	2
3. Support for you .....	3
4. Developing good academic practice.....	4
5. Identification of potential academic misconduct .....	4
6. Improving academic integrity .....	5
7. Academic misconduct review.....	7
8. Serious academic misconduct review .....	8
9. Outcomes .....	10
10. Right of appeal .....	12
11. Appeal Hearing .....	13
12. Independent external review .....	14
13. Appendix 1: Composition of the Serious Academic Misconduct Panel.....	16
14. Appendix 2: Investigating complex academic misconduct cases .....	17
15. Appendix 3: Role of the Board of Examiners .....	18
16. Appendix 4: Reconsidering the same misconduct .....	19
17. Appendix 5: Misconduct that is identified after the student has graduated .....	20
18. Appendix 6: Definitions.....	21

# Section 17C

## 1. Introduction

---

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

- 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 work of others as your own, whether that work was produced by a person or machine including AI tools.
  - d. conducting research ethically.
  - e. reporting truthfully on your research.
  - f. acting in an ethical manner in your academic studies.
- 1.3 Not following 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 those of you who achieve their qualifications by entirely legitimate means.
- 1.4 Anyone not demonstrating academic integrity will be subject to review and potential action under this policy.
- 1.5 If you are encountering difficulties in your studies you should seek guidance and support from your School, and, as appropriate, from Student Support Services.
- 1.6 The policy applies to all students except those on research degrees or studying at a partner institution.

## 2. Principles

---

**This policy is designed to ensure that you are treated fairly with regards to Academic Integrity.**

- 2.1 The policy is designed to promote positive behaviours by supporting and developing you to engage in good academic practice and act with academic integrity.

# Section 17C

- 2.2 Throughout this process we will ensure that you are treated fairly and consistently. Therefore the University will ensure that:
- a. expected standards of behaviour are made clear and detail is provided about how the University will respond where these standards are not met;
  - b. there is independent consideration at each stage of the process to avoid potential bias;
  - c. reasons are given all for actions and decisions made;
  - d. timescales for reviews are fair and give reasonable notice of attendance at meetings;
  - e. the policy is applied consistently to everyone;
  - f. you will have a fair hearing;
  - g. there is a right of appeal against any outcome;
  - h. information is treated as confidential and is only shared with those who need it to make decisions or provide support.
- 2.3 The University will ensure that everyone with protected characteristics, as defined under the Equality Act 2010, is treated fairly and without discrimination.
- 2.4 This policy applies regardless of intent to commit academic misconduct.
- 2.5 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 considered to be necessary or appropriate in the circumstances.
- 2.6 The University can transfer cases of alleged academic misconduct to another policy or procedure if it is considered to be necessary, for example to be investigated via the Student Code of Behaviour.
- 2.7 In cases where you admit an allegation, this policy allows for the matter to proceed without the need to hold a formal meeting/hearing

## 3. Support for you

---

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

- 3.1 You have the right to be accompanied to any meeting or hearing arranged as part of a review. This person may be another student, friend, partner, relative or NTSU Information Advice Service Advisor. This person is known as a supporter.
- 3.2 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 may decide not to engage with your supporter if, in our, they do not behave in an acceptable manner, respect the nature of the role, or attempt to disrupt or delay the process.

# Section 17C

- 3.3 You can seek independent advice from the Students' Union [Information and Advice Service](#) at any stage in this policy.
- 3.4 You may seek advice from academic or other members of staff at the University.
- 3.5 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.
- 3.6 NTU provides a number of support services. You are encouraged to engage with these services and take up any appropriate support available. You 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](#).
- 3.7 The NTSU [peer-support scheme](#) offers you support from others with similar experiences, problems or conditions. It is free, confidential and independent from NTU.

## 4. Developing good academic practice

---

**Good academic practice is about making sure that anybody who reads your work can easily identify your thoughts and ideas and can distinguish these from the thoughts and ideas of others.**

- 4.1 You have a responsibility to develop and engage in good academic practices so that you can act with academic integrity.
- 4.2 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](#) plus other sessions and resources 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.
- 4.3 You are expected to engage with these and any development opportunities provided to you.

## 5. Identification of potential academic misconduct

---

# Section 17C

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

- 5.1 A Module Leader, or nominee, may have concerns that your assessment, or other behaviours, do not meet the expected academic integrity standards set out in this policy.
- 5.2 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 review.
- 5.3 The School Academic Integrity Lead, or nominee, will review the statement and supporting evidence and decide on any further action to be taken under this policy, which might be:
  - a. The need to improve academic integrity;
  - b. An academic misconduct review; or
  - c. A serious academic misconduct review.

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

## 6. Improving academic integrity

---

**The Improving Academic Integrity aspect of this policy is designed to support you to improve your academic practice in future assessments.**

**An example would be that you might, on occasions, breach academic integrity standards, by not referencing the sources you have used in your work appropriately.**

- 6.1 The University recognises that making mistakes is an important part of the learning process, so the Improving Academic Integrity policy can be used to manage more limited, potentially accidental forms of poor academic practice, which might include:

Lack of understanding of scholarly practice and appropriate academic attribution, such as;

  - a. unattributed quotations;
  - b. limited paraphrasing;
  - c. reproducing an existing concept or idea unintentionally;

# Section 17C

- d. missing or incorrect citations;
  - e. paragraphs of word for word copying without acknowledgement;
  - f. unacknowledged help with linguistic components of assessments;
  - g. reproducing an existing creative output or design;
  - h. work that is overly derivative in terms of form, content or presentations, or;
  - i. unacknowledged use of digital resources in any form;
  - j. violations of the NTU Turnitin policy.
- 6.2 To support you to develop good academic practice, the Improving Academic Integrity process is the only one used for all first summative assessments that provide an understanding of your overall learning (they may include class tests, assignments, exams, presentations or projects) on a course except where there is clear evidence of serious academic misconduct.
- 6.3 Where the Academic Integrity Lead, or nominee, considers that you need to improve your academic practice, you will receive further communications within **five working days** of this decision including an outline of the areas that require improvement and why.
- 6.4 You will be invited to 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.
- 6.5 If you choose not to attend the discussion, the Personal Tutor, or nominee, will agree a support plan in your absence and a copy will be sent to you.
- 6.6 The Improving Academic Integrity notice and details of the support plan will be recorded on your Student file. Because this is a developmental process, this information will not be used in any later written academic references.
- 6.7 You 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.
- 6.8 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 to resubmit the work, and the grade will be capped at a low 3<sup>rd</sup> or pass.
- 6.9 Where requirements to improve academic integrity are identified on more than one assessment submitted within ten working days, these will be considered as a single case, and will inform the support plan.
- 6.10 Where two or more separate breaches of academic integrity are identified during the course of your studies this will automatically require an academic misconduct review.

# Section 17C

6.11 You have the right to appeal any outcome of the Improving Academic Integrity process. You should submit your appeal in writing to the Head of Department who will review the case and decide whether to approve or reject your appeal.

## 7. Academic misconduct review

**An academic misconduct review takes place when a student has two or more separate cases of Improving Academic Integrity or where there is evidence of potential misconduct beyond needing to improve Academic Integrity.**

- 7.1 Academic misconduct can apply to all levels of study but there is an assumption of increasing seriousness as you progress through your studies. This because with each assessment you complete you should develop awareness of good academic practice and be able to act with academic integrity.
- 7.2 Where potential academic misconduct is identified on more than one assessment submitted within a ten working day window, these will be reviewed as a single case, and will inform the outcome accordingly.
- 7.3 Where the School Academic Integrity Lead, or nominee, decides that an academic misconduct review is required you will be informed within **five working days** of this decision inviting you to attend a discussion with the School Academic Integrity Lead, or nominee within **five working days** of the date the notification is sent.
- 7.4 You can provide a written statement and any supporting evidence about the allegation to be considered at the discussion. This should be submitted to the School Academic Integrity Lead, or nominee, at least **two working days** before the discussion.
- 7.5 You can bring one person with you to the discussion for support. This person may be a friend, partner, representative of Nottingham Trent Students Union Information Advice Service or other appropriate person. You are not allowed legal representation.
- 7.6 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 discussion. The Academic Integrity Lead will take your admission into consideration when determining any outcome to be applied, and this may result in a lesser outcome.
- 7.7 Where you admit the allegation in advance, you may choose not to attend the discussion, and the matter will be dealt with promptly and without the need for further meetings.
- 7.8 An administrator will be present at the discussion to take notes and record any decisions.
- 7.9 At the discussion you will be given the opportunity to discuss the concerns about possible misconduct and to present any evidence you may have. You are not allowed to use any recording devices during these meetings.

# Section 17C

- 7.10 If you can't attend the discussion 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 a different date. The University will agree to an different date on a single occasion.
- 7.11 If you do not attend the discussion, and do not request a different date, the School Academic Integrity Lead, or nominee, will decide an outcome based on the evidence available.
- 7.12 Having reviewed all the evidence, outcomes will be decided on the basis of whether academic misconduct was more likely than not to have occurred.
- 7.13 The School Academic Integrity Lead, or nominee, will decide on one of the following outcomes within **five working days** of the discussion. The academic misconduct allegation is:
- not supported as there is no case to answer;
  - not supported and deemed to be a case of Improving Academic Integrity;
  - admitted and confirmed;
  - not admitted and confirmed;
  - considered to be serious academic misconduct.
- 7.14 Where the academic misconduct allegation is **not supported and there is no case to answer** all record of the review will be removed from your file and notes produced at the meeting will be destroyed. There will be no impact on your assessment grade.
- 7.15 Where the academic misconduct allegation is **not supported 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.
- 7.16 Where the academic misconduct allegation is **admitted and confirmed** the School Academic Integrity Lead, or nominee, will recommend an appropriately reduced outcome. This will indicate what the outcome would have been had the misconduct not been admitted. The outcome will be recorded and you may be required to retake the assessment at the next available opportunity.
- 7.17 Where the academic misconduct allegation is **not admitted and confirmed** the School Academic Integrity Lead, or nominee, will recommend an outcome. The outcome will be recorded and you may be required to retake the assessment at the next available opportunity.
- 7.18 Where the review thinks 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.

## 8. Serious academic misconduct review

---

# Section 17C

**Where a case is thought to be potential serious academic misconduct, either at the start or as a result of an academic misconduct review, a panel of independent academic staff is formed to investigate.**

- 8.1 Serious academic misconduct is decided either by the extent of the misconduct, evidence of clear attempt to gain substantial advantage, or where there is a second separate allegation of academic misconduct, having previously had a confirmed outcome.
- 8.2 Where potential serious academic misconduct is identified on more than one assessment submitted within ten working days, these will be considered as a single case.
- 8.3 Where the School Academic Integrity Lead, or nominee, decides that a serious academic misconduct review is required you will be sent a notification within **five working days** summarising the allegations made and inviting you to attend a Serious Academic Misconduct Hearing within **ten working days** of the date the notification is sent.
- 8.4 You can provide a written statement and any supporting evidence (including witness statements) about the allegation to be considered at the hearing. This should be submitted to the Panel Chair, at least **two working days** before the hearing.
- 8.5 You can bring one person with you to the hearing for support. This person may be a friend, partner, relative, representative of Nottingham Trent Students' Union Information Advice Service or other appropriate person. You are not allowed legal representation at the hearing.
- 8.6 You may decide to admit the allegations of serious misconduct. Where this is the case, you should send your admission in writing to the Panel Chair at least **two working days** before the hearing. The Panel will take your admission into consideration when agreeing any outcome, and this may result in a lesser outcome. You still need to attend the hearing regardless of your admission.
- 8.7 An administrator will be present at your hearing to take notes, including who was present, a brief outline of the proceedings, the reasons for the decisions taken, and, where appropriate, any outcome. You cannot use any recording devices during these meetings.
- 8.8 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 will ask questions in order to verify the evidence presented.
- 8.9 Both you and the School can 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 told in writing, **five working days** in advance, of any witnesses the School intends to invite.
- 8.10 The Chair of the Panel can decide whether to include any written statements, evidence or witness received later than five working days in advance.

# Section 17C

- 8.11 You are normally expected to attend the hearing in person. If you can't attend in person for valid reasons, such as illness, you should tell the Chair of the Panel at least **two working days** before the hearing. The Chair may allow the hearing to take place online. You cannot use any recording devices during these meetings.
- 8.12 If you can't attend the hearing date for valid reasons, such as illness, you should contact the Chair of the Panel at least **two working days** before the original hearing date and request a different date. The Chair will decide 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 once.
- 8.13 If you do not attend the hearing, and do not request a different date, the Panel will continue in your absence and will decide an outcome on the basis of the evidence available.
- 8.14 The Panel, will agree one of the following outcomes within **five working days** of the hearing. The serious academic misconduct allegation is:
- not confirmed as there is no case to answer;
  - not confirmed and agreed to be a case of Improving Academic Integrity;
  - not confirmed and agreed to be a case of academic misconduct;
  - admitted and confirmed;
  - not admitted and confirmed.
- 8.15 Where the serious academic misconduct allegation is **not confirmed and there is no case to answer** all record of the review will be removed from your file and notes produced at the hearing will be destroyed. There will be no impact on your assessment grade.
- 8.16 Where the serious academic misconduct allegation is **not confirmed 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.
- 8.17 Where the serious academic misconduct allegation is **not confirmed and deemed to be a case of academic misconduct** the Panel will recommend an outcome. The outcome will be recorded and you may be required to retake the assessment at the next available opportunity.
- 8.18 Where the serious academic misconduct allegation is **admitted and confirmed** the Panel, will recommend an appropriately reduced outcome. This will say what the outcome would have been had the serious misconduct not been admitted. The outcome will be recorded and you will be required to retake the assessment at the next available opportunity.
- 8.19 Where the serious academic misconduct allegation is **not admitted and confirmed** the Panel will recommend an outcome. The outcome will be recorded and you will be required to retake the assessment at the next available opportunity.

## 9. Outcomes

---

# Section 17C

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

9.1 The following outcomes may be recommended to the Board of Examiners by the School Academic Integrity Lead in cases of confirmed academic misconduct.

Outcome
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)

9.2 Assessment that is part of an academic misconduct review will not be graded until after the review has finished. In cases of confirmed academic misconduct, where the work is deemed to have passed, the recommended outcome 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 outcome will then be applied to any reassessed work that has subsequently passed.

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

Outcome	Reassessment
Overall module grade is capped at zero	Reassessment may be allowed, 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 achieved in any other elements/sub-elements of assessment.
Placement Certificate / Diploma is not awarded	Reassessment or retaking of the placement is not allowed.

# Section 17C

No credit given for the module (including credit bearing placement modules)	Reassessment is not allowed. It will not be possible to achieve the credit required for the award. A suitable interim award will be agreed, where applicable.
Termination of studies	Reassessment is not allowed. The final award will not be achieved and a suitable interim award will be agreed, where applicable.

- 9.4 When agreeing an outcome the decision maker (either the School Academic Integrity Lead or the Panel) will take into account:
- The number and outcome of any previous confirmed 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.
- 9.5 In all cases the decision maker should give reasons for the outcome selected, including why a less serious outcome was not suitable in the particular case.
- 9.6 There may be times when a particular case does not fit with the outcome framework. In such cases a different outcome may be thought to be appropriate. The decision to use a different outcome is sent to the Board of Examiners for approval.
- 9.7 For some courses, Professional, Statutory and Regulatory Bodies (PSRB) may require adjustments to the outcome framework. These changes must be approved by the School Academic Standards and Quality Committee, and will be communicated to you and all other affected students, staff and to Academic Registry for the purposes of appeals.
- 9.8 To ensure consistent decision making, anonymised summary records of misconduct and the penalties applied will be kept by Academic Registry and made available to decision makers for reference.

## 10. Right of appeal

**You have the right to appeal a confirmed outcome.**

- 10.1 You can appeal the outcome of an academic misconduct or serious academic misconduct outcome on the following grounds:
- That the University failed to follow the procedures set out in this policy at any stage in the process;
  - You now have new and relevant evidence that was not available for consideration at an earlier stage in the process; or

# Section 17C

- c. The decision was unreasonable in the circumstances or the outcome was disproportionate or not allowed under the outcome framework.
- 10.2 You can submit an appeal 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 or where no evidence has been provided will be rejected.
- 10.3 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.
- 10.4 If you have valid reasons for late submission of your appeal you should outline these 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.
- 10.5 The Academic Registrar, or nominee, will review the appeal and decide whether it meets one or more of the grounds for appeal.
- 10.6 Where the appeal **does not** meet one or more of the grounds for appeal, you will be informed within **15 working days** of submission. This decision is final and there is no further right of appeal within the University's procedures.
- 10.7 If your appeal meets one or more of the permitted grounds, the Academic Registrar, or nominee, will send the submission back to the School for reconsideration and action.
- 10.8 The School will then either:
- 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
  - convene a new Serious Academic Misconduct Panel with new membership to consider the case again.
- 10.9 Reconsideration by the School does not guarantee a change in the original outcome. 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.

## 11. Appeal Hearing

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

- 11.1 The Appeal Hearing will be convened by Academic Registry within **15 working days** of the decision.

# Section 17C

- 11.2 The Appeal Panel will have 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.
- 11.3 A member of Academic Registry 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.
- 11.4 You will receive **10 working days'** notice of the hearing date and will receive copies of all documentation about your case.
- 11.5 You are normally expected to attend the hearing in person. If you can't attend 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 online. You cannot use any recording devices during these meetings.
- 11.6 If you can't attend the hearing date for valid reasons, such as illness, you should contact Academic Registry before hearing is due to start and request a different date. The Chair will decide whether your reasons for non-attendance are accepted and if so, will reschedule the hearing within **ten working days**. The University will only reschedule a hearing on a single occasion.
- 11.7 If you do not attend the hearing, and do not request a different date, the Panel will meet in your absence and will agree an outcome on the basis of the evidence available.
- 11.8 You can bring one person with you to the hearing for support.
- 11.9 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.
- 11.10 At the hearing, you will 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.
- 11.11 The Panel, will agree one of the following outcomes withing **five working days** of the hearing. The appeal is:
- not confirmed and the original outcome stands;
  - confirmed and the original outcome is overturned; or
  - confirmed and the School is required to convene a new review of the case.
- You will receive the outcome in writing with reasons for the decisions made.
- 11.12 The decision of the Appeal Panel is final and there is no further right of appeal within the University's procedures.

## 12. Independent external review

---

# Section 17C

**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 for Higher Education (OIAHE), an independent body set up to review student complaints.**

- 12.1 In order to submit a complaint to the OIAHE you must have first completed all of the University's appeal procedures for alleged academic misconduct/serious academic misconduct.
- 12.2 At the end of our appeal procedures we will issue you with a Completion of Procedures Letter which you will need to present to the OIAHE.
- 12.3 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.
- 12.4 Further information can be found on the OIA's website at [www.oiahe.org.uk](http://www.oiahe.org.uk).

# Section 17C

## **13. Appendix 1: Composition of the Serious Academic Misconduct Panel**

---

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

- 13.1 Membership of the Serious Academic Misconduct Panel is decided by the Executive Dean of your School, or nominee, and will include:
- a. A Head of Department, or suitably experienced nominee, as Chair;
  - b. A minimum of two other academic staff members from a list of trained people in the School; and
  - c. An administrator from the School.
- 13.2 The Chair will be 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.
- 13.3 Panel members must have had no previous direct contact with you, the module in question or the Board of Examiners for your course.
- 13.4 You will be informed in advance of who will be on the Panel.
- 13.5 Where it is not possible to put together a panel of people who are suitably independent, panel members may come from other Schools.

# Section 17C

## 14. Appendix 2: Investigating complex academic misconduct cases

---

**Establishing academic misconduct may mean that the evidence relating to the allegation is examined and confirmed before a discussion or Serious Academic Misconduct Panel takes place.**

- 14.1 Establishing academic misconduct or serious academic misconduct can be more difficult in some cases, for example if the allegations are as a result of suspected software-based text/image modification or contract cheating.
- 14.2 In such cases, the School can hold investigative meetings ahead of discussions or Serious Academic Misconduct Panels taking place.
- 14.3 Investigative meetings consider the evidence relating to the allegation. This may include, for example, careful examination of your understanding of issues or the use of syntax, grammar and vocabulary in your assessment.
- 14.4 Investigative meetings result in a report which is then presented as evidence as part of the review.
- 14.5 Where investigative meetings need to be held, the timelines for any later review will be adjusted accordingly, and you will be provided with revised timescales in writing.

# Section 17C

## 15. Appendix 3: Role of the Board of Examiners

---

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

- 15.1 The Board of Examiners will not revisit the outcome of the original review but will consider the outcome in the context of your overall academic profile.
- 15.2 The Board of Examiners can decide whether reassessment is allowed.
- 15.3 Where an outcome results in you not being able to achieve enough credit to meet the intended award, the Board of Examiners will agree a suitable interim award, where applicable.
- 15.4 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.
- 15.5 Where there is confirmed 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.

# Section 17C

## **16. Appendix 4: Reconsidering the same misconduct**

---

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

16.1 In making a decision whether or not to reconsider a case, the following is taken into account:

- a. Whether the new evidence is likely to change the original outcome;
- b. The length of time since the original review and the effect of this on the reliability of any evidence;
- c. The severity of the original misconduct;
- d. The impact on the student of undergoing a second review;
- e. Whether leaving the matter unaddressed would impact on matters of fitness to practice or PSRB requirements.

16.2 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.

# Section 17C

## **17. Appendix 5: Misconduct that is identified after the student has graduated**

---

**Potential academic misconduct or serious academic misconduct may be investigated up to one year after publication of award results.**

- 17.1 In making a decision whether to investigate alleged misconduct after conferment, the following should be taken into account:
- a. Whether the new evidence is likely to change the original outcome;
  - b. The length of time since the original investigation 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.
- 17.2 Where it is determined that the case should be investigated the procedures in sections 8 or 9 of this policy should be followed.

# Section 17C

## 18. Appendix 6: Definitions

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

18.1 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 exaggeration 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:  a. Attempting to communicate with another candidate during an examination (either in-person or by electronic means)  b. Communicating with anyone other than the invigilator or another authorised member of staff during an examination
<b>Misuse of the Request for Additional Consideration policy</b>	The falsification of evidence submitted in support of a request for additional consideration.
<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:  c. Self-plagiarism: reproducing or representing work for assessment without proper attribution and

# Section 17C

	<p>attempting to gain credit for this work where credit has already been received</p> <p>d. Paraphrasing: rephrasing a source’s ideas without proper attribution</p> <p>e. Mosaic plagiarism/patchworking: weaving phrases and text from several sources into your own work; and/or adjusting sentences without quotation marks or attribution</p> <p>f. Source-based plagiarism: providing inaccurate or incomplete information about sources such that they cannot be found</p> <p>g. Computer code plagiarism: copying or adapting source code without permission from and attribution to the original creator</p>
<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>	<p>Any other form of dishonest academic practice not identified within the above categories and definitions.</p>

18.2 The following are definitions of potential serious academic misconduct:

<b>Academic misconduct type</b>	<b>Definition</b>
<b>Breach of exam regulations and conduct</b>	<p>Action designed to seek a considerable unfair advantage in an examination, including:</p> <p>a. Bringing any written or electronic materials into the examination, unless expressly allowed</p>

# Section 17C

	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <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> <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>in an examination or other timed or in-person assessment</li> <li>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.

18.3 **Academic integrity** is defined as the commitment to, and demonstration of fundamental values and behaviours including honesty, fairness, respect, and responsibility.

18.4 **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.

18.5 **Needing to improve academic integrity** is defined as an intentional or unintentional failure to uphold the values and behaviours of academic integrity.

# Section 17C

- 18.6 **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.
- 18.7 **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.
- 18.8 The following are examples of breaches / potential breaches of academic integrity which might constitute academic misconduct. Definitions of these are set out below;
- a. Multiple, non-concurrent breaches of academic integrity;
  - b. Collusion;
  - c. Fabrication, falsification or misrepresentation;
  - d. Minor breach of examination regulations or conduct;
  - e. Misuse of the Request for Additional Consideration policy;
  - f. Plagiarism;
  - g. Software-based text modification;
  - h. Academic dishonesty.
- 18.9 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. Impersonating someone else

# 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
Sept 2024	19.09.24	01.10.24	Language updated in line with the Review of Student Facing policies.

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