

LIS Academic Integrity and Misconduct Policy and Procedure

Contents

Academic integrity and misconduct: at a glance	3
1. Purpose, scope and principles	5
i. Purpose	5
ii. Scope	5
iii. Principles	6
2. Academic integrity and forms of academic misconduct	8
i. Academic integrity and good academic practice	8
ii. Poor academic practice	8
iii. Academic misconduct	9
3. Raising and initially considering concerns	13
i. Responsibilities of markers	13
ii. Normal marking and feedback	13
iii. Poor academic practice	14
iv. Summary consideration of minor academic misconduct	15
4. Academic Misconduct Panel	22
i. Convening a Panel	22
ii. Panel membership	22
iii. Conduct of a hearing	26
iv. Determining a penalty	28
5. Outcomes and penalties	30
i. Purpose and application of penalties	30
ii. Poor academic practice	30
iii. Summary penalty	30
iv. Penalties available to the Academic Misconduct Panel	30
v. Previous findings and repeated misconduct	32
vi. Mitigating and aggravating circumstances	33
vii. Implementation of academic penalties	34

viii.	Referral for academic support following an outcome.....	34
ix.	Referral to Student Engagement Review Group	35
x.	Referral to Student Wellbeing.....	35
xi.	Safeguarding	35
6.	Appeals	37
i.	Challenging a summary decision	37
ii.	Appealing against a Panel decision	37
7.	Completion, former students and records	39
i.	Completion and conferment.....	39
ii.	Former students and conferred awards	39
iii.	Confidentiality	40
iv.	Case records.....	40
8.	Monitoring and governance	42
i.	Timescales.....	42
ii.	Monitoring and annual reporting	42
iii.	Guidance and training	43
iv.	Review and approval	43

Academic integrity and misconduct: at a glance

This page summarises the main points for students. More detailed information is provided in the full Policy and Procedure.

What you need to do

- Submit work that genuinely demonstrates your own achievement.
- Follow the requirements in each assessment brief, including those relating to collaboration, referencing, assistance and technology.
- Acknowledge your sources and declare any assistance where required.
- Check what use of generative AI is permitted for each assessment.
- Keep drafts, notes, prompts or version histories where required.

If you are unsure what is permitted, ask your Module Leader or marker before submitting your work.

Using artificial intelligence

Using generative AI is not automatically academic misconduct. It may become misconduct where its use is not permitted, goes beyond what is permitted, is not declared when required, misrepresents who produced the work or prevents the assessment from demonstrating your own achievement.

An AI-detection result, writing style or missing AI declaration is not sufficient on its own to establish misconduct. Authorised assistive technology and reasonable adjustments are not academic misconduct.

What happens if a concern is raised by a marker?

The response will depend on the evidence, nature, and seriousness of the concern:

- **Normal marking and feedback:** weaknesses in the work will be addressed through the assessment criteria and feedback.
- **Poor academic practice:** a limited issue that is not sufficiently serious to constitute misconduct may be addressed through marking, feedback and guidance. No separate penalty will be applied.
- **Summary consideration:** a marker may make a provisional finding of limited, minor misconduct and apply a provisional deduction of five percentage points. The deduction cannot turn a pass into a fail.
- **Academic Misconduct Panel:** serious, substantial, repeated or complex cases, and challenges to summary decisions, will be considered formally. You will

receive the allegation and evidence and will normally have five working days to respond.

How decisions are made

LIS must establish, on the balance of probabilities, that misconduct occurred. This means that the evidence, considered as a whole, must show that misconduct was more likely than not. You are not required to prove that you did not commit misconduct.

Any penalty must be proportionate to the seriousness and circumstances of the misconduct. Penalties may include training, a warning, a mark deduction, a capped mark or a mark of zero. Exceptionally serious or repeated misconduct may result in termination of registration.

Your rights

You have the right to:

- understand the concern and receive the relevant evidence;
- respond and provide your own evidence;
- access support and request reasonable adjustments;
- be accompanied at a Panel hearing;
- receive the decision and reasons in writing; and
- challenge or appeal the decision where permitted.

You may challenge a summary finding, penalty or both within 15 working days. A Panel decision may normally be appealed under the Academic Appeals Procedure within 15 working days.

1. Purpose, scope and principles

i. Purpose

The School is committed to maintaining academic integrity and protecting the standards and credibility of its awards. This Policy and Procedure:

- explains the standards of academic integrity expected of students;
- defines poor academic practice and academic misconduct;
- sets out how concerns about academic practice or suspected misconduct will be considered;
- explains the possible outcomes and penalties; and
- sets out how students may challenge or appeal a decision.

The aims of this Policy and Procedure are to:

- help students understand and meet the School's expectations;
- prevent and identify academic misconduct;
- ensure that concerns are considered fairly, consistently and proportionately; and
- safeguard the integrity of assessment and the standards of the School's awards.

ii. Scope

This Policy and Procedure applies to all students registered with the School and to all assessment undertaken for credit or an award. It applies to individual and group assessment and to written, oral, practical, creative, digital and examination-based work.

The School may consider a misconduct concern identified after a student has completed or withdrawn from their programme, or after an award has been conferred, where the concern relates to assessment undertaken while the student was registered. Any action affecting an award will be taken in accordance with the School's Academic Regulations.

Where conduct may fall within both this Policy and Procedure and another School procedure, the School will determine which procedure should be followed and in what order. The student will be told which procedure applies and whether any related process will follow.

This Policy and Procedure should be read alongside the:

- Academic Regulations;
- Student Code of Conduct and Disciplinary Procedure;

- Academic Appeals Procedure;
- Research Ethics Policy; and
- relevant assessment brief and published guidance on academic integrity and the use of artificial intelligence.

Relationship with other LIS procedures

More than one LIS procedure may occasionally be relevant to the same student. Where this occurs, LIS will identify the **purpose of each procedure** and avoid unnecessary duplication of investigations or penalties.

Academic Progress, Attendance and Engagement

This policy determines:

Is the student engaging and progressing academically, what is getting in the way, and what academic intervention is required?

Support to Study and Wellbeing

This policy determines:

Is health or wellbeing significantly affecting the student's ability to study and what support or proportionate intervention is required?

LIS may:

- run procedures concurrently;
- sequence them;
- temporarily pause one procedure;
- refer information between procedures where appropriate and lawful; or
- determine that only one procedure is necessary.

The student will be told which procedure or procedures are being used and why.

A finding made under one procedure will not automatically determine a different finding under another procedure.

iii. Principles

1. Academic integrity is founded on honesty, trust, fairness, respect and responsibility. Students are expected to act with academic integrity in all learning and assessment activities.
2. Academic integrity is a shared responsibility. The School will provide students with clear, current guidance and appropriate opportunities to develop their

academic practice. Students are responsible for understanding and following the requirements that apply to their assessments.

3. Assessment briefs will clearly explain whether particular forms of collaboration, assistance or technology—including generative artificial intelligence—are permitted, restricted, required or prohibited, and whether their use must be acknowledged or declared.
4. The School will design and operate assessment in ways that support academic integrity, minimise opportunities for academic misconduct and facilitate its identification where it occurs.
5. Suspected academic misconduct cases will be considered on the evidence available. It is for the School to establish, on the balance of probabilities, that poor academic practice or academic misconduct has occurred. A student is not required to prove that they did not commit misconduct.
6. Cases will be handled fairly, impartially, confidentially, proportionately and without unnecessary delay. Students will be given a meaningful opportunity to understand and respond to any concern raised about their work.
7. Students will be informed of the support available to them. Reasonable adjustments will be made to the procedure where required to enable a disabled student to participate effectively.
8. Outcomes will reflect the nature, extent and seriousness of the conduct and any relevant circumstances. Concerns will be handled at the lowest appropriate level. Minor or first instances may be addressed through marking and feedback, an educative response or the summary procedure set out in this Policy. Serious, repeated or materially disputed allegations will normally be referred to an Academic Misconduct Panel. An academic penalty may only become final after the student has been informed of the concern and given a fair opportunity to respond to or challenge the decision.
9. Students will receive written reasons for decisions and information about any right to challenge or appeal the outcome.
10. The School will monitor cases and outcomes to promote consistency, identify areas requiring additional guidance or support, and improve assessment and academic practice.

2. Academic integrity and forms of academic misconduct

i. Academic integrity and good academic practice

Academic integrity means acting honestly, responsibly and transparently in learning and assessment. It requires students to submit work that genuinely demonstrates their own achievement and complies with the requirements of the assessment.

Good academic practice includes:

- producing assessment work independently, except where collaboration is expressly permitted;
- clearly distinguishing the student's own ideas, words and work from material derived from other sources;
- acknowledging and referencing sources in accordance with the conventions relevant to the assessment;
- using assistance, resources and technologies only as permitted by the assessment brief and other published guidance;
- accurately declaring permitted assistance, including the use of generative artificial intelligence, where required; and
- retaining appropriate records of how work was developed, where required by the School.

ii. Poor academic practice

Poor academic practice is a limited or minor failure to follow academic conventions or assessment requirements that is not sufficiently serious to constitute academic misconduct.

Poor academic practice may include:

- incomplete, inaccurate or inconsistent referencing;
- failing to use quotation marks correctly in a limited part of the work;
- insufficiently distinguishing between a student's own words or ideas and those of a source;
- a minor or inadvertent failure to follow a requirement concerning acknowledgement or declaration; or
- another limited breach arising from an insufficient understanding of academic conventions.

In determining whether conduct amounts to poor academic practice or academic misconduct, the School will consider:

- the nature, extent and significance of the conduct;
- the proportion and importance of the assessment affected;
- the student's level and previous educational experience;
- the clarity of the relevant instructions and the guidance available to the student;
- whether the student had previously received relevant guidance, feedback or a finding of poor academic practice or misconduct;
- whether the conduct was intentional, reckless, negligent or genuinely inadvertent;
- whether the conduct gave, or could have given, the student or another person an unfair advantage; and
- any other circumstances relevant to the case.

The distinction between poor academic practice and academic misconduct must be based on the circumstances as a whole. An intention to deceive is not required for a finding of academic misconduct. Conduct may constitute misconduct where it is too extensive or serious to be treated as poor academic practice, or where it repeats similar poor academic practice after the student has received clear guidance.

iii. Academic misconduct

Academic misconduct is conduct relating to learning or assessment that:

- breaches the School's academic integrity or assessment requirements;
- improperly represents the authorship, originality, accuracy or circumstances of work;
- gives, or could give, a student or another person an unfair academic advantage;
- disadvantages, or could disadvantage, another student; or
- otherwise undermines the integrity of assessment or the standards of the School's awards.

Academic misconduct includes attempted misconduct and assisting, encouraging or enabling another person to commit misconduct. Examples of academic misconduct may include, but are not limited to, the following:

Plagiarism

Presenting another person's words, ideas, data, images, code, designs, creative work or other material as the student's own, without appropriate acknowledgement.

Re-use of work

Submitting work, in whole or in part, that has previously been submitted for academic credit by the student or another person, unless this has been expressly permitted and appropriately acknowledged.

Collusion

Working with another person beyond the collaboration permitted for the assessment, including sharing work in circumstances where it may be copied or used improperly.

Unauthorised third-party assistance

Obtaining or accepting assistance from another person or service beyond that permitted for the assessment, including commissioning, purchasing or otherwise arranging for work to be produced or substantially altered.

Impersonation

Arranging for another person to undertake an assessment or undertaking an assessment on behalf of another person.

Fabrication or falsification

Inventing, altering or misrepresenting data, evidence, sources, results, records, research activity or other information.

Misrepresentation

Providing false or misleading information about the production, authorship or circumstances of assessment work.

Breaches of assessment conditions

Academic misconduct may include:

- accessing, possessing, sharing or using unauthorised information, materials, devices or assistance during an examination or other controlled assessment;
- communicating with another person during an assessment where communication is not permitted;
- obtaining or attempting to obtain confidential assessment materials without authorisation; or

- failing to comply with another requirement stated in the assessment brief, examination instructions or Academic Regulations where the breach is sufficiently serious to constitute misconduct.

Research misconduct

Conducting research or using data in breach of relevant ethical approval, consent, confidentiality or research-integrity requirements.

Interference and improper influence

Academic misconduct may include:

- interfering with another student's work or access to learning or assessment resources; or
- attempting to influence an academic decision through bribery, intimidation, coercion or other improper means.

Facilitating misconduct

Providing work, materials, access, information or assistance for use in another person's academic misconduct.

Misuse of artificial intelligence

The use of generative artificial intelligence is not inherently academic misconduct. Whether its use is permitted will depend on the category assigned to the assessment and any additional instructions in the assessment brief.

Misuse of generative artificial intelligence may constitute academic misconduct where a student:

- uses it in an assessment in which its use is prohibited;
- uses it for purposes beyond those expressly permitted for the assessment;
- presents AI-generated or AI-modified material as their own work where this is not permitted;
- materially or knowingly fails to acknowledge or declare the use of generative artificial intelligence where acknowledgement or declaration is required;
- uses it to fabricate or falsify sources, data, evidence, research activity or other information;
- uses it to obscure the authorship or production of assessment work; or
- otherwise uses it in a way that prevents the assessment from genuinely demonstrating the student's achievement of the relevant learning outcomes.

Where generative artificial intelligence is integral to or encouraged within an assessment, students must use it in accordance with the assessment brief, including any requirements concerning the tasks for which it may be used, critical evaluation, record keeping, acknowledgement or declaration.

The authorised use of assistive technology, accessibility tools or reasonable adjustments will not constitute academic misconduct. Where a tool includes generative artificial intelligence or materially alters submitted work, the student must follow the requirements stated in the assessment brief and any guidance provided by the School.

An AI-detection score, writing style, linguistic characteristic or apparent difference from a student's previous work will not, by itself, establish academic misconduct. Any concern must be considered alongside the assessment requirements and the wider evidence available.

A missing, incomplete or inaccurate AI declaration does not, by itself, establish that unauthorised AI use occurred. The School may ask the student to complete or clarify the declaration and explain how the assessment was produced.

Depending on the nature of the omission, the student's explanation and the other evidence available, a failure concerning an AI declaration may result in no further action, a finding of poor academic practice or consideration as possible academic misconduct.

External framework

LIS operates this policy having regard to:

- Office for Students conditions relating to effective, valid and reliable assessment and credible awards;
- the OIA Good Practice Framework on disciplinary procedures;
- the Equality Act 2010;
- UK GDPR and the Data Protection Act 2018;
- LIS Academic Regulations; and
- relevant sector guidance.

The Office for Students defines academic misconduct as action or attempted action that may result in an unfair academic advantage in assessment and expects providers to design assessment in ways that minimise opportunities for misconduct and facilitate its detection.

3. Raising and initially considering concerns

i. Responsibilities of markers

Markers are responsible for assessing work against the published assessment criteria and exercising their academic judgement about the quality of the work.

Where a concern arises, the marker should normally determine a provisional mark for the work based solely on its academic quality and the published assessment criteria. Any penalty applied under this Policy and Procedure must be recorded separately from the academic mark initially awarded.

Weaknesses such as inaccurate referencing, unsupported claims, limited critical analysis, fabricated or unreliable sources, failure to answer the task or an inability to demonstrate the relevant learning outcomes may affect the academic mark where they are relevant to the assessment criteria. This does not necessarily mean that poor academic practice or academic misconduct has occurred.

Markers are expected to make ordinary academic judgements about the quality of assessed work. A referral should not be made solely because the marker:

- is uncertain what mark the work merits;
- would prefer another person or body to determine its academic quality;
- considers that the work is inconsistent with the student's previous performance;
or
- has received a similarity or AI-detection result that is not supported by other identifiable evidence.

A marker who is uncertain about the appropriate route may consult the Module Leader, moderator or another suitably experienced academic before taking further action. This consultation does not, by itself, create a formal case.

Concerns should be addressed at the lowest level appropriate to their nature, evidential basis, seriousness and likely impact.

ii. Normal marking and feedback

Where the available information identifies weaknesses in the work but does not provide reasonable grounds to suspect poor academic practice or academic misconduct, the marker will:

- complete the marking in the usual way;
- apply the published assessment criteria;
- provide appropriate academic feedback; and

- take no action under this Policy and Procedure.

A similarity or AI-detection report may assist a marker in identifying sections of work requiring closer consideration. The percentage or score shown in a report must not be used as a substitute for examining the work or exercising academic judgement.

A missing or incomplete AI declaration may initially be addressed by asking the student to complete or clarify it. Unless there is other evidence suggesting undeclared or unauthorised AI use, the omission will not normally require referral for possible academic misconduct.

iii. Poor academic practice

A marker may determine that poor academic practice has occurred where the issue is limited or minor, is not sufficiently serious to constitute academic misconduct, and can appropriately be addressed through marking, feedback and academic guidance.

Before reaching that decision, the marker may consult the Module Leader, moderator or another suitably experienced academic. Consultation should normally take place where:

- the marker is uncertain whether the concern exceeds poor academic practice;
- the issue affects a significant part of the assessment;
- a formal record of the poor academic practice may be retained; or
- the student has previously received relevant guidance or feedback.

Where poor academic practice is identified, the marker should:

- complete the marking by applying the published assessment criteria;
- identify the relevant issue clearly in the feedback;
- explain the academic practice expected in future work;
- direct the student to relevant guidance or support; and
- notify the Registrar where a record should be retained because the matter may be relevant to any future concern.

Where a finding of poor academic practice will be recorded, the student should be informed of:

- the conduct identified as poor academic practice;
- the guidance or assessment requirement that was not followed;
- any relevant evidence;
- the support or action recommended; and

- the fact that the matter will be recorded and may be considered if a similar concern arises in future.

Poor academic practice does not carry a separate or fixed mark penalty. The work will still be marked against the published assessment criteria, and any relevant weaknesses may affect the mark awarded.

Repeated poor academic practice must not be addressed through feedback and guidance alone and should be considered for formal referral. Conduct that is too extensive or significant to be treated as poor academic practice may be addressed through the summary procedure, where its conditions are met, or referred for formal consideration.

iv. Summary consideration of minor academic misconduct

The summary procedure enables a marker to apply a limited penalty for minor academic misconduct without making a formal referral or convening an Academic Misconduct Panel.

A marker may use the summary procedure where they are satisfied, on the balance of probabilities, that:

- the student breached a clearly communicated academic integrity or assessment requirement;
- the misconduct is limited in extent and seriousness;
- the matter appears to be an isolated or first instance; and
- the fixed summary penalty is proportionate.

The summary procedure must not be used where:

- the suspected misconduct is serious, extensive or repeated;
- the conduct affects a substantial or critical part of the assessment;
- contract cheating, impersonation, substantial false authorship, fabrication, examination cheating or deliberate interference is suspected;
- the evidence is too uncertain or complex for the marker to reach a fair decision;
- a penalty greater than the fixed summary penalty may be appropriate; or
- the summary penalty would reduce a passing assessment mark to a failing mark.

In these circumstances, the marker must refer the concern to the Registrar for formal consideration.

A marker may seek advice from the Module Leader, moderator or another experienced academic if they are uncertain about the evidence or appropriate route. Such consultation is not required before using the summary procedure.

Similarity reports and AI-detection results may be considered alongside other evidence, but neither is sufficient on its own to establish academic misconduct or determine the appropriate penalty. A missing, incomplete or inaccurate AI declaration may also be relevant but does not, by itself, establish unauthorised AI use.

Where the marker decides that minor academic misconduct occurred, they will apply the following provisional summary penalty:

- a deduction of five percentage points from the assessment mark;

The penalty must not be calculated by reference to the percentage or score shown by similarity or AI-detection software. The marker may issue the provisional penalty at the same time as the assessment mark and feedback. Feedback must make clear:

- the conduct found to constitute minor academic misconduct;
- the requirement that was breached;
- the principal evidence supporting the finding;
- the academic mark awarded before the penalty;
- the deduction and resulting mark;
- any academic integrity guidance or support required or recommended; and
- how and by when the student may challenge the decision.

A student may challenge the finding, the penalty, or both by requesting consideration by an Academic Misconduct Panel within 15 working days of receiving the summary decision. The request must be submitted to the Registrar. It does not need to identify formal grounds of appeal, but the student should explain what they are challenging and provide any relevant information or evidence.

Where the finding is challenged, the Panel will consider the allegation afresh and will not treat the marker's decision as a previous finding of misconduct. Where only the penalty is challenged, the Panel will consider whether the summary penalty was permitted and proportionate in the circumstances. Challenging a summary decision will not, in itself, result in a more severe penalty.

The summary finding and any penalty challenged by the student will remain provisional until the Panel has reached its decision. Where no challenge is received within 15 working days, the summary finding and penalty will become final.

The marker may correct or withdraw a summary finding before it becomes final where the student identifies a clear factual error or provides information demonstrating that the finding should not stand. The student and Registrar will be informed of any change.

Referral for formal consideration

A concern should be referred to the Registrar for formal consideration where there are reasonable grounds, supported by identifiable evidence, to believe that academic misconduct may have occurred and the matter cannot appropriately be addressed through normal marking, feedback, the poor academic practice route or the summary procedure. Student Support will be informed when a case is being considered under this stage of the process.

Formal referral will normally be required where:

- the suspected conduct is substantial, serious or repeated;
- the conduct affects a significant or critical part of the assessment;
- the student materially disputes evidence that is capable of supporting a misconduct finding;
- the case involves suspected contract cheating, impersonation, substantial false authorship, fabrication or falsification, examination cheating or deliberate interference;
- the student has a relevant previous finding;
- the matter may affect more than one student or indicate a wider academic integrity concern; or
- the potential penalty exceeds the authority available through the summary procedure.

The person making the referral must provide:

- the student's name and the assessment concerned;
 - a clear description of the suspected conduct;
 - the academic integrity, assessment or regulatory requirement that may have been breached;
 - the evidence supporting the concern;
 - the student's response, where one has already been obtained;
 - any relevant information about previous poor academic practice or misconduct;
- and

- an explanation of why formal consideration is required.

Initial screening by the Registrar

The Registrar, or a nominee with no material prior involvement in the matter, will undertake an initial screening of the referral. The initial screening will consider:

- whether the matter falls within the scope of this Policy and Procedure;
- whether the suspected conduct and relevant requirement have been identified clearly;
- whether there is credible evidence capable of supporting the concern;
- whether the matter has been referred through the appropriate route;
- whether further information is required;
- whether the case requires additional investigation; and
- whether the matter should be considered under, or in conjunction with, another School procedure.

Initial screening should normally be completed within ten working days of receipt of the referral. The initial screening may result in:

- no further action because there is insufficient evidence or no identifiable breach;
- return of the matter for normal marking and feedback;
- consideration as poor academic practice;
- return of the matter to the marker for consideration under the summary procedure, where the relevant conditions are met;
- a request for specific additional information;
- referral for proportionate investigation;
- referral directly to an Academic Misconduct Panel; or
- referral to another School procedure.

The Registrar or nominee may assess whether there is a case to answer but must not make a formal finding of academic misconduct or resolve materially disputed facts through the screening process.

Investigation where required

A separate investigation is not required in every referred case. A matter may be referred directly to an Academic Misconduct Panel where the allegation, relevant requirements,

evidence and student's response can be presented fairly and clearly without further investigation.

An investigation may be undertaken where:

- the case is serious or complex;
- relevant evidence has not yet been gathered;
- information is required from several people or sources;
- the circumstances in which the assessment was produced require clarification; or
- fairness otherwise requires further enquiries before the case is presented to a Panel.

The Registrar will appoint an Investigating Officer who:

- has had no material prior involvement in raising or deciding the concern;
- will approach the matter impartially;
- has appropriate knowledge of the procedure; and
- will not subsequently serve as a voting member of the Panel considering the case.

At the start of an investigation, the student will be informed in writing of:

- the specific conduct alleged;
- the academic integrity, assessment or regulatory requirement that may have been breached;
- why the School considers that there may be a case to answer;
- the evidence available at that stage;
- the investigation process and possible next steps;
- their right to provide a written response and relevant evidence;
- any deadline for responding, which will normally be at least ten working days;
- the advice and support available to them; and
- how to request reasonable adjustments to participate effectively.

The Investigating Officer may:

- examine the assessment, relevant sources and assessment instructions;

- obtain marking, moderation, examination or system records;
- request drafts, notes, prompts, version histories, metadata, research records or other material relevant to how the work was produced;
- seek information from relevant members of staff or other witnesses;
- consider similarity or AI-detection reports as part of the wider evidence; and
- invite the student to an investigatory meeting where this would assist in establishing the facts.

A student invited to an investigatory meeting will receive reasonable notice of its purpose and the matters to be discussed. They may be accompanied by a member of the School community or another appropriate supporter, subject to any reasonable conditions set by the School.

A written record will be made of any investigatory meeting. The student will be given an opportunity to identify any material inaccuracies in that record.

A student is expected to engage reasonably with the investigation. If the student does not respond or attend a meeting without good reason, the investigation may proceed on the evidence available. Failure to participate will not, by itself, be treated as evidence that misconduct occurred.

The Investigating Officer will prepare a report setting out:

- the allegation and relevant requirements;
- the evidence gathered;
- the student's response;
- any material facts that are agreed or disputed; and
- whether there is a case to answer.

After considering the investigation report, the Registrar or nominee may:

- close the case because there is no case to answer;
- return the matter for normal marking or consideration as poor academic practice;
- return the matter to the marker for consideration under the summary procedure, where its conditions are met; or
- refer the case to an Academic Misconduct Panel.

The student will be informed promptly of the outcome of the investigation. Where the case is referred to a Panel, the student will receive the investigation report and relevant evidence, subject to any necessary and proportionate redactions.

Marks and timescales while a case is considered

Where necessary to protect the integrity of the assessment process, the School may temporarily withhold the mark, progression decision or award affected by a formal concern. This is a precautionary measure and not a penalty. The student will be informed where a result is being withheld and, where possible, when a decision is expected.

Concerns will be considered as quickly as reasonably possible. Where consideration is delayed, the student will be told the reason and given an updated expected timescale. Cases affecting progression, reassessment, graduation or immigration status will be identified and prioritised where practicable.

4. Academic Misconduct Panel

i. Convening a Panel

The Registrar or nominee will convene an Academic Misconduct Panel where:

- a case is referred for formal determination under the procedure;
- a student challenges a summary finding, penalty, or both within the permitted time limit

Where the finding is challenged, the Panel will determine the allegation afresh and will not treat the marker's decision as a previous finding of misconduct. Where only the penalty is challenged, the Panel will consider whether the summary penalty was permitted and proportionate.

ii. Panel membership

A Panel will normally comprise two voting members. Where the initial consideration or investigation indicates that termination of registration may be an appropriate outcome if the allegation is upheld, the Panel must comprise three voting members, including at least one senior member of staff.

A panel will typically compromise:

- the Registrar or an appropriately senior nominee, who will act as Chair;
- an academic member of staff with appropriate knowledge or experience of assessment.
- Where a three-member Panel is required, the third member will be an academic or another senior member of staff with appropriate knowledge or experience.

A Secretary appointed by the Registrar will normally support the Panel. The Secretary is not a voting member.

Panel members must:

- have had no material prior involvement in raising, investigating or determining the allegation;
- have no actual or reasonably perceived conflict of interest;
- approach the allegation impartially; and
- have appropriate knowledge of this Policy and Procedure.

The Registrar may chair the Panel where their previous involvement was limited to administrative screening, appointing an investigator or arranging the procedure and they

have not determined disputed facts or expressed a view on whether misconduct occurred.

A marker, Module Leader or Investigating Officer who has been materially involved in the case may provide evidence or answer questions but must not serve as a voting member of the Panel.

The student will be informed of the Panel's membership. Any concern about a member's involvement or possible conflict of interest should be raised with the Registrar as soon as reasonably possible. The concern will be considered by a senior member of staff who is not involved in the case.

Format of consideration

The Panel may consider a case:

- through written evidence;
- at a hearing; or
- through a combination of written and oral evidence.

The Chair will determine the appropriate format, taking account of:

- the nature and seriousness of the allegation;
- whether the material facts are agreed or disputed;
- whether the reliability or credibility of evidence needs to be explored;
- the student's stated preference and reasons;
- any reasonable adjustments required;
- the possible consequences for the student; and
- what is necessary to consider the case fairly and proportionately.

Written consideration will normally be appropriate where the allegation, evidence and student's response are sufficiently clear, and the Panel does not need to assess contested oral evidence or credibility.

A hearing will normally be appropriate where:

- material facts or evidence are substantively disputed;
- the Panel needs to ask questions to understand the evidence or the student's account;
- the reliability or credibility of a material account may affect the outcome;
- a particularly serious penalty may be imposed; or

- fairness otherwise requires oral consideration.

The student may request a hearing or ask for the case to be considered in writing. The Chair will consider the request but may determine that another format is required to ensure fair and effective consideration.

The Chair may change the format or adjourn the case where it becomes apparent that further written or oral consideration is necessary. The student will be informed and given a reasonable opportunity to participate.

Information provided to the student

The Secretary will notify the student in writing that the matter has been referred to the Panel. The student will normally be given five working days from the date of notification to submit a written response and any supporting evidence. 'student support will be made aware of the case and may contact the student to offer wellbeing support if needed.

The student will be provided with:

- the specific allegation or allegations to be determined;
- the academic integrity, assessment or regulatory requirements that may have been breached;
- the referral and any investigation report;
- the evidence that will be considered by the Panel;
- the proposed format and, where applicable, the date and arrangements for the hearing;
- the possible outcomes and range of penalties;
- the deadline for submitting a response and any additional evidence;
- information about advice, support and reasonable adjustments; and
- the names and roles of the Panel members.

The School will rely only on evidence that has been disclosed to the student, subject to any necessary and proportionate redactions. Where information must be redacted or withheld to protect another person's rights or confidential information, the student will be given sufficient information about its substance to understand and respond fairly to the case.

Information about previous findings of poor academic practice or academic misconduct will not be provided to the Panel until it has determined whether the current allegation is upheld, unless the previous matter is directly relevant to establishing a

material fact in the current allegation. Where previous information is considered before the finding, the student will be told why it is relevant and given an opportunity to respond.

Student response and evidence

The student may:

- submit a written response to the allegation;
- provide relevant evidence about how the assessment was produced;
- identify information already held by the School that they consider relevant;
- respond to the reliability or interpretation of the School's evidence;
- provide relevant information about reasonable adjustments, communication differences or the circumstances in which the work was produced; and
- provide mitigating information for consideration if misconduct is found.

Relevant evidence may include drafts, notes, prompts, outputs, version histories, metadata, research records, data files, code, correspondence or other information about the development of the work.

The Panel may limit evidence that is irrelevant, unnecessarily repetitive or unrelated to the allegation. It must not exclude evidence that may reasonably affect the finding or penalty.

Where the student is unable to provide relevant evidence within the stated deadline for a good reason, they should inform the Secretary as soon as possible. The Chair may extend the deadline or permit the evidence to be submitted later where this is fair and proportionate.

Attendance, support and representation

A student attending a hearing may be accompanied by a member of the School community, student representative or another appropriate supporter. The supporter may:

- provide advice and support to the student;
- help the student present their case;
- confer with the student during the hearing; and
- address the Panel with the Chair's permission.

The student will normally be expected to answer questions about their work and how it was produced directly, although the Chair may adjust this where necessary to enable the student to participate effectively.

Legal representation will not normally be necessary. The Chair may permit it where there are good reasons, including the complexity or seriousness of the case, the requirements of fairness, or the need to make a reasonable adjustment. Requests should normally be made in advance and explain why legal representation is sought.

The School will make reasonable adjustments to enable a disabled student to participate effectively. Adjustments may include changes to the hearing format, additional breaks, assistance with communication, remote attendance or additional time to respond.

If the student does not attend a hearing, the Chair will consider whether to:

- adjourn the hearing;
- proceed in the student's absence;
- consider the case through written evidence; or
- make another appropriate adjustment.

In deciding how to proceed, the Chair will consider the reason for the absence, the student's previous engagement, the seriousness and urgency of the case and whether the case can be considered fairly without the student. Non-attendance will not, by itself, be treated as evidence that misconduct occurred.

iii. Conduct of a hearing

The Chair is responsible for ensuring that the hearing is fair, focused and conducted respectfully. Panel meetings will normally take place online, will be recorded, and the recordings made available to panellists and the student until a full outcome has been reached.

The Chair will:

- introduce those present and explain their roles;
- confirm the allegation, procedure and possible outcomes;
- explain the order in which the case will be considered;
- ensure that the student understands the allegation and has had access to the relevant evidence; and
- address any preliminary procedural or adjustment matters.

The Panel will normally:

- consider the School's evidence and any investigation report;
- invite the student to respond to the allegation and present relevant evidence;
- ask questions of the student and any person providing information;
- give the student an opportunity to respond to any material matter raised during the hearing; and
- invite the student to make a final statement before the Panel deliberates.

The procedure is not intended to operate as a court hearing. Questions to another participant will normally be asked through the Chair. The Chair may prevent questioning that is irrelevant, repetitive, intimidating or otherwise inappropriate.

The Panel may adjourn to obtain further information or clarification. Any additional evidence obtained will be disclosed to the student, who will be given a reasonable opportunity to respond before a decision is reached.

Decision-making

The School is responsible for establishing the allegation. The student is not required to prove that misconduct did not occur.

The Panel will assess the evidence as a whole, taking account of its relevance, reliability and consistency, and will determine the allegation against the requirements communicated to the student for the assessment.

The Panel will determine whether each allegation is established on the balance of probabilities. This means that the Panel must be satisfied that it is more likely than not that the alleged conduct occurred.

The Panel's determination may be:

- the allegation is not established and no further action will be taken;
- academic misconduct is not established, but poor academic practice occurred and an educative response is appropriate; or
- academic misconduct is established.

A finding of academic misconduct must be agreed by both members of a two-member Panel. A three-member Panel will decide by majority, except where this Policy requires a unanimous decision.

The Panel will give reasons for its finding, including:

- the material facts it accepted;
- the evidence on which it relied;

- how it resolved any material conflict in the evidence;
- how it considered the student's response; and
- why the conduct did or did not meet the relevant definition.

iv. Determining a penalty

The Panel will consider a penalty only after determining that academic misconduct occurred. When determining the penalty, the Panel may consider:

- the nature, extent and seriousness of the misconduct;
- the importance of the affected material to the assessment;
- the degree of unfair advantage obtained or potentially obtained;
- whether the conduct was intentional, reckless, negligent or inadvertent;
- the student's level and experience;
- any relevant disability, health condition or support need known to the Panel, including its relationship to the circumstances of the misconduct or the likely impact of the penalty;
- the clarity of the assessment requirements and guidance;
- any relevant previous findings;
- the student's response, including any early admission;
- any mitigating or aggravating circumstances;
- the impact of the available penalties, including any disproportionate or unintended consequences; and
- the need to protect academic standards and ensure consistency with comparable cases.

If misconduct is established, the Panel will select a penalty permitted by this Policy and explain why it is proportionate. Relevant personal circumstances, including any disability or support needs, will not normally affect whether misconduct occurred but may be considered when determining the penalty and any support to be offered.

Written outcome

The student will normally receive the written outcome within five working days of the Panel's decision. The written outcome will state:

- the allegation considered;
- the relevant requirements;

- the evidence considered;
- the finding on each allegation;
- the reasons for the finding;
- whether the conduct was classified as poor academic practice or academic misconduct;
- any penalty, educative action or support requirement;
- the reasons why the outcome was considered proportionate;
- how and when the outcome will be implemented;
- details of how to contact Student Support for advice or support;
- the record that will be retained; and
- the student's right to appeal, the applicable grounds and the time limit.

The Chair may communicate an indicative decision at the conclusion of a hearing, but the decision is not final until it has been confirmed in writing.

If the allegation is not upheld, any mark withheld or academic decision deferred while the case was considered must be released or made as soon as reasonably practicable.

Record of proceedings

The Secretary will keep an appropriate record of:

- the Panel membership and those attending;
- any declared conflicts of interest;
- the documents and evidence considered;
- the substance of any oral evidence;
- the Panel's findings and reasons;
- any penalty or other action; and
- the written outcome issued to the student.

Panel records will be handled confidentially and retained in accordance with the School's records-retention requirements.

5. Outcomes and penalties

i. Purpose and application of penalties

Penalties are intended to protect academic standards and address any unfair advantage arising from misconduct. Where a penalty involves a deduction from the assessment mark, the deduction must be applied after the work has been marked in accordance with the normal assessment criteria. The original mark, the penalty applied and the resulting mark must be recorded separately and communicated clearly to the student.

ii. Poor academic practice

Poor academic practice will not result in a separate mark deduction or other academic penalty. Any relevant weaknesses may still affect the mark awarded under the published assessment criteria. The outcome may include:

- feedback explaining the academic practice requiring improvement;
- referral to appropriate guidance, training or support;
- a requirement to correct an incomplete declaration or acknowledgement; and
- retention of a record where this may be relevant to a similar future concern.

Weaknesses arising from poor academic practice may affect the academic mark where they are relevant to the published assessment criteria.

iii. Summary penalty

Minor academic misconduct established through the summary procedure will attract:

- a deduction of five percentage points from the assessment mark

The summary penalty must not reduce a passing assessment mark to a failing mark. Where it would do so, the matter must be referred for formal consideration.

iv. Penalties available to the Academic Misconduct Panel

Where academic misconduct is established, the Panel will determine an outcome or penalty that is proportionate to the severity and circumstances of the misconduct.

In assessing severity, the Panel will take account of all relevant factors, including:

- the nature, extent and impact of the misconduct;
- whether it affected a limited, substantial or critical part of the assessment;
- whether it affected the validity of the assessment or other parts of the student's programme;
- the actual or potential unfair advantage;

- whether the conduct involved intention, recklessness, planning, concealment, deception or material misrepresentation;
- whether another person or service produced all or a substantial part of the assessment;
- whether the conduct involved impersonation, contract cheating, fabrication or falsification, examination cheating or deliberate interference;
- whether the conduct affected other students or more than one assessment;
- whether the student has a relevant previous finding of academic misconduct;
- whether previous guidance, interventions or penalties have failed to prevent further misconduct;
- the student's level of study and experience;
- the clarity of the relevant academic integrity or assessment requirements; and
- any relevant mitigating or aggravating circumstances.

The Panel may impose one or more of the following compatible outcomes or penalties:

- a requirement to complete academic integrity training or another appropriate learning activity;
- a formal written warning;
- a deduction of between five and ten percentage points from the assessment mark;
- another equivalent outcome that does not exceed the academic effect of a ten-percentage-point deduction;
- a requirement to submit a corrected or alternative assessment, with the mark capped at the applicable pass mark;
- the affected assessment mark capped at the applicable pass mark;
- a mark of zero for the affected assessment, with any permitted reassessment capped at the applicable pass mark;
- the overall module mark capped at the applicable pass mark;
- a mark of zero for the affected module, with any permitted reassessment capped at the applicable pass mark;
- a mark of zero for the affected assessment or module without a further assessment opportunity, where permitted by the Academic Regulations;

- loss of credit for the affected module, where permitted by the Academic Regulations;
- voiding or deferring the attempt for the assessment or the entire related module, with the right to take the assessment(s) as though for the first time;
- termination of the student's registration, with any exit award determined under the Academic Regulations; or
- where an award has already been conferred, a recommendation that the authorised academic body amend or revoke the award in accordance with the Academic Regulations.

The Panel may impose only an outcome listed above or otherwise expressly permitted by the Academic Regulations. It must consider the circumstances of the case and explain why the outcome is proportionate.

The Panel may require academic integrity training or issue a formal warning in addition to an academic penalty. The Panel must not combine mark-related penalties in a way that penalises the same misconduct more than once.

Termination of registration is reserved for exceptionally serious or repeated misconduct where the Panel concludes that no lesser penalty would adequately protect academic standards. Any exit award will be determined in accordance with the Academic Regulations.

Termination of registration may be imposed only by a Panel comprising three voting members, including at least one senior member of staff. The decision must be unanimous.

v. Previous findings and repeated misconduct

Once the current misconduct has been established, the Panel may consider any relevant previous formal finding when determining the penalty. It will consider the seriousness and recency of the previous misconduct, its similarity to the current case, and any guidance, training or warning provided at the time.

Previous findings may justify a more serious penalty, but termination must be based on the overall seriousness and circumstances of the case rather than the number of findings alone.

A previous instance of poor academic practice is not equivalent to a formal finding of academic misconduct. It may be taken into account where it involved similar conduct and the student received clear guidance about the relevant requirements.

vi. Mitigating and aggravating circumstances

Mitigating circumstances do not normally determine whether academic misconduct occurred, but may affect the penalty. Relevant mitigating circumstances may include:

- an early admission and meaningful cooperation with the procedure;
- evidence that the student misunderstood an unclear assessment requirement;
- significant personal circumstances affecting the student's judgement;
- evidence of limited intention to obtain an unfair advantage;
- the student's level and previous educational experience; or
- steps taken by the student to acknowledge the conduct and improve their academic practice.

Relevant aggravating circumstances may include:

- deliberate planning or concealment;
- fabrication, falsification or destruction of evidence;
- knowingly providing a false account or declaration;
- involving, pressuring or disadvantaging another student;
- committing misconduct for financial or other personal gain;
- repeated or systematic conduct; or
- failure to engage with previous academic integrity guidance.

A student's decision to deny an allegation, request Panel consideration, submit an appeal or otherwise exercise a procedural right must not be treated as an aggravating factor.

Notification of the outcome and penalty

The student must be notified in writing of the Panel's decision. The written outcome must explain:

- the finding and the reasons for it;
- the evidence relied upon;
- any factors affecting the seriousness of the misconduct;
- the penalty imposed and why it was considered proportionate;
- the academic consequences for the student; and
- how and when the student may appeal.

vii. Implementation of academic penalties

The relevant Board of Examiners will implement the academic effect of a penalty and determine any resulting progression, reassessment or award decision in accordance with the Academic Regulations.

The Board of Examiners may not reconsider the Panel's finding or replace the penalty imposed. If the penalty cannot be implemented lawfully or in practice, the matter must be referred to the Panel Chair for clarification or to the full Panel for reconsideration. The Board must not confirm a provisional summary finding or penalty until the challenge period has ended and any challenge has been resolved.

Where an assessment or module result has already been confirmed, the Board of Examiners may amend the result, progression decision, classification or award where this is necessary to implement the penalty and is permitted by the Academic Regulations.

The student will be told where the penalty may:

- cause failure of an assessment or module;
- affect progression or reassessment;
- delay completion or graduation;
- affect an award or classification;
- require repetition of study or additional fees; or
- have another significant academic consequence.

Concerns about previous assessments

A finding in one assessment does not, by itself, establish that misconduct occurred in any other assessment.

The School may review a previous assessment only where there is specific and credible evidence giving reasonable grounds to suspect misconduct in that assessment.

Any concern about a previous assessment will be treated as a separate allegation. The student will be informed of the allegation and evidence and given the same opportunity to respond as they would have received had the concern been identified originally.

A penalty affecting a previously confirmed result or award may be imposed only after the allegation concerning that assessment has been determined under this Policy and Procedure.

viii. Referral for academic support following an outcome

An Academic Misconduct Panel may identify a need for:

- academic writing support;
- referencing education;
- AI literacy;
- academic coaching;
- additional tutor contact;
- research-methods support; or
- another academic intervention.

The Panel may refer the student to the appropriate academic support route.

Such a referral does not automatically constitute an Academic Progress concern.

ix. Referral to Student Engagement Review Group

Referral to the Student Engagement Review Group may be appropriate where the case identifies a wider pattern such as:

- repeated non-submission;
- substantial academic disengagement;
- significant problems understanding assessments;
- a need for structured academic support; or
- multiple outstanding assessments.

The Group should consider the wider academic-engagement issue rather than re-investigate the misconduct finding.

x. Referral to Student Wellbeing

Where a student identifies a significant personal or wellbeing concern, staff may offer referral to the student wellbeing team. Student Wellbeing does not determine whether academic misconduct occurred.

The misconduct record should not contain unnecessary details of confidential wellbeing discussions.

xi. Safeguarding

An immediate safeguarding concern identified during an academic misconduct process must be referred under the Safeguarding Policy without waiting for completion of the misconduct procedure. The safeguarding form must be completed – or email

dsl@lis.ac.uk

The existence of a safeguarding referral does not itself determine the academic misconduct allegation.

6. Appeals

i. Challenging a summary decision

A student may challenge a marker's summary finding, penalty, or both by requesting consideration by an Academic Misconduct Panel within 15 working days of receiving the summary decision. This is not an academic appeal. A student may appeal against the subsequent Panel decision under the Academic Appeals Procedure.

ii. Appealing against a Panel decision

A student may appeal against a finding or penalty imposed by an Academic Misconduct Panel under the Academic Appeals Procedure. An appeal must normally be submitted to the Registrar within 15 working days of the date on which the student was notified of the Panel's written decision.

In relation to an academic misconduct decision, an appeal may be made on one or more of the following grounds:

- there was a material procedural or administrative irregularity in the investigation or decision-making process;
- the finding was not reasonably supported by the evidence available to the Panel;
- the student was not given a fair opportunity to understand or respond to the allegation or material evidence;
- there is evidence of actual bias or circumstances giving rise to a reasonable perception of bias;
- there is relevant new evidence that could not reasonably have been provided earlier, and the student has given a good reason for its late submission; or
- the penalty was not permitted by the relevant regulations or was disproportionate to the misconduct established.

An appeal is not a rehearing of the allegation and will not be upheld solely because the student:

- disagrees with the Panel's assessment of the evidence;
- disagrees with academic judgement;
- regrets an admission or disagrees with the consequences of the penalty; or
- seeks a different outcome without establishing a permitted ground.

The appeal will follow the stages, timescales and decision-making arrangements set out in the Academic Appeals Procedure.

Where an appeal is upheld in whole or in part, the permitted outcomes may include:

- setting aside the finding or penalty;
- correcting a procedural or administrative error;
- referring the allegation for fresh consideration by a differently constituted Academic Misconduct Panel;
- requiring a procedural step to be repeated;
- referring the penalty for reconsideration;
- substituting a penalty that is permitted and proportionate where the Academic Appeals Procedure authorises this; or
- directing the correction of the student's record and any resulting academic decision.

A person materially involved in the original investigation, Panel decision or summary determination must not determine the appeal.

Effect of an appeal

The School will determine whether implementation of the penalty should be suspended while an appeal is considered. In making this decision, it will consider:

- whether implementation could cause irreversible or disproportionate consequences;
- the need to protect academic standards;
- any imminent progression, reassessment or graduation decision; and
- whether temporary arrangements can preserve the position of the student and the School.

The student will be told what they are expected to do while the appeal is pending, including whether they should continue to attend, study, submit assessments or undertake reassessment.

Once the School's internal procedures have been completed, the student will receive a Completion of Procedures Letter and may ask the Office of the Independent Adjudicator for Higher Education to review the matter. The applicable OIA deadline will be stated in the letter.

7. Completion, former students and records

i. Completion and conferment

The School may temporarily withhold an affected result, progression decision or award while a formal academic misconduct allegation is considered. This is a precautionary measure and not a penalty.

A student will not normally graduate while a formal allegation capable of affecting their award remains unresolved. The School will prioritise the case and explain the effect of any delay to the student.

Where an allegation does not affect the student's eligibility for an award, the School will consider whether the unaffected result or award can be released.

ii. Former students and conferred awards

The School may investigate alleged misconduct identified after a student has completed or withdrawn from their programme or after an award has been conferred, where the allegation concerns assessment undertaken while the person was registered.

The School will make reasonable efforts to contact the former student and provide:

- the allegation and relevant evidence;
- an opportunity to respond;
- information about the procedure and possible consequences; and
- the written outcome and any right of appeal.

A former student's failure to respond does not establish misconduct. The School may proceed on the evidence available where reasonable efforts to secure their participation have been unsuccessful.

In considering historic allegations, the School will take account of:

- the time elapsed;
- whether relevant records and witnesses remain available;
- whether the student can participate effectively;
- the reliability of the available evidence; and
- whether the allegation can still be determined fairly.

Any amendment or revocation of a conferred award will be determined by the body authorised under the Academic Regulations. The student will receive written reasons and information about any right of appeal.

iii. Confidentiality

Information about a concern or case will be shared only with those who reasonably require it to raise, investigate, determine, implement, support or review the matter.

Students, staff, supporters and Panel members are expected to respect the confidentiality of proceedings. This does not prevent a student from seeking confidential advice or support.

Where a case involves more than one student, each student will normally receive only the information necessary to understand and respond to the allegation concerning them. Information about another student will be disclosed only where this is necessary for fairness and lawful to disclose.

iv. Case records

The Quality Manager will maintain an accurate central record of:

- concerns formally recorded as poor academic practice;
- summary academic misconduct decisions;
- formal investigations and Panel decisions;
- penalties and their implementation;
- appeals and review outcomes; and
- any resulting actions or improvements.

A record that an allegation was not established must not be treated as a previous adverse finding in any future case.

Where a finding or penalty is overturned or amended, the central record and any associated student record will be corrected promptly.

Records will be accurate, limited to information reasonably required and held securely in accordance with data-protection law, the School's privacy notices and its records-retention schedule.

Unless a longer period is required by law or because proceedings remain active, records will normally be retained as follows:

- records of poor academic practice: until one year after the student completes or leaves the programme;
- records of allegations that were not established: until one year after the case and any related appeal are concluded;
- records of confirmed academic misconduct, penalties and appeals: for six years after the student completes or leaves the programme; and

- permanent academic record information concerning termination, amendment or revocation of an award: in accordance with the School's arrangements for retaining award records.

The Registrar may authorise longer retention where this is necessary for ongoing proceedings, legal or regulatory requirements, safeguarding academic standards or responding to an external review. The reason will be recorded.

8. Monitoring and governance

i. Timescales

The School will handle concerns without unnecessary delay and will normally aim to complete the formal misconduct procedure, including any internal appeal, within 90 calendar days of receiving the formal referral or a student's challenge to a summary decision.

The time during which the School is reasonably awaiting information from the student, an external organisation or another process may be excluded from the 90-calendar-day period.

Where the procedure cannot be completed within the expected timeframe, the student will be told:

- the reason for the delay;
- the current position;
- any action required from them; and
- the revised expected completion date.

The School will identify and, where practicable, prioritise cases affecting imminent progression, reassessment, graduation, immigration status or another time-sensitive matter.

ii. Monitoring and annual reporting

The Quality Manager will prepare an anonymised annual report for Academic Council covering:

- the number and type of concerns and formal cases;
- the classification of cases as poor academic practice, summary misconduct or formal misconduct;
- the academic level, programme and assessment type concerned;
- the outcomes and penalties applied;
- the time taken to complete cases;
- the number, grounds and outcomes of appeals;
- the use and evidential role of similarity or AI-detection software;
- recurring issues in assessment briefs, guidance or academic practice;
- any identifiable equality, access or differential-outcome patterns; and

- actions taken or recommended in response.

Reporting will be sufficiently anonymised or aggregated to avoid identifying individual students, particularly where cohorts or case numbers are small.

Academic Council will use the annual report to:

- monitor fairness, consistency and proportionality;
- identify any need for additional student or staff guidance;
- consider changes to assessment design or practice;
- review the consistency of penalties;
- identify any equality or academic-standard risks; and
- approve or commission appropriate improvement actions.

iii. Guidance and training

The School will provide students with accessible and current guidance on academic integrity, academic misconduct and the permitted use of artificial intelligence and other forms of assistance.

Staff involved in marking, investigation or Panel consideration will receive appropriate guidance or training on this Policy and Procedure, the assessment of evidence, the limitations of similarity and AI-detection software, potential bias or differential impact, and the consistent use of outcomes and penalties.

iv. Review and approval

Academic Council is responsible for approving this Policy and Procedure and overseeing its effectiveness. The Policy and Procedure will normally be reviewed at least every three years, or earlier where:

- legislation, regulation or sector guidance changes;
- monitoring identifies a significant concern or inconsistency;
- developments in technology or assessment practice require revision;
- learning from cases, appeals or external review indicates that change is needed;
or
- Academic Council otherwise requires a review.

Material amendments will be communicated clearly to students and staff before they take effect.

A case will normally be considered under the procedure in force when the concern is formally raised. A later procedural change may be applied where this would improve fairness and would not disadvantage the student.

Version Control

Name of policy/procedure:	Academic Integrity and Misconduct Policy and Procedure
Document owner:	A Redford, Registrar
Date Originally Created:	01/2019
Related documents: (eg associated forms, underpinning processes, related policies or overarching policies)	Academic Regulations; Student Code of Conduct and Disciplinary Procedure; Academic Appeals Procedure; Research Ethics Policy;

Version Control				
Version	Author	Date	Brief summary of changes	Effective
1	Hannah Kohler (Director of Admissions and Student Support)	13/01/2019	Original draft	
2	Prof. Carl Gombrich (Director of Teaching and Learning)	10/03/2019	Max 2-week window for feedback; greater flexibility for students to fail one or two modules (so that they take risks); ensuring that first year is weighted toward final degree mark; changing of penalties for late work; greater tolerances on world-limit excess to account for tolerances of software packages; clarification of role of Registrar; “three	

			strikes and you're out" on academic misconduct	
3	Prof. Chris Maguire (Registrar)	20/06/2019	Clarification of language. Inclusion of CertHE and DipHE. Clarification of position on reasonable adjustments. Single moderator for each assessment or module. Simplification of Reasonable Adjustments Panel meeting (no need for student to attend in person). "Malpractice" changed to "Misconduct" for clarity reasons.	
4	Hannah Kohler (Director of Admissions and Student Support)	23/06/2019	Inclusion of AMBeR Tariff in Academic Misconduct Policy. Included Invigilation Guidelines. Removal of criteria for External Examiners and tenure, etc. Given this will be determined by the OU. Bringing of extenuating circumstances procedure in line with standard university procedures (movement away from flexible assessment). Included contents page for clarity and greater ease of navigation by staff and students, and separated additional regulations and procedures into those for students and those for staff	

5	Hannah Kohler (Director of Admissions and Student Support)	24/06/2019	Revision of Extenuating Circumstances process to align with Academic Appeals Procedure. Added section on release of results. Alteration of reasonable adjustments section to align with Disability Policy and to clarify link to Academic Appeals Procedure.	
6	Prof. Chris Maguire (Registrar)	28/06/2019	Updated notes on invigilators	
7	Hannah Kohler (Director of Admissions and Student Support)	15/08/2019	Separated out Academic Misconduct Policy and Procedure into separate document	
8	Hannah Kohler (Director of Admissions and Student Support)	04/11/2019	Minor wording changes ; definition of good academic practice	
9	Academic Council	18/12/2019	Requires update as part of update of all general academic regulations in light of decision to pursue NAPs	
10	Hannah Kohler (Director of Admissions and Student Support)	12/02/2020	Minor typos corrected, no major changes	
11	Academic Council	16/03/2020	Approved	2021-2022
12	Regulatory Working Group	Nov 2021	Inclusion of reference to level 7 and AMber tariff points for level 7	
13	A Redford Head of Quality	RWG, chair's action. 08/09/2022	Inclusion of self-plagiarism definition	2022-2023 onwards

14	A Redford, Head of Quality	PRC, chair's action 22/03/2023	Inclusion of reference to ChatGPT and AI in examples of misconduct	2022-2023, term 3 onwards
15	A Redford, Head of Quality	PRC: 17/05/2023	Removal of initial meeting. Removal of Ambr tariff Reordering of content Inclusion of Panel terms of reference Inclusion of PAP examples	2023-2024 onwards
16	B Cuming, Quality Manager	Academic Council, Chair's Action September 2026	Comprehensive review: clarified the distinction between poor academic practice and academic misconduct; revised the marker-led summary procedure, including reducing the fixed penalty from ten to five percentage points and strengthening students' rights to respond and challenge; expanded guidance on AI and evidential requirements; clarified the burden and standard of proof; and revised Panel arrangements and the proportionate penalty framework.	2026/2027 onwards