
Academic Misconduct Regulations and Procedures



Contents

1. Purpose and Scope	1
2. Definitions	2
3. Principles of Academic Integrity	2
4. Principles of the Academic Misconduct Procedure	4
5. Academic Misconduct Procedure	10
5.1. Stage 1: Allegation	10
5.2. Stage 2: Case Review	11
5.3. Stage 3: Appeal Review	12
5.4. Completion of Procedures and Referral to the OIA	14
6. Document Control	15
Appendix A: Penalty and Sanction Tariff	16

1. Purpose and Scope

- 1.1. To ensure that the core values of academic integrity are respected, upheld and applied consistently, the University operates an Academic Misconduct Procedure to manage the investigation, allegation, penalties and appeals against breaches of academic integrity.
- 1.2. The regulations shall apply to all current and past students of the University, regardless of the date of the event giving rise to the concern.
- 1.3. These regulations apply to any assessments that are submitted or presented as part of an assessment.
- 1.4. The *Academic Misconduct Regulations and Procedure* is managed by the Office for Student Complaints, Appeals and Regulations (OSCAR).
- 1.5. Partner Institutions will manage the implementation of these regulations at a local level. In most cases, unless otherwise specified, the University will receive referrals from partner institutions at Stage 3: Appeal Review.
- 1.6. Students can get free, impartial and confidential advice on these regulations and procedures from the Students' Union at advice.su@uca.ac.uk.
- 1.7. Members of University staff (or partner institutions) may seek advice on the operation of these regulations from their programme director, executive dean, campus life offices or directly from OSCAR.

2. Definitions

- 2.1. The following paragraphs explain the University's definition of *Academic Integrity* and *Academic Misconduct* as applied within these regulations.
- 2.1.1. *Academic Integrity* means demonstrating honest and moral behaviours when researching, developing, producing, submitting, or publishing academic work.
- 2.1.2. The University recognises that there is a difference between *academic misconduct* and *poor academic practice*. Poor academic practice involves minor breaches of academic convention.
- 2.1.3. The University defines *academic misconduct* (breaches of academic integrity) to be any action by a student that has the potential to give them or others an unfair advantage.
- 2.1.4. Academic misconduct can take a variety of forms and includes, but is not limited to, the following (please see *Appendix E: Types of Academic Misconduct Explained* for further information):
- poor academic practice
 - plagiarism (including self-plagiarism)
 - collusion
 - commissioning (from a third party)
 - dishonest or unethical conduct.
- 2.2. For the purposes of this policy, a *working day* is considered to be Monday to Friday (9am to 5pm), excluding U.K. public and bank holidays, or other published university closure.
- 2.3. Please see the supporting appendices of this document for guidance and a glossary of definitions of the types of academic misconduct and other terminology used within these regulations.

3. Principles of Academic Integrity

- 3.1. A cornerstone of education philosophy is *academic integrity*. It is regarded by the University to be a guiding principle of study in higher education.
- 3.2. The University aims to promote and support an environment in which academic integrity is respected and encouraged by both students and staff.
- 3.2.1. It is recognised that students may not be familiar with what the University considers to be good academic conventions and practices when they first begin their studies.
- 3.2.2. It is the University's expectation that students will engage with opportunities to familiarise themselves with good academic conventions.

3.3. Academic integrity applies to all work submitted for both formative and summative assessment, and to the behaviour students exhibit and the processes they engage with when producing that work. It includes but is not limited to the following:

- essays
- dissertations
- reports
- prints
- designs
- images
- scripts
- quizzes
- exams
- artefacts
- posters
- films
- storyboards
- projects
- simulations
- performances
- presentations (oral or visual)
- computer programming and software
- claims for mitigating circumstances or appeals
- research methodology and ethical conduct.

3.4. To comply with the principles of academic integrity, student's work should demonstrate the following:

- a. Be correctly and fully referenced. Students must make sure that they use the correct techniques for citation and referencing (using the Harvard Referencing style).
- b. Produced by the student: each student is responsible for producing the work they submit for assessment, and they must only take credit for work which is their own. Where a student is required to produce work as part of a collaborative project, their work should be a clear and accurate reflection of their individual contribution to that project.
- c. Be original and unique: Every assessment that is submitted must be a new piece of work. Students should never submit the same piece of work twice unless explicitly permitted by the assessment brief (e.g. some Resit assessments).
- d. Be honest and trustworthy: Any research represented in a student's work must have been carried out by the student themselves (or their group where permitted), and the data must be factual, true and obtained by fair and ethical means. This also extends to actively protecting work from being misused by others.

3.5. Further information and support can be found using the University's [Academic Integrity Tool Kit](#).

3.6. The University defines the appropriate use of **Artificial Intelligence (AI)**, adaptive technology, learning support or proof-reading services in the creation of assessable material as follows:

- 3.6.1. The University considers that the use of AI and adaptive technology has the potential to enhance teaching and learning and can support inclusivity and accessibility. To protect academic integrity, students must always be careful and vigilant to avoid misusing any tool, resource or service in the creation of assessable material.
- 3.6.2. All work submitted by students must be their own. Any use of a proof-reader, supportive technology or services must not compromise the authenticity of a student's work.

-
- 3.6.3. AI is a rapidly developing technology. Students are recommended to seek advice from their tutors or learning support staff if they are unsure whether their proposed use of AI is permitted in any given assessment.
 - 3.6.4. Students are required to declare if they have used AI, technologies or proofreading services for legitimate purposes in the creation of their work.

4. Principles of the Academic Misconduct Procedure

4.1. The Academic Misconduct Procedure is an internal procedure designed to facilitate the examination of a piece of work that is believed to be subject to a breach of academic integrity. It explains the grounds for such a belief may be held, how the claim will be investigated, how such an allegation should be made and what sanctions may be applied. It also provides students with the right to appeal against such an allegation if they believe it to be incorrect or unfair; and the process that will be followed to consider the evidence.

4.2. Collective responsibility to report suspected offences

- 4.2.1. It is expected that most instances of suspected academic misconduct will be identified by a member of staff actively involved in the teaching, supervision or marking process. However, all staff, students and external examiners have a responsibility to report instances of suspected academic misconduct.
- 4.2.2. Where allegations of academic misconduct are notified to staff or students by an individual outside the University, the individual and/or evidence should be referred to OSCAR in the first instance.
- 4.2.3. The University will cooperate with other institutions for the purpose of assuring academic integrity within the sector and support investigations of mutual concern.
- 4.2.4. The University will not consider anonymous, unevidenced or vexatious allegations.

4.3. Penalties and Sanctions

Where an allegation of academic misconduct is upheld, penalty points will be allocated to the offence in accordance with the *Penalty and Sanction Tariff* (Appendix A).

- 4.3.1. Points are allocated in consideration of the type of academic misconduct, the extent and the student's respective history of academic conduct.
- 4.3.2. All sanctions that permit the continuation of study will include a referral to learning opportunities to support the student's understanding of academic integrity.

4.4. Communication and engagement

- 4.4.1. Communications concerning an allegation will normally be sent to the student's university email account, except in the following circumstances:
 - a. That the student's access to the University's email system has been suspended by the institution for any reason.

-
- b. Where an explicit request to use an alternative email address (or means of correspondence) has been agreed in advance. This will usually only be accepted where there is a good cause to do so such as evidenced disability access issues or international travel where the University's systems may not be available to students.
 - c. Where an allegation is raised against a graduate, the University will contact them using the last known contact details held on file.
- 4.4.2. It is the student's responsibility to engage with the communications and procedures associated with the investigation.
- 4.4.3. Non-engagement with the academic misconduct procedure and associated communications will not normally be permissible as a defence or appeal against the allegation or outcome of the procedure.
- 4.4.4. Students will be invited to attend integrity meetings or integrity hearings either in person or online.
- 4.4.5. The University reserves the right to proceed with any meeting or hearing in the absence of a student, subject to the student having been properly notified of the date and time of the event.
- 4.4.6. Students will be given no less than five working days' notice of a meeting or hearing. An academic integrity meeting or hearing may only be postponed or deferred once on the student's request and by no more than five working days unless evidenced mitigating circumstances apply.

4.5. Detection and Evidence

Where an assessor suspects a breach of academic integrity, they must provide evidence to substantiate their concerns.

- 4.5.1. Suspicions, allegations and outcomes of academic misconduct are based on the *balance of probabilities*. That is to say, based on the evidence available, it is more likely than not that the offence occurred (and warrants the respective sanction).
- 4.5.2. An occurrence of academic misconduct may be detected, investigated and evidenced in a number of ways, including but not limited to the following examples:
- a. Examples of the original material that is believed to have been plagiarised such as references, extracts, copies or images of those works.
 - b. Active searching online by a marker to identify the origin or material presented in the submission.
 - c. Detection software is used by the University, such as Turnitin, to identify potential plagiarism or inappropriate use of AI or adaptive technology.
 - d. Academic judgement to determine discrepancies within a student's academic profile that indicate inconsistent authorial voice, stylistic approach, academic performance, visual language or an unexplained change of content.

-
- e. Academic Integrity Vivas are used to establish whether, in the academic judgement of university staff, the student has sufficient knowledge and understanding of the submission that you can be determined to be the author.
 - f. In some cases, students may be required to prove that they have or have not done something. For example, if a student is accused of copying or using another student's work, they may be asked to provide draft and development material to demonstrate the authenticity of their work.
 - g. Witness statements (where appropriate).

4.6. Determining penalty points and sanctions

- 4.6.1. In making an allegation, the member of staff will use their academic judgement to award penalty points in accordance with the *Penalty Point and Sanction Tariff* (Appendix A). Points will be awarded in consideration of the following:
 - a. The student's history of academic misconduct. Repeated offences will incur higher penalties.
 - b. In the academic judgement of the assessor, to what extent is the validity of the work compromised by the misconduct.
 - c. The type of misconduct.
 - d. The impact the compromised piece of work has upon the final award. For example, where a significant assessment such as final-project has been compromised additional points may be awarded.
- 4.6.2. The sum total of penalty points will be calculated to determine the appropriate sanction as indicated in the *Penalty Point and Sanction Tariff* (Appendix A). It is not permissible to impose a higher sanction than indicated by the tariff. However, it is at the discretion of those making the allegation or reviewing it at any stage to consider a lower sanction than indicated.
- 4.6.3. The University uses text matching software and artificial intelligence detection software (e.g. Turnitin) to support academic integrity. While data from such software can support staff in determining whether academic misconduct has occurred, it should not form the sole basis for allegations, but rather prompt further investigation.

4.7. Simultaneous and Contemporaneous Offences

The University recognises that early in their studies, students may make a mistake which is repeated across more than one assessment where these have been submitted at or around the same time (contemporaneous), and before they have had a reasonable opportunity to correct compromised work.

- 4.7.1. A breach of academic integrity is considered to have been contemporaneous where it has not been possible to bring the misconduct to the student's attention, or for them to learn from that mistake, between the identification of such a breach of integrity and the marking of a further piece of work.

-
- 4.7.2. Where one or more breaches of academic integrity are identified as a contemporaneous occurrence, they will be considered together with the piece of work attracting the highest penalty point score and respective sanction applied equally to all affected assessments, units or levels of study.
 - 4.7.3. Any breach of academic integrity that is identified following 10 working days of an allegation being made will be considered as a subsequent offence which will result in a more serious penalty.

4.8. The assessment of work subject to academic misconduct

In accordance with the University's principles of assessment, all students' work is assessed on their success at demonstrating that they have achieved the stated learning objectives and that they have achieved the standard required for the unit credit to be awarded.

- 4.8.1. If a student's work has been determined to be subject to academic misconduct, yet permitted to be assessed, only the remaining content and material of that submission which can be determined as authentically the student's own work will be considered.
- 4.8.2. A unit of study that has been determined, in accordance with these regulations and procedures, to have been subject to academic misconduct will not be eligible for a Progression and Award Board to consider or apply any form of stage or credit compensation that may otherwise be permitted within the University's regulations.

4.9. Confidentiality

An allegation of academic misconduct and the associated procedure will be treated confidentially by the University, subject to the following conditions:

- 4.9.1. The case may be disclosed to other members of staff, as part of an investigation or where the case identifies concern for the student's wellbeing.
- 4.9.2. The case will not be disclosed or discussed with other students except where those students are identified as a material witness to the allegation.
- 4.9.3. Some of the University's courses are regulated by a professional, statutory and regulatory body (PSRB). The University may be required to notify the respective PSRB and students will be advised where such a disclosure may be necessary.
- 4.9.4. The *Skills and Post-16 Education Bill (2022)* made it a criminal offence to engage in paid cheating services, often known as *essay mills*. The University is legally required to report confirmed use of such services to the police.
- 4.9.5. Due to the impact an ongoing investigation or sanction may have upon the administration of a student's studies, the outcome of an allegation is usually internally reported to relevant departments within Student Life.

4.10. Timeframe to complete an allegation or appeal against academic misconduct.

The procedure outlines the indicative time scales of each respective stage of investigation or appeal. The University will endeavour to manage cases of academic misconduct as

swiftly as possible. However, some allegations of academic misconduct or the evidence provided by a student in their defence may require more complex investigations.

- 4.10.1. If an ongoing investigation or consideration of a case prevents a student from progressing to the next level of study, they may be permitted to progress based upon a *provisional* pass mark where the following criteria is met:
 - a. The work, if marked on face-value, would attract a pass mark.
 - b. The case cannot be concluded in sufficient time.
 - c. That OSCAR agrees the student meets the above criteria.
- 4.10.2. If the allegation is subsequently dismissed or sanction amended, the ratified mark will be applied. However, if the allegation is upheld, the corresponding sanction may significantly impact the student's eligibility to continue with those studies.
- 4.10.3. Assessments subject to an academic misconduct investigation are not eligible to be considered under the Academic Appeal Regulations until all procedures relating to the Academic Integrity Regulations are completed.

4.11. Immigration Compliance

International Students who are subject to a visa sponsored by the University should note the following implications:

- 4.11.1. Where an allegation is made against a student, their visa sponsorship will not be affected unless the outcome of the misconduct is serious enough that their studies are either interrupted or terminated.
- 4.11.2. Visa sponsorship cannot be extended because of a delay in the student's progression (or Resit) resulting from an ongoing investigation or appeal. It is essential that students respond in a timely manner and comply with any investigation to avoid a delay in concluding their case.

4.12. Representation on behalf of a student

- 4.12.1. Sometimes students wish to nominate someone to speak on their behalf. The University will only engage with a third party where the student has provided written permission for the University to do so. Students are responsible for ensuring that any statements, evidence, or representations made throughout the procedure are accurate.
- 4.12.2. Where a student is invited to attend an Academic Integrity Meeting or Hearing, they may be accompanied by a fellow student or a Students' Union representative. Students are not normally permitted to be represented by members of their family except where there are justifiable reasons to do so. Permission will be considered in exceptional circumstances.
- 4.12.3. Legal representation is not normally permitted at any stage of the procedure; the Academic Integrity Regulations and Misconduct Procedure is internal to the University and is not considered unduly formal.

-
- a. If a student chooses to instruct legal representation to manage the correspondence regarding the case on their behalf, the University will engage with them only as the student's intermediary and within the purpose, scope and requirements of the regulations. Students are responsible for meeting any costs associated with their representation.
 - b. Where a student requests to be legally represented at a meeting or hearing because of the complexity of the case, their request will be considered on an exceptional basis.
 - c. The University reserves the right to seek and attain its own legal representation where it is agreed that a student's legal representation is permitted.

4.13. Application of the regulations

- 4.13.1. Where an allegation relates to the current academic year, it shall be considered in accordance with the procedures outlined in this document. Where, for whatever reason, it is which process should be followed, the case will be referred to OSCAR for advice.
- 4.13.2. Where a case of academic misconduct is under investigation or appeal at the point a student is interrupted (or is identified after their interruption), the case will be suspended until the student's return unless otherwise requested by the student.
- 4.13.3. An allegation of academic misconduct may be made and investigated against a student who is a debtor. However, the outcome and their right to appeal shall be suspended until the debt is cleared.
- 4.13.4. Where a former student is found to have achieved credit for their award through academic misconduct, the University reserves the right to rescind the award.
 - a. All such cases will be investigated and referred to Stage 2 for consideration and judgement. Such cases will usually be investigated up to seven years after graduation in accordance with the Office for Students' B4 requirement for the retention of student work.
 - b. The University reserves the indefinite right to investigate and reconsider any doctoral award where it is suspected there to have been gross research misconduct.

5. Academic Misconduct Procedure

The procedure consists of three stages as follows:

5.1. Stage 1: Allegation

- 5.1.1. Where a member of staff either suspects or has been informed of suspected academic misconduct, they should take one of the following actions:
 - a. Determine whether the work is indicative of poor academic practice; or
 - b. Determine whether there is substantiated evidence of fact that the work is subject of academic misconduct (and does not need further investigation); or
 - c. That the work is indicative a breach of academic integrity that requires further investigation.
- 5.1.2. Where the work is identified as indicative of *poor academic practice* (e.g. poor referencing skills) the assessor will use their discretion to address their concerns and may invite the student to an Academic Integrity Meeting and/or a referral to learning opportunities to support the student's understanding of academic integrity.
- 5.1.3. Where the work is identified to be indicative of a more serious type or extent of academic misconduct, the assessor will submit an Academic Misconduct Report Form (AMF1) to the programme director.
- 5.1.4. Upon receipt of an Academic Misconduct Report, the programme director will take one of the following actions:
 - a. They disagree with the allegation (dismiss).
 - b. They agree that academic misconduct was committed but amend the allegation and/or the sanction in the form based on the evidence provided.
 - c. They agree with the allegation and sanction.
- 5.1.5. Where the programme director confirms an allegation and proposed sanction, they will update and sign the Academic Misconduct Report Form (AMF1).
 - a. Where the indicated sanction includes an interruption or termination of studies, the case will be referred to OSCAR for a Stage 2 Case Review (see 5.2).
 - b. All other outcomes will be referred to the Campus Life Office for processing.
- 5.1.6. The Campus Life Office will send the allegation to the student. The student will have the following options:
 - a. To accept the allegation and sanction.
 - b. To accept the allegation but appeal the sanction applied.
 - c. To deny the allegation and request an appeal.

-
- 5.1.7. The student may appeal against the allegation or sanction in writing to the Campus Life Office requesting a Stage 2 Case Review:
- a. This must be made using the Case Review Request form (AMF2a); and submitted
 - b. no later than 12pm (midday) on the 10th working day following notification of the allegation.

5.2. Stage 2: Case Review

- 5.2.1. Stage 2 Case Reviews may either be considered by the executive dean or by the *Academic, Conduct and Experience Review Board* (the Review Board).
- a. Case Review requests will be considered within 10 working days by the executive dean, or in their absence, the Student Affairs Manager or their nominee.
 - b. Where a Stage 1 outcome is determined by the programme director to incur a category of sanction that requires a student to interrupt or withdraw from their studies, the case will be referred to OSCAR to present the case at the next available meeting of the Review Board.
- 5.2.2. To be eligible to *request* a Stage 2 Case Review, the student must be able to demonstrate the following:
- a. That they have complied with any previous investigation requests to provide evidence or to attend Academic Integrity Meetings; or are otherwise able to demonstrate why, for justifiable reasons, they were unable to do so.
 - b. That their request for a Stage 2 Case Review is made no later than 12pm (midday) on the 10th working day following notification of the allegation. Late requests will not normally be considered and only where, for justifiable reasons, the student was unable to do so by the deadline. If a request is rejected as *out-of-time*, the student may request an appeal by following the Stage 3 process (see section 5.3).
 - c. That the determination or outcome being appealed is neither a Category A sanction nor against the academic judgement that the work is subject to poor academic practice.
 - d. The request is made
- 5.2.3. The Stage 2 Case Review will consider the allegation, the evidence provided and the student's statement which should explain why they dispute the allegation or penalty and provide any relevant evidence to be considered.
- 5.2.4. The Stage 2 Case Reviewer(s) will make one of the following determinations based upon the balance of probability of either the student's admission or denial of the allegation.

-
- a. That the case reflects sufficient complexity or ambiguity such that the student will be invited to attend an Academic Integrity Hearing.
 - b. That the Stage 1 investigation is insufficient. The case will be returned to Stage 1 or a nominee of the executive dean to investigate.
 - c. That the Stage 1 investigation is inconclusive or flawed. The case will be re-investigated by the executive dean (or their nominee) as a Stage 2 Academic Integrity Meeting.
 - d. That they disagree with the allegation such that it is unfounded or that there is sufficient reasonable doubt.
 - e. That they agree the work was subject to academic misconduct such that the penalty and sanction applied were appropriate.
 - f. That they agree the work was subject to academic misconduct, but the penalty calculated was disproportionate to the offence. The penalty and sanction will be amended.
 - g. That they agree the work was likely to be subject to academic misconduct, but the evidence is either (i) inconclusive to substantiate extent of the allegation; or (ii) the appeal has demonstrated reasonable grounds to consider amending the sanction. The penalty score will be retained but the sanction amended.
- 5.2.5. The student will receive notification of the Stage 2 Case Review (AMF2b) outcome within 5 working days of the decision:
- a. If the case is considered at Stage 2 by the executive dean, the outcome will be reported to the Campus Life Office to notify the student.
 - b. If the case has been considered by the Review Panel, the clerk will notify the student and Campus Life Office of the outcome.
- 5.2.6. To appeal against an allegation or sanction confirmed by the Stage 2 Case Review, a student may request a Stage 3 Appeal Review of the case by the *Academic, Conduct and Experience Appeal Board*.

5.3. Stage 3: Appeal Review

- 5.3.1. Stage 3 Appeal Reviews are received and considered by the *Academic, Conduct and Experience Appeal Board* (the Appeal Board).
- 5.3.2. Requests for Stage 3 Appeal Reviews be made as follows:
- a. Using the Appeal Review Request form (AMF3); and be submitted
 - b. No later than 12pm (midday) on the 10th working day following notification of the Stage 2 outcome. Late appeals will only be accepted where the student is able to demonstrate why, for justifiable reasons, they were unable to do so before the deadline.

-
- 5.3.3. The Appeal Board will only consider cases where one or more of the following grounds and criteria are met:
- a. That the student believes there to have been a procedural or administrative error by the University in the conduct of the allegation, its investigation or review which has materially impacted previous consideration of the case.
 - b. That the student denies the allegation and has fully complied with all investigation requests to provide evidence or to attend an Academic Integrity Meeting; or are otherwise able to demonstrate why, for justifiable reasons, they were unable to do so.
 - c. That the student has accepted the allegation but wishes to appeal against the imposed sanction because they believe it to be unfair and are able to provide justifiable reasons for the panel to consider an alternative outcome.
 - d. That the student's request for a Stage 2 Case Review was rejected as *out-of-time* and that they can explain or evidence why, for justifiable reasons, they were unable to submit the request on time.
- 5.3.4. If the appeal meets the grounds and criteria to be considered at Stage 3, the case will be presented to the next available meeting of the *Academic, Conduct and Experience Appeal Board*.
- 5.3.5. Where the student is unable to demonstrate both sufficient grounds and criteria for appeal, the case will be *rejected*.
- 5.3.6. A Stage 3 Appeal Review will not reinvestigate the allegation nor consider previously unidentified evidence. The Appeal Board will only consider the following:
- a. The student's appeal statement explaining the respective grounds for appeal and any plea they have made.
 - b. Evidence identified through any previous investigation.
- 5.3.7. The Board will consider the appeal and make a determination based on the balance of probabilities. Outcomes may include upholding the findings of previous stages of the procedure in full or in part, dismissing the allegations, amending applied sanctions or returning the case to previous stages of the procedure for reconsideration because of a proven procedural or administrative error.
- 5.3.8. Where the clerk to the Appeal Board receives a case where there is insufficient evidence for the board to consider, the clerk may return the case to either Stage 1 or Stage 2 for investigation to avoid any unnecessary delay.
- 5.3.9. The clerk will report the board's findings to the student within 5 working days of the board meeting. The report will stipulate rationale, determination and respective sanctions to be imposed (or lifted) or other actions to be taken.
-

-
- 5.3.10. Unless the board return a case to an earlier stage for re-investigation, the Stage 3 Appeal Review represents the University's final decision and that the internal procedures regarding the appeal have been completed.

5.4. Completion of Procedures and Referral to the OIA

- 5.4.1. If the student is dissatisfied with the outcome of their appeal once the University's internal appeal procedures are completed, they may refer the appeal to the Office of the Independent Adjudicator for Higher Education (OIA).
- 5.4.2. Where it is determined, at any stage of the appeals process, that the outcome represents the last point in the University's internal procedures, the student will be eligible for a *Completion of Procedures (CoP)* letter, which will allow them to take their case to the OIA. Completion of procedures letters may be requested or will be issued as follows:
- a. A CoP letter will be issued in consequence of any Stage 3 decision other than one to return to the previous stage.
 - b. A CoP letter may be requested within 1 month of a student accepting the Stage 1 or Stage 2 outcome, or it had been otherwise reasonable for the University to believe the student's compliance with any sanction indicated that they had accepted that outcome.
 - c. A CoP letter may be requested within 1 month of an appeal being *rejected* at Stage 1 or 2 as either *out-of-time* or because that it was *not eligible* to meet the grounds and criteria for further consideration (where the case had otherwise not been referred to Stage 3).
- 5.4.3. The OIA provides an independent scheme for the review of student complaints and appeals. The complaint must be submitted to the OIA within 12 months from the date of issue of the Completion of Procedures letter.
- 5.4.4. Further details about the OIA can be obtained from the following website: <http://www.oiahe.org.uk/> or by contacting the OIA at the following address:

Office of the Independent Adjudicator for Higher Education
Second Floor, Abbey Gate, 57-75 Kings Road, Reading, RG1 3AB
Telephone: 0118 959 9813 / Email: enquiries@oiahe.org.uk

6. Document Control

Responsible Officer	Director of Student Life
Version	2024 01.1
Approved by	Academic Board
Approval Date	24 July 2024
Version amendments	1.1 01 July 2025
Effective from:	01 August 2024
Next Scheduled Review	2027-28 academic year

Related documents and guidance

- Appendix A Penalty Point and Sanction Tariff
- Appendix B1 Academic Misconduct Report Form (AMRF1)
- Appendix B2 Academic Misconduct Appeal Form (AMRF2)
- Appendix C Overarching Procedure Flowchart
- Appendix D Procedure for an Academic Integrity Hearing
- Appendix E Types of Academic Misconduct Explained
- Appendix F Academic Integrity Glossary
- Appendix G Protect Your Academic Integrity: using technology and support services.
- Annex 1 Guidance for Students (accused of academic misconduct)
- Annex 2 Guidance for Assessors (Academic Staff)
- Annex 3 Guidance for Programme Directors
- Annex 4 Guidance for Executive Deans
- Annex 5 Guidance for Campus Life Offices
- Annex 6 Guidance for ACE Review Board and ACE Appeal Board members

Academic Misconduct Regulations and Procedures



Appendix A: Penalty and Sanction Tariff

History

History refers to a point value for the number of instances (offences) of academic misconduct for any individual student. Campus Life Offices can confirm whether the student has previous offences.

Table 1: History of Academic Integrity

1 st formal offence	10 points
2 nd formal offence	100 points
3 rd formal offence	200 points

Extent and Impact

In the academic judgement of the assessor, to what extent is the validity of the work compromised by the alleged academic misconduct.

Table 2: Extent of impact on the assessment

Between 1 and 10%	0 points
Between 11% and 25%	25 points
Between 26% and 50%	50 points
Between 51% and 75%	75 points
Between 76% and 100%	100 points

Type of Academic Misconduct

Choose the appropriate type of misconduct that best reflects the alleged breach of academic integrity (definitions can be found in Appendix E).

Table 3: Type of academic misconduct

Poor Academic Practice Maximum extent score is 50%	1 point
Plagiarism or Collusion	10 points
Commissioning Contract Cheating 3 rd Party To be determined as either having either a 50% or 100% extent score.	100 points

Dishonest or unethical conduct at Levels 3 or 4	50 points
Dishonest or unethical conduct at Levels 5 or 6	75 points
Dishonest or unethical conduct at Levels 7	100 points
Dishonest or unethical behaviour with substantial impact upon the ethical practice and reputability of either the student and or institution	200 points

Additional penalties

All academic misconduct is treated seriously. However, in some instances the impact will have a more significant value because of the importance of the assessment or significant credit volume the unit contributes towards an award.

Table 4: Additional penalties where applicable

Major Project unit (Levels 6 & 7)	50 points
-----------------------------------	-----------

Sanctions

The sum of applicable points will give a total penalty score. Using the score-range, this will indicate the penalty band/category and corresponding Sanction Type. The table below explains what the sanction outcome and required action is against the respective assessment attempt where the offence occurred. All sanctions should include referral to learning support opportunities to develop the student's understanding of academic integrity.

Table 5: Penalty Bands and Sanctions

Penalty Category	Score Range	Sanction Type	Explanation of penalty outcome.
A	11-125	Submission accepted with Formal Warning	<p>A formal warning letter issued.</p> <p>Student referred to Library for advice regarding academic integrity and convention.</p> <p>Submission assessed uncapped on merit.</p> <p>Retrieval opportunities allowed if required and where further attempts are permitted.</p>
B	126-150	Component submission accepted with sanction.	<p>Work marked on merit.</p> <p>If successful, the mark to be capped (pass).</p> <p>If unsuccessful, retrieval attempt permitted where available.</p>
C	151-210	Component submission refused with retrieval attempt where permitted	<p>Component graded as OAM.</p> <p>Retrieval attempt permitted where available.</p>

Penalty Category	Score Range	Sanction Type	Explanation of penalty outcome.
D	211-250	Unit voided with retrieval attempt where permitted.	Unit graded as OAM. Retrieval of affected unit(s) permitted through Retake where available. Any other non-AM failed attempts may be taken as Resit in current year.
E	251-299	Level voided with retrieval attempt where permitted by Retake.	All credit at level of study rescinded. Retake offered for all units where available or exit award permitted if appropriate).
F	300+	Termination of Studies	All credit rescinded with registration terminated. Academic Fail (no exit award). Re-registration not permitted.

Initial attempts are where students have been enrolled for the unit (or credit equivalent) for the first time (first and second attempts).

Retake attempts are where retrieval opportunities permit undergraduate students to enrol for a second time to repeat failed units (or credit equivalent) (third and fourth attempts).

Resit attempts are retrieval opportunities permitted after an initial first attempt or retake attempt (second and fourth attempts).

Responsible Officer	Director of Academic Registry
Version	2024 Appendix A 1.0
Approved by	Academic Board
Approval Date	24 July 2024
Version amendments	None
Effective From	01 August 2024
Next Scheduled Review	2027-28 academic year