



CITY
ST GEORGE'S
UNIVERSITY OF LONDON

Academic Integrity & Misconduct Policy

Scope: All programmes leading to an award of City StGeorge's, University of London.

Senate Regulations:

[Senate Regulation 19 Assessment Regulations](#)

[Senate Regulation 13 Student Discipline](#)

[Senate Regulation 24 Doctoral Programmes](#)

Summary: This Policy outlines the general principles and the purpose of the University's Academic Integrity & Misconduct Policy, and the context in which the relevant procedures will be implemented if the principles of good academic practice have not been upheld.

Date approved/re-approved: Approved by Senate 2016/17, 2020/21, 2024/25 & 2025/26. (Minor Updates November 2018, May 2020, August 2021, October 2021, September 2022, April 2023 & October 2023)

Date approved/re-approved: July 2025

Date for review: To be reviewed by the end of 2028/29academic year, with allowance for minor updates, as required.

Effective from: 2025/26

Equality and Diversity Statement

City StGeorge's, University of London is committed to promoting equality, diversity and inclusion in all its activities, processes, and culture, under its Public Sector Equality Duties and the Equality Act 2010. This includes promoting equality and diversity for all, irrespective of any protected characteristic, working pattern, family circumstance, socio-economic background, political belief, or other irrelevant distinction.

Where relevant to the policy, decision-making panels should normally aim to reflect gender diversity and to consider representation across protected characteristics. Panel membership will be based on relevant expertise and independence, and the panel may proceed where such diversity is not practicably achievable for a particular meeting. This clause does not impose fixed quotas and is inclusive of all gender identities.

Freedom of Speech

City St George's, University of London, regards freedom of speech and academic freedom to be fundamental to delivering its mission as the University of business, practice and the professions. Its values in this respect are set out in a code of practice on freedom of speech and academic freedom, which explains how the University will uphold, secure, and promote [Freedom of Speech](#) within the law. Nothing in this policy should be interpreted in any way that would be inconsistent with the code of practice and in the event of any inconsistency the provisions of the code will prevail.

Contents

Academic Integrity & Misconduct Policy	3
1.1. Introduction	3
1.2. Responsibilities	5
1.3. Generative Artificial Intelligence (AI)	7
1.4. Training for Staff and Student Support	7
1.5. Identifying Suspected Academic Misconduct	8
1.6. Preliminary Investigations	10
1.7. Case Management	13
1.8. Managing Retrospective Cases	14
1.9. Determining the Category of Academic Misconduct	14
1.10. Dealing with Poor Academic Practice Cases	15
1.11. Dealing with Academic Misconduct Cases	15
1.12. Dealing with Severe Academic Misconduct Cases	15
1.13. Allegation Reporting (Students or Third Party)	16
1.14. The Academic Misconduct Panel	18
1.15. Academic Misconduct Panel Recommendations	21
1.16. Disciplinary or Fitness to Practise (Train) Panel Considerations	22
1.17. Assessment Board Decisions	22
1.18. Academic Misconduct Cases with Extenuating Circumstances	23
1.19. Reporting and Statistics	23
1.20. Right to Appeal	24
Appendix 1: Definitions of Academic Misconduct	25
Appendix 2: Types of Academic Misconduct Cases	31
Appendix 3a: Academic Misconduct Sanctions for Taught Modules	33
Appendix 3b: Academic Misconduct Sanctions for Doctoral Research	34
Appendix 4: Mapping of Sanctions	35
Appendix 5: Academic Misconduct Process Flowchart	37

Context

In this document, “you”, “your”, “yours”, “student” and “students” means all University students, including doctoral researchers. “We”, “us” and “ours” means the University and depending on context, staff and officers acting on the University’s behalf.

Academic integrity is at the heart of our commitment to academic excellence and reflects a shared set of principles which include honesty, trust, responsibility, fairness and respect. Academic integrity thrives through honesty, trust, and respect. We strive to communicate and support clear standards of integrity so you can value and embed those standards in your academic study and carry them forward in your professional life. This policy applies to all programmes leading to an award of City StGeorge’s, University of London. There may be exceptions to this policy on certain programmes that are governed by PSRB requirements.

Academic Integrity & Misconduct Policy

1.1. Introduction

- 1.1.1. This Policy has been developed with the following principles in mind:
- **Natural Justice:** acting fairly and transparently without bias.
 - **Academic Integrity and Quality:** recognising the importance of academic integrity and quality and the risks if this is not maintained.
 - **Proportionality:** ensuring outcomes are proportionate to the situation bearing in mind all the circumstances and overall impact on outcomes.
- 1.1.2. To maintain the principle of natural justice, the approach taken must be applied consistently and fairly to all students. This Policy should be followed in order to uphold the principles and to reduce the risk of inconsistency, complaints and appeals. **In applying this Policy, decision-makers must also respect lawful freedom of speech and academic freedom, ensuring that no student is treated less favourably or subjected to disciplinary action for lawful expression, and that any restrictions are only those required by law and proportionate.**
- 1.1.3. The University has an obligation to uphold the academic integrity of the degrees it awards. As a University student you are also expected to uphold academic integrity and good academic practice by demonstrating behaviour that is honest and ethical in all of your academic work. **This expectation concerns academic standards and does not restrict your lawful expression of ideas or arguments.**
- 1.1.4. Academic integrity means conducting all aspects of your academic life in a professional manner. It involves:
- taking responsibility for your own work;
 - respecting the rights of other scholars;
 - behaving with respect and courtesy when debating with others even when you do not agree with them;
 - fully acknowledging the work of others wherever it has contributed to your own (thereby avoiding plagiarism)
 - ensuring that your own work is reported honestly;
 - ensuring that you follow the ethical conventions and requirements appropriate to your discipline;
 - if you are studying on a professionally-recognised vocational programme, maintaining standards of conduct which are appropriate to a practitioner in that area;
 - supporting others in their own efforts to behave with academic integrity;
 - avoiding actions which seek to give you an unfair advantage over others;
 - following the requirements of the [University Regulations \(Regulation 19: Assessment Regulations\)](#) and [Regulation 24: Doctoral Programmes Regulations](#));
 - complying with and undertaking your research responsibly, following all necessary regulatory, legal and professional obligations.

- 1.1.5. This policy sets out the process which is triggered if we suspect that you have not upheld these principles and committed Academic Misconduct.
- 1.1.6. This Policy will not normally be applied to work that is being reviewed for formative/informal feedback before it is submitted for summative assessment or a point of progression. Within the scope of this Policy, a point of progression for Doctoral Research may include, but is not limited to, your upgrade, annual reviews, and/or submission of a thesis for examination.
- 1.1.7. In such instances we all still hold a responsibility to uphold academic integrity and although the formal process of investigation outlined within this Academic Integrity and Misconduct Policy will not be applied, it is vital to recognise this as an educational opportunity and provide support and advice accordingly.
- 1.1.8. **Academic Misconduct** is any action that produces or seeks to produce an improper advantage for you in relation to your work/assessment(s)/progression or deliberately and unnecessarily disadvantages other students. It can be committed intentionally or accidentally. We actively pursue all cases of suspected misconduct. (Please see **Appendix 1**)
- 1.1.9. This Policy safeguards the integrity of our awards as well as the interests of the majority of students who work hard for their award through their own efforts and is designed to ensure that anyone suspected of Academic Misconduct is provided with an independent and transparent system that is both efficient and fair.
- 1.1.10. **Research Misconduct** is defined as any unethical or improper behaviour in the conduct of research and is considered a serious ethical breach because it undermines the integrity of the research process and can damage public trust in scientific findings.
- 1.1.11. For doctoral researchers (or anyone not covered under the scope of this Policy) suspected of committing research misconduct, this will be managed under our [Procedure for Investigating Allegations of Misconduct in Research](#).
- 1.1.12. If you are a doctoral researcher, please ensure you familiarise yourself with both this Academic Integrity and Misconduct Policy and our [Procedure for Investigating Allegations of Misconduct in Research](#) as both are applicable to your studies.
- 1.1.13. Where a suspected case of misconduct involves a doctoral research, the Preliminary Investigation will determine whether the case is managed under this Policy or our [Procedure for Investigating Allegations of Misconduct in Research](#). If both academic and research misconduct are suspected, research misconduct will take precedence and the case will be managed under our [Procedure for Investigating Allegations of Misconduct in Research](#).

- 1.1.14. Following investigation into a case, the assessment of the type and severity of individual cases will be determined by academic judgement and the balance of probabilities, these may be designated as:
- **No case to answer**
 - **Poor Academic Practice (PAP)**
 - **Academic Misconduct**
 - **Severe Academic Misconduct**
- (Appendix 2 gives more detail of this)
- 1.1.15. The range of sanctions available are published within the **Appendix 3** of this policy. **Appendix 4** outlines examples of Poor Academic Practice (PAP)/Academic Misconduct and related indicative sanctions.
- 1.1.16. The Policy the [Student Disciplinary Regulation \(Regulation 13\)](#) set out the levels at which cases of alleged PAP/Academic Misconduct might be considered:
- Initial consideration (the Preliminary Investigation)
 - School-level consideration (via an Academic Misconduct Panel)
 - Institutional-level consideration (via the Disciplinary Panel, for PSRB regulated programmes, a Fitness to Practise (Train) Panel.)
- 1.1.17. Cases of Academic Misconduct will be recorded and reported to your School's Board of Studies/Doctoral College Board of Studies on an annual basis.
- 1.1.18. Please note, if at any time during an Academic Misconduct investigation there is concern for the safety or well-being of a student or staff member, staff must follow the procedure as outlined in our [Safeguarding Policy](#).

1.2. Responsibilities

- 1.2.1. We will promote good academic conduct in relation to all work, both academic and research. This means providing to you during the induction process and in writing, in programme materials and other media as appropriate, guidance on academic integrity, which should cover programme-specific content and include at least:
- a) referencing (and any preferred referencing style);
 - b) how to avoid plagiarism;
 - c) acceptable use of a proofreader, including guidance on declaring the use of a proofreader;
 - d) collusion;
 - e) contract cheating;
 - f) fabrication & falsification;
 - g) good practice in research.

Where Programmes include collaborative/group work we will:

- a) advise you on the boundary between legitimate collaboration and inappropriate collaboration/collusion;
- b) advise you about any method to be used to demonstrate individual and/or collective contributions.

- 1.2.2. You are expected to undertake your all of your work with integrity and in doing so have the following responsibilities:
- To familiarise yourself with the guidance we provide, in relation to the avoidance of academic misconduct.
 - To familiarise yourself with guidance we provide in relation to conduct in Practical Examinations, Class Tests, Written Examinations and [Good Practice in Research](#).
 - To follow written and oral instructions provided in relation to all Practical Examinations, Class Tests and Written Examinations, including:
 - a) the announcements made at the start, during and at the end of the Practical Examination, Class Test and Written Examination;
 - b) The instructions at the top of the question paper (rubric), and any other written instructions provided by the University.
- 1.2.3. A key element of academic integrity is understanding good academic practice in written work, numerical disciplines and creative practice. Understanding how to use the work of other scholars, including your peers, to develop your own insights into a subject is an important professional skill. The skills you need to succeed at University may be different from those you have learned at school, college or in your workplace.
- 1.2.4. Within the UK professional academic community, it is never acceptable to use the words of others or their creative output (whether published or unpublished, including material from the internet) without explicit acknowledgement. To do so would not be seen as a mark of respect but rather as plagiarism.
- 1.2.5. By submitting your work, you acknowledge that:
- you have read and understood this Policy including any additional information provided to you relating to plagiarism, as specified in the Programme Handbook.
 - this work will be subject to a variety of checks for academic misconduct.
- 1.2.6. By submitting your work, you declare that:
- the work is entirely your own except those parts duly identified and referenced within the submission
 - it complies with any specified word limits and the requirements and regulations detailed in the instructions and any other relevant programme and module documentation.
- 1.2.7. In order to demonstrate authorship, should the need arise and to support the academic integrity of your work, you are strongly encouraged to keep draft copies of your work. Wherever possible and appropriate retain dated versions of your work, including outlines, rough drafts, and revisions. Maintaining multiple drafts helps demonstrate your development of ideas and can serve as crucial evidence in cases of suspected academic misconduct.

1.3. Generative Artificial Intelligence (AI)

- 1.3.1. Through your work and approach to learning you are expected to demonstrate your development as an independent learner, researcher, and critical thinker, this also means that we expect you not to use Generative Artificial Intelligence (AI) tools (such as ChatGPT and Microsoft Co-Pilot) to generate any work, unless you have been explicitly told that you may or must do so.
- 1.3.2. If your Module Leader/Programme Director has made clear that you may use Generative AI sources in your assessed work, or as a doctoral researcher if you have used Generative AI to support your work, then you should acknowledge, describe, and reference these as instructed. Always check your assessment guidelines and check with the Module Leader/Programme Director if you are unclear on what has been authorised. And for doctoral researchers, please familiarise yourselves with the [Use of Generative AI Tools in Doctoral Research](#).
- 1.3.3. Using Generative AI to gain an unfair advantage by misrepresenting its work as your own is considered to be Academic Misconduct / Severe Academic Misconduct and can have serious consequences.
- 1.3.4. The University's Guidelines on the use of Generative AI tools can be found on the Student Hub here: [Using generative artificial intelligence \(AI\) for learning | Student Hub | City, University of London](#)
- 1.3.5. Resources for staff can be found on the [Academic Integrity & Misconduct Staff Hub](#) page including staff guidance that has been developed to provide helpful tips for spotting AI-written content by sight: [Generative AI Detection Guidance for Staff](#).

1.4. Training for Staff and Student Support

- 1.4.1. Schools and the Doctoral College, supported by the wider University briefing sessions, are asked to establish a pool of Academic and Professional Staff experts to support and deliver training to academic staff on how to identify academic misconduct and what to do when suspected cases are discovered. Doctoral researchers can find Doctoral training resources on the [Doctoral College Webpage](#).
- 1.4.2. Within each School, the Associate Dean of Education (ADE) or Research (ADR) in liaison with the Heads of Academic Services (or equivalent) should develop local plans on disseminating information on how to maintain academic integrity and how to avoid any form of misconduct when undertaking academic writing or completing academic assessments.
- 1.4.3. The underlying principle of academic originality is central to avoiding academic misconduct. Your Programme Teams/Supervisors should direct you to current and relevant advice on an ongoing basis throughout your studies.

The process of informing and teaching necessary skills on avoiding Academic Misconduct, should also be included in departmental induction week or at another appropriate and timely point.

- 1.4.4. As a University student, you are encouraged to speak to your Personal Tutor/Academic Advisor/Supervisor, Module Leaders and Programme Teams for advice and support on academic skills and integrity.
- 1.4.5. Personal Tutors/Academic Advisors/Supervisor can be made aware of any upheld cases of PAP or Academic Misconduct to enable them to offer you advice and support. Additionally, where appropriate, you may also be referred to the Academic Skills Team.
- 1.4.6. The Academic Skills Team can support you with:
 - Referencing
 - Critical thinking and writing skills
 - Academic reading skills
 - Managing your time
 - Dissertations
 - Revision techniques
 - Exam performance
 - Understanding lecturer feedback

(Please note: The Academic Skills team does not provide a proofreading service.)

- 1.4.7. For further support available to you please see the [Student Hub](#).

1.5. Identifying Suspected Academic Misconduct

- 1.5.1. **Reporting Member of Staff:** The member of staff, which would usually be the marker/assessor who suspects and reports the potential case.
- 1.5.2. **Preliminary Investigation (PI) Lead:** The suitably trained member of professional or academic staff (such as Professional Service Staff, Senior Tutor for Research, Programme Director etc) who leads the Preliminary Investigation and reviews the information and evidence submitted by the reporting member of staff. The PI Lead must be a different person from the Reporting Member of Staff. The reporting member of staff can be consulted with if necessary for academic judgement.
- 1.5.3. **Academic Moderator:** This can be any academic member of staff who moderates the Suspected PAP / AM form that is completed by the reporting member of staff, where appropriate. The Academic Moderator is not expected to review the suspected AM case but rather to moderate the rationale and available evidence within the form itself in order to ensure validity. Although this process is not mandatory, it is strongly encouraged in order to ensure consistency of practice and enhance fairness of outcome.

- 1.5.4. If a member of staff/assessor suspects that you have committed Poor Academic Practice (PAP), Academic Misconduct or Severe Academic Misconduct, their first step is to ascertain the initial concerns and gather evidence.
- 1.5.5. Members of staff may identify suspicious assignments due to a variety of reasons. Some of the most common are listed below, although this list is not exhaustive:
- a) Similarity to another student's assignment.
 - b) Recognition of text from elsewhere.
 - c) False data provided.
 - d) Dissertation handed in on different topic or without supervision.
 - e) Shifts in language style/grammar/vocabulary throughout the work.
 - f) Submission not aligned to assignment set.
 - g) Odd changes in font or layout.
 - h) Presence of characteristics typical in a web-published document (URLs, formatting in html, hyperlinks, etc.).
 - i) Bibliographies which are exclusively or substantially non-UK material (unless appropriate to specific assignment) OR include references over three years old, especially where assignment is on a topical issue.
 - j) Highly specific professional language used by a student who is new to the discipline.
- 1.5.6. Technologies (such as Turnitin) may be used to support academic judgement in cases of suspected academic misconduct, for example: to investigate suspected cases of academic misconduct already identified via other means; or to check the work of a whole cohort or a defined sample of students. The reports arising from these technologies should only be used as evidence if they are subject to academic interpretation and accompanied by a short-written analysis of the results. For Doctoral Research, the interpretation of the Turnitin report and the short-written analysis should be completed by the relevant Internal Examiner or where appropriate the Assistant Vice President (Doctoral College). Please note, submissions being made to Turnitin for doctoral research must be safeguarded from publication issues by ensuring that they are submitted to an 'institution only' repository or to no repository.
- 1.5.7. Academic staff are advised not to discuss the matter with you informally but to ensure that due process is followed as per this Policy. To protect fairness, confidentiality and the integrity of proceedings, communications about the matter should follow the process set out in this Policy. This does not prevent routine academic contact or neutral signposting to support services that does not address the substance of the matter.
- 1.5.8. Academic staff are required to refrain from releasing the mark and any feedback on any work/assessments where the alleged academic misconduct has occurred until the procedures are complete.

If you are submitting work prior to your Viva Voce Examination, where a suspicion of academic misconduct is raised, the Viva Voce Examination will be postponed until the investigation procedures are complete. A Viva Voce Examination will not be utilised as a preliminary investigation meeting or AM Panel hearing, when the academic misconduct is already suspected and meets the criteria of 'reasonable suspicion' as defined within this Policy.

- 1.5.9. In order to ensure fairness and procedural integrity, you have the right to know if you are under investigation and should be given an opportunity to prepare an appropriate defence. However, in cases where concerns about potential academic misconduct arise during and not prior to a Viva Voce Examination, the matter may be explored as part of the examination. The Examiner(s) must then report their concerns to the Doctoral College and the relevant School. If appropriate, an Academic Misconduct Investigation will be initiated in accordance with the procedures outlined in this Policy.
- 1.5.10. If academic misconduct is suspected, it is essential that a report is made through the process outlined within this Policy as soon as the suspicion comes to light, before the work is fully marked or marks are released in order to ensure that all cases are managed in compliance with this Policy.
- 1.5.11. The reporting member of staff will complete their School's/Doctoral College's Suspected PAP_AM Form and send it along with the supporting evidence (as noted below in paragraph 1.6.6 of this Policy) to their Designated Individual(s). This will then be directed to an appropriately qualified Preliminary Investigation Lead to manage the case.
- 1.5.12. Although it is not mandatory, it is strongly encouraged that the reporting member of staff shares the Suspected PAP_AM Form with an Academic Moderator, before sending it to the Designated Individual(s). The Academic Moderator will review the rationale and available evidence within the form itself. This is to facilitate consistency in case management and to mitigate material error. The Academic Moderator will not review the suspected AM case and give opinion as to outcome, they are simply providing an academic quality check.

1.6. Preliminary Investigations

- 1.6.1. During the preliminary Investigation, you will be informed of the allegation made against you and may be invited to discuss the allegations. Cases relating to a first instance of Poor Academic Practice (PAP) may be resolved at the Preliminary Investigation stage without the need for an Academic Misconduct Panel.
- 1.6.2. However, any suspected subsequent offence will be escalated to the 'Academic Misconduct' level which will be reviewed by an Academic Misconduct Panel.
- 1.6.3. The Preliminary Investigation Lead will review the suspected allegation.

- 1.6.4. Only work/assessments directly related to the suspected misconduct will be investigated. Should any evidence come to light during the course of an investigation, which implicates other work/assessments, the University reserves the right to investigate.
- 1.6.5. Where there is specific evidence of Academic Misconduct a Preliminary Investigation should be launched.
- 1.6.6. Specific evidence includes, but is not limited to:
- Turnitin similarity report (with academic interpretation).
 - screenshots indicating collusion.
 - plagiarism i.e. words taken from another source without attribution.
 - similarity between work/assessments submitted by two or more students.
 - the work containing markers of Generative AI such as made-up references.
- 1.6.7. The standard of proof needed in order to launch a Preliminary Investigation, where there is no specific evidence, is 'reasonable suspicion'. 'Reasonable suspicion' is defined within the scope of this Policy as a suspicion of academic misconduct grounded in academic judgment and articulable facts, it cannot be based on subjective feeling, ambiguous assumptions, or unparticularised hunches.
- 1.6.8. Examples of specific and articulable facts may include, but are not limited to:
- the content of the work submitted is at an academic level containing concepts and material that would be unexpected for the level or area of study.
 - the content of the work submitted does not relate to the content taught.
 - the quality of the work is significantly different to the quality of the work produced in the past.
 - the content of the work is too generic and does not show an independent understanding of the subject matter.
- 1.6.9. Where there is no specific evidence of academic misconduct, but it has been demonstrated (using specific and articulable facts) that there are good reasons to believe that the work is not your own, it may be deemed appropriate to expect you to demonstrate that the work is your own original work. This may involve but is not limited to asking for draft copies of the work and/or asking a series of questions about the content of the submitted work. This can take place during either the Preliminary Investigation meeting/correspondence, led by the reporting member of staff / relevant academic or Preliminary Investigation Lead or during an Academic Misconduct Panel, led by the Panel Chair.

- 1.6.10. In cases of suspected subsequent Poor Academic Practice, Academic Misconduct or Severe Academic Misconduct (Please see **Appendix 2** for definitions), a Preliminary Investigation should take place, however, a Preliminary Investigation meeting/correspondence does not need to take place. The case can be immediately referred to an Academic Misconduct Panel, as this will ensure that the case is considered by a group of experienced and trained staff and not by one or two individuals.
- 1.6.11. The Preliminary Investigation Lead will review the evidence and determine whether there is a potential case to answer, this includes determining if the evidence meet the standard of 'reasonable suspicion'.
- 1.6.12. If the Preliminary Investigation Lead determines that the evidence does not meet the standard of 'reasonable suspicion', a finding of 'no case to answer' will be made and the case will be closed.
- 1.6.13. If the Preliminary Investigation Lead determines that there is a potential case to answer (that is, that the evidence meets the standard of 'reasonable suspicion') a Preliminary Investigation meeting/correspondence may take place.
- 1.6.14. Additionally, the Preliminary Investigation Lead must ascertain whether there are any declarations of a disability and agreed reasonable adjustments. Where this is the case, it is essential that any potential impact the disability or reasonable adjustments may have are accommodated in the academic misconduct process and any potential mitigation for the academic misconduct must be outlined clearly within the investigation and Panel (where appropriate) documents.
- 1.6.15. Where a Preliminary Investigation meeting takes place, it is recommended that 7 calendar days' notice is provided, where possible in order to ensure that you are able to sufficiently prepare; this can include seeking advice and support from the [Students' Union](#).
- 1.6.16. The meeting will be attended by the Preliminary Investigation Lead and an academic staff member (this can be the reporting member of staff) and yourself. A secretary may also be present.

Preliminary Investigation meetings can be conducted either in-person, online (by Zoom or Teams) or by correspondence*. Where these are conducted by correspondence, this will include you providing a written statement.

*Preliminary Investigations may take place via correspondence:

- where legitimate adjustments and considerations are required to ensure the process is accessible and runs fairly;
- where there are specific equality needs, and/or where reasonable adjustments are required;
- where there is a suspected case of mass academic misconduct (e.g. mass collusion) involving 5 or more students and it is deemed necessary so that the specific case is managed fairly and in a timely way;

- where it is deemed necessary in order to ensure the student's progression or their ability to attend Graduation.
- 1.6.17. Where you commit a first Poor Academic Practice (PAP) or first Academic Misconduct offence and admit that you are at fault, the case may be dealt with in accordance with Sanction 1 or Sanction 2 (if deemed appropriate) at the Preliminary Investigation stage (see Appendix 3) Where such cases are resolved during a Preliminary Investigation rather than by an Academic Misconduct Panel, we will ensure that you are not advantaged or disadvantaged in any way.
- 1.6.18. Resources for staff to support the Preliminary Investigation process, including the Suspected PAP_AM Form and the Preliminary Investigation Record Form can be found on the [Staff Hub](#).

1.7. Case Management

- 1.7.1. The School Head of Academic Services (or equivalent member of staff) is responsible for the overall administration of Academic Misconduct cases, including the record keeping and conducting appeal hearings.
- 1.7.2. In managing cases of alleged academic misconduct your School must ensure that you:
- know about the case being put against you at a reasonable time before the case is heard;
 - are able to challenge the outcome of the case;
 - are treated without any bias;
 - are offered the opportunity to appeal against the final outcome or decision. (see section 1.18 for more details)
- 1.7.3. In cases where the Preliminary Investigation Lead and the reporting member of staff disagree with the proposed outcome of the Preliminary Investigation, resolution is encouraged. The member of staff reporting the suspected AM is required to share as much evidence as possible with the Preliminary Investigation Lead, and vice versa to ensure that each party has sufficient information with which to reach an informed decision.
- 1.7.4. If disagreement continues, a conversation should take place with the ADE, ADR or nominee (and where appropriate should include relevant professional service colleagues). All of the information, each person might hold, should be discussed and examined.
- 1.7.5. All staff members must work together, so that decisions are being made with care by all colleagues. Once the discussion has taken place, if the Preliminary Investigation Lead and the reporting member of staff continue to disagree the ADE/ADR or nominee will be the arbitrator and will make a final decision.

1.8. Managing Retrospective Cases

- 1.8.1. Where compelling evidence exists, the University reserves the right to retrospectively investigate suspected cases of Poor Academic Practice and/or Academic Misconduct. Retrospective cases are defined as cases where you have already been granted an award by the University or where work has been marked/examined and provisional grades or Assessment Board ratified marks, or feedback have already been released to you. This can also include ratified marks from your previous programme stages.
- 1.8.2. In cases such as this, and due to the potentially serious implications, the School's ADE/ADR should be consulted. The ADE/ADR can where necessary, consult with Academic Services, the Vice President (Education) and the Vice President (Research & Innovation) or their delegate. Where it is agreed that there is a case to answer, the standard investigation procedure outlined within this Policy should be followed, i.e., a Preliminary Investigation and, where appropriate, referral to an Academic Misconduct Panel.
- 1.8.3. Only work/assessments directly related to the suspected misconduct will be investigated. Should any evidence come to light during the course of an investigation, which implicates other work/assessments, the University reserves the right to investigate.
- 1.8.4. Where a Sanction is applied, previously ratified Assessment Board/Doctoral College decisions may be rescinded and replaced with the relevant sanction.

1.9. Determining the Category of Academic Misconduct

- 1.9.1. The University has defined three categories for Academic Misconduct which are:
 - **Poor Academic Practice**
 - **Academic Misconduct**
 - **Severe Academic Misconduct**

(Please see **Appendix 2** for more details and guidance)
- 1.9.2. When sufficient evidence has been gathered to indicate that potential Poor Academic Practice or Academic Misconduct/Severe Academic Misconduct has occurred, the relevant members of academic and professional staff should alert you and give you the opportunity to discuss the matter.
- 1.9.3. Your School will make reasonable attempts to contact you to arrange a Preliminary Investigation meeting, either in person, via virtual meeting platforms, or by correspondence. But the Preliminary Investigation will continue if you fail to respond to these requests or do not attend an arranged meeting.

- 1.9.4. The Preliminary Investigation meeting/correspondence will seek to ascertain whether Poor Academic Practice or Academic Misconduct/Severe Academic Misconduct may have occurred. During this stage, you will be asked about your work and the allegation made against you, but it is important to remember that this is not a formal hearing. If the case is referred to an Academic Misconduct Panel, this will be a formal hearing and the Panel will question you more thoroughly.
- 1.9.5. Following the Preliminary Investigation meeting/correspondence, a written summary of the discussion and outcome should be drawn up and, wherever possible, signed by you as a true record.

1.10. Dealing with Poor Academic Practice Cases

- 1.10.1. Upheld cases of Poor Academic Practice (PAP) should be dealt with at the Preliminary Investigation stage (locally) in accordance with Sanction 1.
- 1.10.2. You should also be referred to the Academic Skills Team to give you the opportunity to receive additional help and advice on avoiding the same mistakes in the future.
- 1.10.3. Any suspected subsequent PAP offences will be immediately referred to an Academic Misconduct Panel.

1.11. Dealing with Academic Misconduct Cases

- 1.11.1. Cases of Academic Misconduct, including suspected subsequent cases of PAP and any case requiring a Sanction 2 or higher, should be referred to an Academic Misconduct Panel.
- 1.11.2. The only exception to this is cases of a first Academic Misconduct offence, where it is deemed appropriate, and where you have admitted to the misconduct. Such cases may be dealt with at the Preliminary Investigation stage, in accordance with Sanction 2. (Any suspected subsequent offences will be immediately referred to an Academic Misconduct Panel.)
- 1.11.3. For a Sanction 2 to be applied at a local level, it must be your first offence (any previous offence including PAP means that the case will instead be referred to an Academic Misconduct Panel), it must be deemed appropriate to apply a Sanction 2 (if there is debate on whether or not the severity of the case should call for a higher sanction, the case must be referred to an Academic Misconduct Panel) and you must admit that you committed the offence.

1.12. Dealing with Severe Academic Misconduct Cases

- 1.12.1. All cases of Severe Academic Misconduct must be referred immediately to an Academic Misconduct Panel. A Preliminary Investigation should take place (i.e. gathering evidence, submitting a Suspected PAP_AM Form and review of the evidence by the Preliminary Investigation Lead), but a Preliminary Investigation meeting/correspondence does not need to be held.

- 1.12.2. The case can be immediately referred to an Academic Misconduct Panel, as this will ensure that the case is considered by a group of experienced and trained staff and not by one or two individuals.

1.13. Allegation Reporting (Students or Third Party)

- 1.13.1. Allegation Reporting under this Policy is defined as speaking up about actual or potential Academic Misconduct or Severe Academic Misconduct that you have seen or know about whilst at University. It is necessary for someone who submits an Allegation Report to have 'direct experience' that potential Academic Misconduct or Severe Academic Misconduct is being, has been, or is likely to be committed. 'Hearsay' is not deemed sufficient to launch Preliminary Investigation.

- 1.13.2. When making an Allegation Report against someone, having 'direct experience' means that you have personally seen, heard, or experienced the events, evidence or behaviour in question, rather than relying on second-hand information or what others have told you (hearsay).

This is crucial because it ensures that the report is based on reliable, firsthand evidence rather than potentially distorted or incomplete second-hand accounts.

- 1.13.3. In this context, 'hearsay' refers to information that is based on what someone else told you, rather than on what you personally observed, heard, or experienced.
- 1.13.4. We encourage you to raise any concerns and submit any evidence (where available) regarding suspected or known potential Academic Misconduct or Severe Academic Misconduct using our online ['Academic Misconduct Allegation Reporting Tool'](#). Please also see full details on how to use the Tool in our [User Guidance](#) which can be found on the AIM Student Hub page.
- 1.13.5. All concerns raised will be reviewed and where appropriate, a Preliminary Investigation process will be launched.
- 1.13.6. Please note that submitting an Allegation Report anonymously may limit our ability to take action. We will generally only consider an anonymous allegation report where it is clear from the supporting evidence that the claim(s) can be substantiated.
- 1.13.7. Please be aware that if you choose to make a report anonymously and do not provide any evidence, we will not be able to take any action as a result. However, data from anonymous reports may be used to identify patterns of incidences so that we can further enhance our academic integrity support services.

- 1.13.8. In all cases, we will ensure that we do not reveal your identity to the reported party or anyone other than those involved in investigating your concerns. If it becomes necessary for anyone else to know your identity to adequately investigate the concern, we will discuss this with you first.
- 1.13.9. When submitting an Allegation Report you will also have the option to attach any relevant evidence. You are strongly encouraged to submit this, wherever possible, to us to be able to take relevant action.
- 1.13.10. Examples of evidence may include:
- Screenshots of text messages, social media messages, WhatsApp messages and any other digital communications platform.
 - Emails.
 - Handwritten notes/letters.
 - Social Media Messages.
- 1.13.11. The information provided within the Allegation Report and if available, the evidence submitted, requires that the person being accused can be accurately identifiable.
- 1.13.12. Where the person being accused cannot be identified using the information you have provided, or where the available evidence or information within the report is deemed to be hearsay, no further action will be taken.
- 1.13.13. The University will support and protect anyone who, in good faith and without knowing that the accusations are likely to be false, report suspicions of potential Academic Misconduct or Severe Academic Misconduct. False accusations which are found to have been made intentionally to cause harm (for example blackmail) will be dealt with under our Disciplinary Procedure.
- 1.13.14. "Allegations made in good faith" means that the allegation is made with the belief that it is true, as far as a reasonable person in the reporting position could hold based upon the facts and available evidence. An allegation is not in good faith if made with disregard for or ignorance of facts that would disprove the allegation.
- 1.13.15. In circumstances when the person submitting the Allegation Report also participated in the academic misconduct (e.g. mass collusion cases), they will not be exempt from any sanctions.
- 1.13.16. Please note in order to be able to manage Academic Misconduct cases confidential in line with this Policy, we will not inform you of the progress or outcome of an Allegation Report you have submitted, unless you are directly involved or implicated in the case.

1.14. The Academic Misconduct Panel

- 1.14.1. The responsibility for considering most Academic Misconduct and all Severe Academic Misconduct offences lies with an impartial, experienced and trained Panel of staff. With the aim of building up a body of knowledge and experience amongst its members and to maintain parity of treatment within each School, and across the University, the Academic Misconduct Panel will conduct all Academic Misconduct hearings within the relevant School.
- 1.14.2. Where a case has been referred to an AM Panel with a recommendation or minutes from a Preliminary Investigation meeting, the AM Panel is required to investigate the case afresh and make its own independent judgement following review of all available evidence.
- 1.14.3. Academic Misconduct Panel hearings can be conducted either in-person or online (by Zoom or Teams).
- 1.14.4. Where it is deemed reasonable to do so, an Academic Misconduct Panel can also take place in absentia (without you present at the Panel hearing) or via correspondence (via a written statement provided by you).

For example, where:

- there is a high number of potentially related cases within the same module, programme or School;
 - where legitimate adjustments and considerations are required to ensure the process is accessible and runs fairly;
 - where there are specific equality needs, and/or where reasonable adjustments are required.
- 1.14.5. At an Academic Misconduct Panel, the responsibility for proving an Academic Misconduct issue i.e. the “burden of proof” lies with the University and the level of proof required is measured using the “balance of probabilities”.
 - 1.14.6. **Burden of Proof:** The “burden of proof” determines whose responsibility it is to prove there is cause to launch an investigation and confirm a case. In a disciplinary case we would expect the burden of proof to be on the University, that is, the University must prove that the student has done what they are accused of doing. You should not have to disprove the allegation.
 - 1.14.7. **Standard of Proof:** The “standard of proof” is the level of proof required. In legal proceedings the standard of proof in criminal cases is normally “beyond reasonable doubt”, which is a very high standard. In civil cases and for this Policy, the standard of proof required to agree an outcome is “the balance of probabilities”. This means it is more likely than not that something happened. Although the “balance of probabilities” standard is lower than “beyond reasonable doubt”, decisions must still be supported by evidence. The standard is higher than simply believing that something is likely to have happened.” ([Office of the Independent Adjudicator \(OIA\), The Good Practice Framework](#))

- 1.14.8. The Panel including Chairs and Deputy Chairs will be selected from a pool of staff members approved by the relevant School/Doctoral College Board of Studies. Panel Chairs will be members of staff who have had no previous involvement in the case. Chairs will be appointed at the start of each academic year by the relevant Boards of Studies.
- 1.14.9. A selection of Deputy Chairs should be identified for circumstances which prevent the Chair from attending, either due to other commitments, or due to issues of impartiality.
- 1.14.10. The Panel Chair will be joined by two academic members of staff or one suitable professional member of staff and one academic member of staff from the approved pool of staff members. Where the Panel hearing is in relation to doctoral research, the members of the Panel are expected to have a robust understanding of research provision. A secretary will also be present at all Panel hearings.
- 1.14.11. When an investigation is escalated from the Preliminary Investigation to an Academic Misconduct Panel you should be informed within 14 calendar days of the Academic Misconduct Panel date, in order to enable you to prepare for the hearing.
- 1.14.12. You are entitled to bring a person to support you at the hearing or act as a witness.
- 1.14.13. You are not permitted to be legally represented at the hearing. If the individual accompanying you is legally qualified. They may attend but only in a supporting role and not to provide legal representation. The names and roles of those attending must be notified to the Secretary in advance of the hearing.
- 1.14.14. As part of the Academic Misconduct Panel proceedings, you will be informed of the reasons for the allegation(s) and provided with any directly relevant evidence that will be shared with you at least 7 calendar days in advance of the hearing. Should you inform us that you are unable to attend but wish to, efforts will be made to rearrange the Panel date if possible.
- 1.14.15. The usual order of business for a hearing at which you are present is:
 - The Chair will ask those present to introduce themselves; Panel members should be clearly identified.
 - The Chair will ask you (where present) if you refute the allegations.
 - The Chair will make a statement supporting the allegation(s).
 - The Chair will invite you to respond to the allegation(s).
 - During and after these statements the Panel may ask questions of either you or the Departmental representative for clarification.
 - All except the Panel members should withdraw while the Panel reaches its recommendation.

- The Panel's recommendation will be communicated to you verbally and again in writing as soon as possible after, and at the latest within 14 calendar days of, the hearing.
- Where you choose to or are unable to attend the hearing in person the usual process is:
 - You will provide a written response to the allegations and the evidence.
 - Any points requiring clarification will be followed up before the Panel meeting.
 - The Panel will meet to review the evidence and decide on the case.
 - The Panel's recommendation, along with reasons, will be communicated to you in writing as soon as possible after, and at the latest within 14 calendar days of, the hearing.

1.14.16. The fundamental principle behind determining a Sanction to impose on any students who have committed Academic Misconduct of any level, is that no student should be dealt with in such a way that they benefit from their misconduct. For example, it would not be acceptable even for a Poor Academic Practice case to be allocated a Sanction which allowed you to correct the misconduct and receive full marks/no penalty, as this would be equivalent to providing formative feedback and an extension.

1.14.17. However, the primary purpose of the Academic Misconduct procedure is not to punish you but to ensure the achievement of relevant learning outcomes.

Therefore, the University has prescribed a range of Sanctions (as detailed in **Appendix 3**) that should be used to apply the appropriate level of penalty.

1.14.18. In cases where the Academic Misconduct Panel upholds the allegation(s), they must decide an appropriate Sanction to recommend to the Assessment Board. Different sanctions exist to accommodate different levels of Academic Misconduct. We have set out standard sanctions (**Appendix 3**) to ensure parity of treatment across the University. Panels should aim to achieve an equitable and consistent outcome in the sanctions recommended for cases of Academic Misconduct/Severe Academic Misconduct.

1.14.19. Recommendations as to Sanctions should be based on the following facts:

- the instance of the misconduct (first or subsequent);
- the nature of the misconduct;
- the extent of the misconduct. This is a decision based on academic judgement;
- whether the misconduct was deliberately fraudulent.

1.14.20. In addition, the following circumstances may have an effect on the choice of Sanction:

- the effect a Sanction would have on your ability to enter your chosen profession;
- your year of study;
- the nature of the module (number of credits, structure, aggregation formula);

1.14.21. In cases of retrospective action (see Section 1.7 of this Policy), Schools should also consider:

- the impact of a Sanction on previous progression or Award decisions;
- the impact of a Sanction on the current programme stage and/or Graduation;
- the practical implementation of a sanction, e.g., the timing of resits;
- financial implications, e.g., where a student has paid tuition fees for programme stages subsequent to the alleged misconduct.

1.14.22. In deciding on an appropriate sanction, the Academic Misconduct Panel should take into account all circumstances related to the academic misconduct, the evidence provided, any historical offences, Professional Body (PSRB) requirements and the overall impact that the Sanction applied will have. The same Sanction might have a different outcome depending on when the misconduct was committed (e.g. year of study, first sit or re-sit) and the structure of the programme. For example, a penalty limiting progression may have an unintended negative impact on a student with a deteriorating health condition or an international student's visa status. The Panel Chair is asked to explain how they have taken these implications (where relevant) into account, as well as any reasonable adjustments, disability and other potential mitigating factors.

1.14.23. Sanctions determined must be both reasonable and proportionate to the level of academic misconduct upheld. These should be in line with the indicative guidance provided in **Appendix 4** to ensure consistency, fairness and a culture of Academic Integrity for all students.

1.15. Academic Misconduct Panel Recommendations

1.15.1. In order to maintain parity across the University, the Panel will consider the allegation of misconduct whilst taking other factors into account, including the number of attempts you have had, and any previous cases recorded on your file. The Panel will decide whether they are satisfied or not satisfied that misconduct has taken place, based on the "balance of probabilities".

1.15.2. If the Panel determines that Academic Misconduct has not been committed, you will be informed in writing and the allegation will not be considered as part of the Assessment Board's deliberations.

- 1.15.3. If the Panel determines that misconduct has taken place, they will make a recommendation to the relevant Assessment Board providing the details of the offence along with an appropriate Sanction. The reasons for the recommendation must be clearly recorded. The Panel must also make clear the rationale for any deviations from Sanctions that are the norm for a given type of misconduct.
- 1.15.4. If the Academic Misconduct Panel determines that you have committed Severe Academic Misconduct, the appropriate Sanction may be greater than those available within the scope of this Policy. In such cases, the Panel will refer your case to be dealt with under our Student Discipline Regulations ([Senate Regulation 13](#)) or, for PSRB regulated programmes, be referred to a Fitness to Practise (Train) Panel.
- 1.15.5. Outcomes of the Academic Misconduct Panel hearing will be recorded and communicated to you. The Sanction applied is not final until it is ratified by the relevant Assessment Board.
- 1.15.6. The Assessment Board Secretary will present the recommendations to the Chair of the Assessment Board for final approval.

1.16. Disciplinary or Fitness to Practise (Train) Panel Considerations

- 1.16.1. In cases of severe academic misconduct (**Appendix 2, 3 & 4**) where the application of Sanctions 1 – 4 are not appropriate due to the severity of the misconduct the Academic Misconduct Panel may deem it necessary to escalate the case to the Disciplinary Panel (Sanction 5) who have the ability to apply more appropriate sanctions. Or for PSRB regulated programmes, you may be referred to a Fitness to Practise (Train) Panel.
- 1.16.2. The Disciplinary Panel will be conducted in line with [Regulation 13 \(Student Disciplinary\)](#).
- 1.16.3. In instances where the allegations are found to be upheld, the Disciplinary or Fitness to Practise (Train) Panel can apply relevant Sanctions as listed in the Assessment and Student Discipline Regulations. Sanctions may also be combined as appropriate and reasonable. The outcome and rationale for the Sanction(s) applied will be recorded and communicated to you in writing.

1.17. Assessment Board Decisions

- 1.17.1. The Assessment Board/Doctoral College will only consider recommendations for Sanctions, for academic misconduct received via the Academic Misconduct Panel or via the Preliminary Investigation. The Assessment Board/Doctoral College will not re-consider the Academic Misconduct Panel's finding of academic misconduct but will consider the recommendations of the Panel or Preliminary Investigation regarding the action to be taken and take these into account when awarding your marks and making decisions concerning your progress and Award.

- 1.17.2. If you are awaiting the outcome and Assessment Board/Doctoral College ratification of an Academic Misconduct Panel, you will be advised to continue with the programme. You may appeal the decision after it has been ratified by the Assessment Board/Doctoral College, and as set out in 1.18.1. Where the case has been referred to the Disciplinary Panel or Fitness to Practise (Train), you do not need to wait for the Assessment Board/Doctoral College to ratify the decision. You may appeal as set out in 1.18.2 and the Disciplinary/Fitness to Practise (Train) Panel will be convened as soon as practically possible.

1.18. Academic Misconduct Cases with Extenuating Circumstances

- 1.18.1. Where an Extenuating Circumstances (EC) claim has been accepted for the same work/assessment where an instance of PAP, Academic Misconduct or Severe Academic Misconduct has been upheld then the AM Sanction (Sanction 1-6) should take precedence.
- 1.18.2. Where you have no further resit opportunities but your EC claim has been upheld by the Assessment Board, you may be allowed a further resit in line with the [EC Policy](#) . If this is the case the resit will be subject to the determined AM Sanction which must be applied.
- 1.18.3. For example, the Assessment Board should permit an additional attempt at the work/assessment, whilst also keeping the AM Sanction in place (e.g. allowing the additional resit but capping the module mark if for example, a Sanction 3 had been recommended by the AM panel).

1.19. Reporting and Statistics

- 1.19.1. In order to ensure consistency of practice, equity and comparability and to support monitoring of the process and the outcomes, cases of Academic Misconduct will be recorded and reported to the relevant School/Doctoral College Board of Studies on an annual basis.
- 1.19.2. Schools are asked to keep a log of all Academic Misconduct allegations, whether dealt with by informal resolution or by a full meeting of the Academic Misconduct Panel. The log should be considered annually by the relevant Boards of Study and should record the nature of the offence, the outcome of any investigation or hearing, and the decision of the Assessment Board.
- 1.19.3. Records should also be retained for cases where the Preliminary Investigation or Panel determine that an offence has not taken place. This is to provide the University with an overview of the nature and quantity of cases that occur, and any patterns or trends that are developing. **Retention and use of these records must not be relied upon to impose or justify any adverse treatment of individuals for lawful expression or academic activity and must comply with applicable legal obligations.**

- 1.19.4. Your record will only show Academic Misconduct cases that have been upheld and the sanctions that have been applied. A case that is not upheld will not feature on any of your student records for any purposes. Any Sanctions applied including reprimands (Sanction 1) will be formally recorded on your record. Where relevant, Sanctions may also be shared with relevant Professional Bodies (PSRBs).

1.20. Right to Appeal

- 1.20.1 You have the right to appeal the recommended Sanction of the Academic Misconduct Preliminary Investigation or an Academic Misconduct Panel (for Sanctions 1-4), following ratification of the decision by the Assessment Board and within the timelines permitted in our [Academic Appeals Regulation](#). With the exception of cases where the Academic Misconduct (AM) Panel has issued a Sanction 5 (Referral to Disciplinary or Fitness to Practise (Train)).
- 1.20.2 In cases where a Sanction 5 has been issued by an AM Panel, you can submit an appeal within the timelines permitted in our [Academic Appeals Regulation](#). You do not need to wait for the Assessment Board to ratify this decision. This is to ensure that there are no delays in managing the next steps of the case (referral to Disciplinary or Fitness to Practise (Train)) and also to ensure fairness and consistency in practice.
- 1.20.3 This ensures that all students (regardless of when their Assessment Boards are held) have the opportunity to appeal a Sanction 5 ahead of the Disciplinary or Fitness to Practise (Train) procedure. You must submit your appeal within 20 working days of the Sanction being issued and the appeal must be on the grounds of 'material error' only.
- 1.20.4 Further details can be found in our [Student Hub Appeals](#) page.

Appendix 1: Definitions of Academic Misconduct

1.21. Plagiarism

- 1.21.1 Plagiarism is defined as use of intellectual material produced by another person or Generative AI tool (such as ChatGPT) without acknowledging its source, for example:
- wholesale copying of passages from works of others without acknowledgment.
 - use of the views, opinions, or insights of another without acknowledgment.
 - submitting as one's own, an assignment prepared by another student
- 1.21.2 Where there is no hard evidence of plagiarism, but it has been demonstrated that there are good reasons to believe that the work is not your own, it may be deemed appropriate for the investigating staff or the Academic Misconduct Panel to expect you to demonstrate that the work is your own original work. This may involve but is not limited to the Preliminary Investigation Lead /Reporting member of staff or the Academic Misconduct Panel Chair asking for draft copies of the work and/or asking a series of questions about the content of the submitted work.
- 1.21.3 Resources for staff can be found on the [Academic Integrity & Misconduct Staff Hub](#) page.

1.22. Self-Plagiarism

- 1.22.1 It is possible to plagiarise yourself by re-using work you have previously submitted*, at this or at any other School/College/University or Institution without acknowledgement.
- 1.22.2 *Please note this does not include any permitted re-submissions of work/sections of work, formative or otherwise which have been explicitly approved by your lecturer/tutor/supervisor.
- 1.22.3 The submission of work that you, as the author, have previously submitted, without suitable acknowledgement of the source of their previous work; should not normally be more than a short quotation, as the same work cannot be submitted for different assignments.

1.23 Collusion

- 1.23.1 The University defines collusion as a form of cheating which may occur where you have consciously collaborated, without permission, on a piece of work, in part or whole, but then passed it off as your own individual efforts. Or where one student has authorised another to use their work, in part or whole, and to submit it as their own.

1.23.2 Actions which would be considered to be Collusion:

- Planning a response together; copying a plan for an individual assessment/task.
- Paraphrasing someone else's assignment and submitting it as your own.
- Relying on some group members to do all the work.
- Getting someone else to do your work/assessment task.

1.23.3 Actions that would be considered to be Cooperation:

- Analysing the assessment question together.
- Practising paraphrasing skills together and sharing tips.
- Sharing work evenly among group members.
- Getting help from your personal tutor/academic advisor

1.23.4 Working together with other students on a piece of work that will be submitted for individual assessment is not permitted and can result in an accusation of academic misconduct for all the students involved.

1.23.5 Discussing the material and ideas you are learning with your colleagues is beneficial and is encouraged, however, when you start to write down the material that you will use for assessment, make sure this is entirely your own work and do not share it with other students.

1.23.6 Collusion is different from group work where students are instructed by the University to work together and the work is then assessed as a group effort. For group tasks you will be advised what the members of the group are expected to do together, and that (if anything) they are expected to do separately. If you are unsure, check with your tutor or lecturer.

1.23.7 If collaboration is permitted at certain stages of a project, explicit instructions should be provided regarding when this is and when it is not allowed. For example, an assignment must be completed independently, it should be explained both verbally and in the assignment guidelines that collaborations will strictly not be permitted. It is essential for programme teams to provide clear instructions for handling group assignments. It is encouraged that this is provided to students both verbally and in writing.

1.24 **Falsification of evidence & Fabrication of data**

1.24.1 Falsification of evidence and fabrication of data is cheating by faking results, as of an experiment, or otherwise “making up” something that one presents as true, factual, or real. Fabrication in an academic context may occur in a number of forms, including these:

- falsifying research results or a report of research processes
- falsifying reports or records related to a field, practicum, or clinical experience

1.24.2 For doctoral research falsification and fabrication will be considered under the [Procedure for Investigating Allegations of Misconduct in Research](#).

1.25 Cheating

- 1.25.1 Cheating is a general category of academic misconduct that, in the context of an academic course, involves dishonesty in completing work in the course — whether an examination or other kind of assignment. Assisting another student dishonestly is also cheating. Note that plagiarism, fabrication of research results, and other such violations of academic integrity may correctly be identified as particular kinds of cheating.

Examples of cheating include, but are not limited to, the following:

- knowingly discovering or attempting to discover the contents of an examination before the contents are released
- taking a picture of or otherwise copying an examination without permission to do so
- providing such a picture/copy to another person
- obtaining, using, or attempting to obtain or use any material or device dishonestly
- supplying or attempting to supply any material or device to another person dishonestly
- obtaining or attempting to obtain unauthorized information during the course of an examination from another student or another student's test materials
- unauthorised possessing, taking, copying, or sharing of solutions manuals or computerized solutions for assignment or research problems

1.26 Breaching the Regulation for Conduct in Examinations

- 1.26.1 The University operates a zero-tolerance policy in relation to cheating in examinations.

- 1.26.2 Breaching the regulation for conduct in examinations includes but is not limited to:
- copying from the examination script of another candidate;
 - obtaining or offers any other improper assistance from or to another candidate (or any other person unless an approved reader or scribe);
 - refusing to comply with invigilator instructions in an exam
 - has with them any unauthorised book (including mathematical tables), manuscript or loose papers of any kind, unauthorised electronic devices* (e.g. mobile telephones, smart watches) or any source of unauthorised information.
 - allows himself/herself to be impersonated or when any person impersonates another examination candidate.
 - knowingly discovering or attempting to discover the contents of an examination before the contents are released.
 - taking a picture of or otherwise copying an examination without permission to do so.
 - providing such a picture/copy to another person

- obtaining, using, or attempting to obtain or use any material or device dishonestly.
- supplying or attempting to supply any material or device to another person dishonestly.
- obtaining or attempting to obtain unauthorized information during the course of an examination from another student or another student's test materials.
- unauthorised possessing, taking, copying, or sharing of pre-existing solutions manuals or pre-existing computerized solutions for assignment or research problems.
- unauthorised use of Generative Artificial Intelligence (AI) tools (such as ChatGPT and Microsoft Co-Pilot), to produce computerized solutions for elements of your assignment or research problems (in severe cases this may also constitute contract cheating, please see 'Contract Cheating & Essay Mills' section below).

*Note: Where you are found to have taken unauthorised materials or an electronic device to your desk, you may be found guilty of academic misconduct, irrespective of your intent or the nature of the materials.

1.27 Contract Cheating & Essay Mills

- 1.27.1 'Contract cheating' happens when a third party completes your work for you and this work is then submitted to the University as your own. This type of contract can in some cases include payment, or other favours, but this is not always the case.
- 1.27.2 The consequences of contract cheating are very serious. Contract Cheating and the use of Essay Mills is defined by the University as Severe Academic Misconduct.
- 1.27.3 'Services' may include essays or other types of written assignments, conducting research, numerical disciplines, impersonation in exams and other forms of unfair assistance for completing assessed work.
- 1.27.4 'Third parties' include web-based companies or auction sites (essay mills), sharing websites (including essay banks) or an individual such as a lecturer, colleague, friend, relative or Generative Artificial Intelligence (AI) tools (such as ChatGPT or Microsoft Co-Pilot).
- 1.27.5 The unauthorised use of Generative AI tools, even if they are freely available, is considered to be academic misconduct and could be determined to be a form of contract cheating, because you are instructing a third party to complete the work for you. Please note, some work/assessment tasks may be designed to incorporate using such tools as part of the assessment. Providing you are following exactly what has been requested by your School this is acceptable and will not be considered contract cheating. Your school will make clear if you can use Generative Artificial Intelligence (AI) tools as part of an assessment process.

- 1.27.6 'Input' means that the third party makes a contribution to your work, such that there is reasonable doubt as to whose work the assessment represents.
- 1.27.7 Where there is no hard evidence of contract cheating, but it has been demonstrated that there are good reasons to believe that the work is not your own, it may be deemed appropriate for the investigating staff or the Academic Misconduct Panel to expect you to demonstrate that the work is your own original work. This may involve but is not limited to the investigating staff asking for draft copies of the work and/or asking a series of questions about the content of the submitted work.
- 1.27.8 Resources for staff can be found on the [Academic Integrity & Misconduct Staff Hub](#) page, and more information on how to avoid Contract Cheating can be found on the [Student Hub](#).

1.28 Proofreading

- 1.28.1 A proof-reader may be another person or a Generative AI tool (such as ChatGPT or Microsoft Co-Pilot).
- 1.28.2 A proof-reader **MAY** proofread to check for, identify and suggest corrections for errors. This means a proof-reader may:
- Identify typographical, spelling and punctuation errors;
 - Identify formatting and layout errors and inconsistencies (e.g. page numbers, font size, line spacing, headers and footers);
 - Identify grammatical and syntactical errors and anomalies;
 - Highlight overly-long or complex sentences or paragraphs, especially where meaning is ambiguous;
 - Identify minor formatting errors in referencing (for consistency and order);
 - Identify errors in the labelling of diagrams, charts or figures;
 - Identify lexical repetition or omissions.
- 1.28.3 **Proofreading is not allowed at all where formatting, grammar etc. are part of the criteria for assessment.**
- 1.28.4 A proof-reader **MAY NOT** edit the work (that is, check or amend ideas, arguments or structure), since to do so is to compromise the authorship of the work. This means a proof-reader may not:
- Add to content in any way;
 - Check or correct facts, data calculations, formulae or equations;
 - Rewrite content where meaning is ambiguous;
 - Alter argument or logic where faulty;
 - Re-arrange or re-order paragraphs to enhance structure or argument;
 - Implement or significantly alter a referencing system;
 - Re-label diagrams, charts or figures;
 - Reduce content so as to comply with a specified word limit;
 - Make grammatical, syntactical or stylistic corrections;
 - Translate any part of the work into English.

- 1.28.5 Please note that for doctoral research, this does not include developing your research writing and presentation skills by working on drafts interactively with your supervisor, including for your final thesis.
- 1.28.6 Please be aware that you have overall authorial responsibility for your work and are responsible for choosing whether you wish to accept the proof-reader's advice.
- 1.28.7 Any accepted proofreader advice must be clearly acknowledged.
- 1.28.8 Additionally, proofreaders must be using tracked changes and comments, and not directly editing any of your work. This is to ensure that you can keep authorial responsibility for your work and a record of the proofreading should your work is ever challenged.
- 1.28.9 Please note, caution is advised when considering the use of any web-based services which claim to offer proofreading and then suggest edits to the writing that compromise the authorship of your work (as detailed above). Submitting work that has been produced by a commissioned service, is a type of severe academic misconduct that could have serious consequences.
- 1.28.10 For further details and guidance on Proofreading please see the [LEaD Proofreading Guide on the Student Hub](#). Resources for staff can be found on the [Academic Integrity & Misconduct Staff Hub](#) page.

1.29 Non-Recognition (Doctoral Research Only)

- 1.29.1 The failure to give fair and appropriate credit for non-published work done by others, including failure by you to formally recognise contributions from others, including your supervisory team.

1.30 Piracy

- 1.30.1 The theft or exploitation of the work/intellectual property of others without permission or acknowledgement, including the use of material that has been provided in a privileged way. For example, the illegal downloading, sharing, or selling of academic materials, including but not limited to course content, lecture recordings, and published/un-published research.

Appendix 2: Types of Academic Misconduct Cases

The following definitions are indicative and for guidance (based on sector research) but are not exhaustive. The severity of individual cases is a matter for academic judgement.

1.31 Poor Academic Practice (PAP)

- 1.31.1 There are occasions where your work might show indications of a breach of academic integrity conventions, such as a lack of understanding of scholarly practice, but falls short of academic misconduct. This normally occurs where you have attempted but failed to adopt good academic practice and is defined by the University as Poor Academic Practice (PAP).
- 1.31.2 Poor academic practice, within the scope of this Policy, should only be found where the breach of academic practice is not extensive.
- 1.31.3 Examples of cases that **would be considered** as Poor Academic Practice under this Policy include, but are not limited to, the following:
- Poor use of referencing that has not materially given you an unfair advantage. For example, errors such as unattributed quotations, inappropriate paraphrasing or some missing / incorrect or incomplete citations.
 - Passing off ideas, data or other information as though originally discovered by you.
 - Several sentences of direct copying without acknowledging the source.
 - Unacknowledged proof-reading.
- 1.31.4 Examples of cases that **would not be considered** as Poor Academic Practice under this Policy include, but are not limited to, the following:
- Inadequate academic practice which can be shown to be the result of a lack of effort. For example, poor or inadequate research and/or poor academic writing skills (e.g., grammatical errors, spelling mistakes and poor punctuation.)
- 1.31.5 In cases where inadequate academic practice has been identified, but is not within the scope of this Policy, the work/assessment should be marked to reflect the inadequate academic practice, which may mean that the mark is low or that you fail the assessment. No Sanction will be given in such circumstances.
- 1.31.6 Where a first PAP offence is identified, a Sanction 1 will be implemented locally, without the need for an Academic Misconduct Panel and you will be referred to the Academic Skills Team. Any suspected subsequent offences of PAP must be referred to the Academic Misconduct Panel.

1.32 Academic Misconduct

Academic misconduct cases can include:

- Plagiarism
- Submission of the same piece of work, or major part thereof, for more than one assessment;
- Collusion i.e. unauthorised collaboration on assessable written, oral or practical work with another person or persons;
- An assignment which has been translated into English by another person or Generative AI tool.
- Suspected subsequent Poor Academic Practice.
- Non-Recognition.
- Cheating, e.g.
 - Breaching the [Regulation for Conduct in Examinations](#) (with the exception of instances listed under Severe Academic Misconduct);
 - The lending of work which has been submitted for assessment to another student;
 - Inclusion of whole paragraphs or significant sections of unattributed work;
 - Including significant sections of unreferenced text

1.33 Severe Academic Misconduct

Severe Academic Misconduct cases could include cases such as:

- Piracy (Theft or exploitation of work of other students or practitioners)
- Contract Cheating e.g.:
 - Buying work from services such as essay mills or similar.
 - Commissioning work from individuals (including friends and family) or organisations.
 - Utilising Generative Artificial Intelligence (AI) tools in an unauthorised way/to gain an unfair advantage/to generate work that is then dishonestly submitted as your own. Always check with the Module Leader/Programme Director if you are unclear on what has been authorised for your submission.
- Evidence of extensive cheating e.g.:
 - Obtaining access to an unseen examination or test prior to the start of an examination/test;
 - Impersonating another person during an examination or arranging for another person to impersonate you during an examination;
- Copying each other's work;
- Evidence of extensive collusion;
- Fabrication of data e.g. altering or generating an entire set of research data;
- Falsification of evidence e.g. altering/creating supporting evidence to obtain an advantage or obtaining evidence illegally;
- Failure to obtain ethical approval prior to conducting research.

Appendix 3a: Academic Misconduct Sanctions for Taught Modules

Poor Academic Practice	Sanction 1	<p>Reprimand</p> <p>A formally recorded warning kept on the student's record. The work should be marked, but the mark may be reduced to reflect a student's failure to address the assessment criteria in areas of collation of sources and their citation.</p>
Academic Misconduct	Sanction 2	<p>Capping of the assessment component</p> <p>Failure in the assessment component, with an opportunity to resit where permissible. The assessment component mark for the resit will be capped at the pass mark.</p>
	Sanction 3	<p>Capping of the module mark</p> <p>Failure in the assessment component, with an opportunity to resit where permissible. The mark for the module will be capped at the pass mark.</p>
Severe Academic Misconduct	Sanction 4	<p>4a: Capping of the assessment component and other assessments for the same period</p> <p>Failure in the assessment component, with an opportunity to resit where permissible. The mark for the resit will be capped at the pass mark. Additionally, capped marks will be imposed on other assessments completed during the same assessment period in which the academic misconduct took place.</p> <p>4b: Award of zero for the module mark and credits awarded for progression</p> <p>Failure in the assessment component with an opportunity to resit where permissible. If the resit is passed, credit for the module will be Awarded in recognition of the learning outcomes being met but a module mark of zero will be recorded.</p> <p>Sanction 4b should not normally be applied to foundation or year one undergraduate students.</p>
	Sanction 5	<p>Referral to Disciplinary Panel</p> <p>A student will be referred to a Disciplinary Panel. Sanctions the Disciplinary Panel may apply for Academic Misconduct are set out in the Student Discipline Regulation (see Senate Regulation 13). For PSRB regulated programmes, students may be referred to a Fitness to Practise (Train) Panel.</p>

Appendix 3b: Academic Misconduct Sanctions for Doctoral Research

<p style="text-align: center;">Poor Academic Practice</p>	<p>Sanction 1</p>	<p>Reprimand Formal warning. Revise and resubmit, Meeting with supervisory team to discuss the poor academic practice. Training identified, either externally available or through the supervisory team to address poor practice. Note added to meeting on the Doctoral College online system that PAP was found and addressed. Resubmission date cannot be longer than 21 calendar days from the date the AM Panel Outcome letter is issued.</p>
<p style="text-align: center;">Academic Misconduct</p>	<p>Sanction 2</p>	<p>Revise and resubmit, with no Supervision Resubmission of revised documentation required within 21 days without supervisor support. One page report on remedial action taken by PGR to address issue and a formal notification of the outcome with note added on the Doctoral College online system.</p>
	<p>Sanction 3</p>	<p>Redact and Examine The portion of work which has been identified to have academic misconduct will be redacted and only the portion of work which is found to be acceptable will be examined by the assessor. A second submission opportunity, where relevant, will remain in place as usual.</p>
<p style="text-align: center;">Severe Academic Misconduct</p>	<p>Sanction 4</p>	<p>Revise and resubmit with no second submission opportunity Revise and resubmit, with plan created with the help of the Supervisor. Resubmission date will be set by the Doctoral College. No second submission opportunity will be granted.</p>
	<p>Sanction 5</p>	<p>Referral to Disciplinary Panel A student will be referred to a Disciplinary Panel. Sanctions the Disciplinary Panel may apply for Academic Misconduct are set out in our Student Discipline Regulation (see Senate Regulation 13). Or for PSRB regulated programmes, students may be referred to a Fitness to Practise (Train) Panel.</p>

Appendix 4: Mapping of Sanctions

The Indication Sanctions are not prescriptive. In deciding on an appropriate Sanction, the Academic Misconduct Panel should take into account all circumstances related to the academic misconduct, the evidence provided, any historical offences, PSRB requirements and the overall impact that the Sanction applied will have on the student.

Examples of types of Academic Misconduct	Severity	Indicative Sanction
Poor use of referencing that has not materially given the student an unfair advantage. For example, errors such as unattributed quotations, inappropriate paraphrasing or some missing / incorrect or incomplete citations.	Poor Academic Practice <i>* Suspected subsequent Poor Academic Practice, should escalate to Academic Misconduct</i>	1
The passing off ideas, data or other information as though originally discovered by the student		
Several sentences of direct copying without acknowledging the source		
Unacknowledged proof-reading		
Suspected subsequent Poor Academic Practice	Academic Misconduct	2 - 3
Plagiarism: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Inclusion of whole paragraphs and/or significant sections of unattributed work Inclusion of significant sections of unreferenced text 		
Self-Plagiarism: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Submission of the same piece of work, or major part thereof, for assessment 		
Collusion: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Unauthorised collaboration on assessable written, oral or practical work with another person or persons 		
The lending of work which has been submitted for assessment to another student		
An assignment which has been translated into English by another person or Generative AI tool (such as ChatGPT);		
Examinations: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Breaching the Regulation for Conduct in Examinations (with the exception of instances listed under Severe Academic Misconduct) 		
Non-Recognition: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> failure to give fair and appropriate credit for non-published work done by others (doctoral research only) 		

<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Piracy (Theft or exploitation of work of other students or practitioners) 	<p>Severe Academic Misconduct</p>	<p>4 - 5</p>
<p>Contract Cheating:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Buying work from essay services such as essay mills or similar • Commissioning work from individuals (including friends and family) or organisation • Utilising Large Generative Artificial Intelligence (AI) tools in an unauthorised way/to gain an unfair advantage/to generate work that is then dishonestly submitted as your own. 		
<p>Examinations:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Obtaining access to an unseen examination or test prior to the start of an examination/test • Impersonating another person during an examination or arranging for another person to impersonate the student during an examination; • Copying each other's work 		
<p>Collusion:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Evidence of extensive collusion 		
<p>Fabrication of data:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Altering or generating an entire set of research data 		
<p>Falsification of evidence:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Altering/creating supporting evidence to obtain an advantage or obtaining evidence illegally; 		
<p>Failure to obtain ethical approval prior to conducting research</p>		

Appendix 5: Academic Misconduct Process Flowchart

