



POLICY 007 ACADEMIC INTEGRITY & MISCONDUCT

If you have a disability which makes reading this document or navigating our website difficult and you would like to receive information in an alternative format, please contact: anddegree@acm.ac.uk

Policy 007: ACADEMIC INTEGRITY & MISCONDUCT

1 Introduction

1.1 ACM is committed to operating in an ethical way in every area to ensure the highest possible standards of decision-making and accountability.

1.2 ACM believes it is essential for students to develop a professional and ethically-informed skill-set based on the fundamental values of trust, honesty and integrity. This is because being able to work in a professional and ethical way is a highly valued graduate attribute. As part of this development it is fundamental that our students know how to learn from and acknowledge others' work in the process of creating their own unique pieces of work – and to be truthful about their own contribution.

1.3 ACM recognises that academic integrity is a set of learned skills, with honesty, fairness and respect for others and their work at the core. ACM will support and guide students to learn the necessary skills through education and reinforcement of learning, the promotion of core values, policies that enable, and the appropriate use of technology.

1.4 In order to demonstrate academic integrity, students must produce their own work, acknowledging explicitly and accurately within the work any material that has been included from other sources or legitimate collaboration, as stipulated in the Assessment Briefs. Students must also present their own findings, conclusions or data based on appropriate and ethical practice. Critical analysis and an understanding of research integrity are key skills that students should aim to develop.

1.5 It is a student's responsibility to familiarise themselves with the academic conventions and practices applicable to the course on which they are registered. It will be the responsibility of students to ensure that the work they submit for assessment is entirely their own, or, in the case of group work, the group's own, and that they observe all Regulations, Procedures and instructions governing assessments.

1.6 Where a student makes use of artificial intelligence at any point in their research or writing process, they must acknowledge the use of that tool as they would any other piece of evidence or material in their submission. It is the student's responsibility to make a full disclosure which comprehensively describes how the AI tool has been used.

1.7 Students are expected to protect the integrity of their work and not allow others to see the text they have produced for their assignments except in official group work. They should exercise caution about sharing their ideas and draft copies with other students. They should not allow others access to electronic versions of their work and should always be able to demonstrate that the work is their own and correctly sourced and referenced.

1.8 It is the responsibility of each individual student when submitting an assessment item to ensure that the work which they are submitting is the work which they wish to be assessed.

1.9 Students must have ethical approval for their project/critical review/ dissertation, which cannot be gained retrospectively. Failure to do so may result in failure of the work. Refer to ACM's Research Ethics Policy for details regarding requirements for ethical approval.

1.10 Academic misconduct is a breach of the values of academic integrity and can occur when a student cheats in an assessment or attempts to deliberately mislead an assessor that the work presented is their own when it is not. It includes, but is not limited to, plagiarism, commissioning or buying work from a third party or copying the work of others, unauthorised and/or unacknowledged use of artificial intelligence in a piece of work submitted for grading.

1.11 If a third party or anonymous whistleblower reports that there has been academic misconduct by a student of ACM, ACM may decide to investigate the allegations.

1.12 ACM will take action against any student who breaches the regulations surrounding academic integrity through negligence, foolishness or deliberate intent in any form of assessment.

1.13 This policy and procedure is concerned with the actions of students and not their intentions. An excuse of "not intending to" is not an acceptable defence.

1.14 In all cases of alleged academic misconduct and cheating, students will be treated as innocent until a case against them has been investigated and upheld.

1.15 A finding that academic misconduct has occurred is a judgement based on available evidence, the standard of proof being the balance of probability.

1.16 These Procedures should be read in conjunction with the Student Terms and Conditions for Academic Integrity.

2 Aims and Purpose

2.1 This policy is designed to support staff and students to embed good practice and develop methods for enhancing Academic Integrity. Its aims are to:

- a) ensure fair and equal treatment of all students when considering whether academic integrity has been breached.
- b) make clear the types of behaviours that are considered to be academic misconduct.
- c) set out the penalties for academic misconduct and cheating.
- d) describe the procedures by which allegations of academic misconduct and cheating will be investigated and determined.
- e) create a culture of enhancement, seeking to learn from cases of academic misconduct.

f) uphold fairness, consistency and natural justice in the treatment of the student body as a whole.

g) maintain awareness through collaboration with support services (e.g. Academic Support Unit and welfare), targeted local campaigns, and visible and accessible central information highlighted to students at relevant key points in the academic year.

2.2 ACM provides unlimited storage in Google Drive to every student. Students should utilise this as a composition space in which to create, draft and store their work. The purpose of this is to enable students to demonstrate academic integrity and to show evidence of their learning.

2.3 When requested, students are required to share the version history of their work. The purpose of this is to verify the writing process (or equivalent) and the history of document creation, and to ensure that all students meet ACM's academic integrity standards. Being able to show how your drafts led to the finished work is a positive way of working with the academic integrity process.

3 Principles

3.1 The following principles underpin ACM's approach to Academic Integrity:

a) ACM treats the decision as to whether minor errors, poor academic practice or unfair and/or dishonest academic misconduct has taken place as a matter for academic judgement and the penalties applied will vary according to the individual case and the seriousness of the offence.

b) This policy and procedure applies to all work submitted for the Foundation year and / or Undergraduate and Postgraduate degree programmes and will include all assessment items, including research proposals and theses.

c) Cases of plagiarism at all levels due to poor referencing, paraphrasing and errors in the form and frequency of citations in text, where, in the judgement of the Academic Misconduct Panel, deception does not appear to be the intention, may be considered as Poor Academic Practice and marked accordingly.

d) ACM recognises that undergraduate students who are new to Higher Education (for example, Foundation year students and students at FHEQ Level 4) may need some time to learn how to acknowledge sources correctly. ACM's response to signs of academic misconduct at FHEQ Level 4, where, in the judgement of the Academic Misconduct Panel, deception does not appear to be the intention, will be to consider this as Poor Academic Practice and to educate students in regard to appropriate academic practice and academic integrity (e.g. via the Academic Support Unit) rather than to penalise. This applies to plagiarism, self-plagiarism and collusion (except collusion in an online examination). It does not apply to other forms of academic misconduct where penalties will immediately apply.

e) If academic misconduct is suspected in relation to work submitted by a student, in the interest of helping students to avoid continued acts, cases should be investigated as soon as possible and normally start within 21 working days of the date of grade release for the relevant module. However, ACM will exercise its own judgement in cases that come to its attention and reserves the right to investigate cases where academic misconduct appears to have taken place more than one month previously.

f) Cases of suspected academic misconduct should be documented and referred by the marker as part of established procedure. Where appropriate a meeting should be conducted to verify the student's understanding of the subject matter and/or their approach to completing their work.

g) Students will receive notification from the marker that their work is under investigation for Academic Misconduct in place of a provisional grade for the work submitted. A Holding Grade of U will be recorded in the student record.

3.2 Where a component of a module has academic misconduct upheld against it, the whole module will normally be affected when a sanction is applied (such as applying a mark of P), and not just that component. (Where the component weighting contributes 20 % or less of the overall module, a lesser penalty may be applied.)

4 Allegations of Academic Misconduct (Third Party Reporting)

4.1 Third parties include: (i) students of ACM (current or former students) reporting misconduct by another student, or (ii) members of the public, or (iii) anonymous reporters.

4.2 If a third party reports that academic misconduct has been committed by a student of ACM, ACM may decide to investigate the allegations, taking into account the nature of the academic misconduct, any evidence provided by the reporting third party and any other supporting evidence obtained from sources independent of the reporting third party.

4.3 ACM will not (unless the law permits) report any details about the investigation undertaken and the outcome of the investigation to the reporting third party, as such information will include the personal information of other individuals including of the student who is being investigated, and such information must remain confidential to comply with Data Protection law and other duties of confidentiality that ACM may have in relation to the student being investigated and other individuals.

4.4 If a reporting third party insists on remaining anonymous, ACM may not be able to rely on the anonymous information as evidence of academic misconduct, as under the data protection legislation and other legal rights that protect individuals faced with allegations against them, the accused person will have a right to know what information others hold about them and how they obtained such information, as this is information relating to them and is therefore their personal data.

4.5 If a reporting third party consents to their identity being disclosed to the student who has allegedly committed academic misconduct, ACM may consider any precautionary measures

that need to be put in place to safeguard the reporting person or anyone else involved, in consultation with the individuals to be safeguarded.

4.6 If ACM cannot investigate an anonymous report, we may use the information to better understand the issues impacting our community, to understand trends, and to inform proactive preventive work.

5 Definitions of Types of Academic Misconduct

5.1 Academic misconduct (cheating and unethical practices) in assessments is where a student gains, seeks, attempts or intends to gain advantage in relation to assessments or to aid another to gain such an advantage by unfair or improper means. The following list provides examples of misconduct, but is not exhaustive.

a) Minor Errors/Poor Academic Practice

Minor errors arise when a student has attempted to adopt academically acceptable practices but has failed to do so accurately or fully, producing work that is unduly derivative or which fails to recognise sources. Examples include forgetting to insert quotation marks, minor mistakes in referencing or citation, gaps in the bibliography or reference list, non-compliance with some aspects of presentation guidelines. Work will be marked down for poor academic practice, including an over-reliance on external sources or for being overly derivative.

b) Cheating in examinations or tests

Breaching the Examination Room Rules for Candidates (Section K). This includes assessments that are taken 'in-class', 'online' or any other form of summative examination.

c) Collusion

Collusion occurs when, unless with official approval (e.g. in the case of group projects), two or more students consciously collaborate in the preparation and production of work which is ultimately submitted by each in an identical or substantially similar form and/or is represented by each to be the product of individual efforts. Examinations and Online timed assessments that contain similar work will be treated as collusion. Collusion also occurs where there is unauthorised co-operation between a student and another person in the preparation and production of work which is presented as the student's own. This includes when one student produces work and allows another student to copy it - both students will be culpable. If both students submit the work in the same submission period, even at different times, both students will be deemed to have colluded.

Collusion can also be the act of one student presenting a piece of work as their own independent work when the work was undertaken by a group. With group work, where individual members submit parts of the total assignment, each member of a group must take responsibility for checking the legitimacy of the work submitted in their name.

Peer review of each other's work or discussing an assignment can be helpful. However, students should be wary of falling into an act of collusion by actually producing/writing parts of an assignment for their peer/friend or giving them access to the work.

d) Copying

Copying occurs when a student consciously presents as their own work material copied directly from a fellow student or other person without their knowledge. It includes the passing off of another's intellectual property, not in the public domain, as one's own. It differs from collusion in that the originator of the copied work is not aware of, or party to, the copying. Copying of work from published sources would be dealt with as plagiarism.

e) Dishonest Use of Data: Fabricating or falsifying data or using without permission another person's work

Fabricating or falsifying data to include presenting work that has not taken place. This includes laboratory reports or projects based on experimental or field work. It may also include falsifying attendance sheets for placements where this is part of the assessment requirements.

f) Requirement for Ethical Approval

Failure to gain ethical approval through ACM's ethical approval processes prior to beginning research, or where the student makes a major deviation from any approved research without gaining additional ethical approval, may result in failure of the work. Refer to ACM's Research Ethics Policy for details regarding requirements for ethical approval.

g) False declarations

False declarations and evidence presented in order to receive special consideration by Assessment Boards, including extensions, deferrals and requests for exemption from work. False declarations may be handled under ACM's Student Conduct and Disciplinary procedure. It will be made clear to students where this is the case.

h) Plagiarism - Passing off someone else's work, whether intentionally or unintentionally, as your own

Plagiarism occurs when a student misrepresents, as their own work, work in the public domain, written or otherwise, of any other person (including another student) or of any institution. Examples of forms of plagiarism include:

- i) the verbatim (word for word) copying of another's work without appropriate and correctly presented acknowledgement and citation of the source.
- ii) the close paraphrasing of another's work by simply changing a few words or altering the order of presentation, without appropriate and correctly presented acknowledgement and citation of the source.
 - Sham Paraphrasing: When someone copies text, word for word from a source, references the work but does not place it in quotation marks so it appears to be paraphrased.
 - Illicit paraphrasing: When someone paraphrases text from a source but does not acknowledge the source.
- iii) failure to reference appropriately or to adequately identify the source of material used:

- Concealing sources: If a student cites a piece of work from a source more than once they must reference it each time. No matter how many times they refer back to the source they must acknowledge the source, even if it is in the very next paragraph.
- Fake Referencing: To make up quotations and/or supply false/inaccurate quotations and/or citations, including references/sources, or any part thereof. The fake or false/inaccurate citation can be either completely fabricated or reference a real source (book, journal, or website) which contains no such article or words that have supposedly been used or to imply that books and/or journals have been used by copying citations from the work of other authors when they have not.
- Secondary referencing: To mention someone's work which has been referred to in a document a student has read, even though the student hasn't read the original piece of work themselves. When a student compiles their reference list students must only include the document(s) read by the student.

iv) the deliberate and detailed presentation of another's words or concept as one's own, including words or concepts generated by generative artificial intelligence.

i) Self-plagiarism

Self-plagiarism, also called auto-plagiarism, is when a student submits the same piece of work, or substantial part thereof, for assessment more than once for graded credit without acknowledging what they are doing by citing the original content. It will be regarded as Self-plagiarism unless the original piece of work is appropriately referenced in the new submission.

j) Purchasing or Commissioning

Purchasing or commissioning is either attempting to purchase or purchasing work for an assessment including, for example, from the internet, or attempting to commission, or commissioning someone else to complete an assessment. Essay mills are now illegal entities, and use of them is facilitating an illegal activity.

For assessments at all levels, the commissioning of proof-reading where this substantially alters the content of the original work, whether this is from a commercial provider or a personal contact, falls under this definition and is considered academic misconduct.

k) Deliberate attempt to gain advantage by unfair or improper means

Trying to deceive specialist text checking software (e.g. Turnitin) by, for example, using text replacement tools, images in documents instead of text, submitting documents in an alternative format than that stipulated by the assessor/assessment brief.

l) Unethical Use of Artificial Intelligence

Unethical use of artificial intelligence in a piece of work submitted for grading is a form of plagiarism. Content generated by artificial intelligence which is not cited or referenced, giving the impression that the content is the student's own original work. This includes:

- where generative artificial intelligence has expanded on an author's original content,

- hallucinated and/or false referencing - where a reference list has been generated but lacks in-text citation or sources cited in-text are not apparent in the reference list (inadequate referencing).

ACM will not distinguish between the input of AI and the input of another human being in drawing the line between permissible help and plagiarism / unethical use of AI. A level of assistance that would be inappropriate if received from a person will also be inappropriate if received from AI.

6 Appropriate Academic Conduct

6.1 Academic Staff are responsible for informing students of the following:

- a) Students are only permitted to submit their own original work for assessments.
- b) Students should not allow others to see the text they have produced for their assignments and should exercise caution about sharing their ideas and draft copies with other students.
- c) Students should not allow others access to electronic versions of their work.
- d) Students should take care to ensure the originality of their own assessment submissions and should always be able to demonstrate that work is their own and how it was developed (drafts of work) and correctly sourced and referenced, including declarations of where and how AI was used, where necessary.

Procedures

7 Initial Procedures

7.1 Whilst an investigation is being carried out, the Assessment Board may note the incident and defer judgement.

7.2 A holding grade of U (allegation of academic misconduct under investigation) should be entered by the Assessment Operations Manager or nominee on the student's module record (for cross-reference with other alleged infringements).

7.3 In the case of formal written examinations, where an internal examiner suspects a candidate of infringing examination room rules, they shall:

- (a) Complete a report detailing the alleged infringement, with evidence to support the allegation;
- (b) report the allegation to the Academic Misconduct Team for processing.

8 Procedure for investigation by the Academic Misconduct Team

8.1 Where a tutor suspects academic misconduct to have occurred, the tutor flags the submitted work to the Academic Misconduct Team for review.

8.2 An Academic Misconduct Team member determines whether there are reasonable grounds to pursue an allegation of academic misconduct or whether the work referred to them should be treated as a case of Poor Academic Practice.

8.3 Where there are no reasonable grounds to pursue an allegation of academic misconduct, the work should be returned to the tutor and marked on its academic merits. All record of the alleged misconduct will be removed from the student's record.

8.4 Where the work should be treated as a case of Poor Academic Practice, the work should be returned to the tutor and marked on its academic merits, taking into account the nature of the poor academic practice, such as (for example) an over-reliance on external sources. The student should be given feedback on where they can seek help (e.g. Academic Support Unit) or where to access resources with regard to referencing, etc.

8.5 If the Academic Misconduct Team determines there are reasonable grounds to suggest the candidate has contravened the regulations in assessment, the Team shall write to the student(s) concerned:

- (a) To put the allegation to the student.
- (b) If appropriate, to enclose copies of any evidence or report.
- (c) Request a written statement to explain how the allegation may have arisen, stating any mitigating circumstances which may be taken into account when considering a penalty (authenticated evidence to be provided where appropriate).
- (d) To notify the student that they may request a meeting in preference to submitting a written statement, if they prefer.
- (e) To request a reply within 7 calendar days of the date on which the letter or email is sent and explaining the consequences of failure to reply.

Student Response

8.6 If a written reply to the allegation or a request for a meeting is not received from the student within 7 calendar days of the date on which the letter or email is sent, or if the student replies accepting the allegation, the Academic Misconduct Team shall escalate the allegation to the Academic Misconduct Panel for consideration under the terms of this Academic Integrity Policy.

9 Retrospective allegations of Academic Misconduct

9.1 Exceptionally, where academic misconduct is discovered after a grade has been published or an award has been conferred, an allegation may be pursued retrospectively under these procedures. Where a student has already graduated, the outcome may result in the revoking of a qualification already awarded.

10 Guidelines for Penalties for Academic Misconduct

- a) The minimum penalty imposed shall normally exceed that which would follow if the student had merely failed the assessment.
- b) The penalties listed must be taken as indicative of the maximum penalties which may be imposed (see Table A).
- c) All confirmed offences for taught programmes must be recorded on the student's record as grade P for the module. This grade is to remain throughout the student's registration at ACM and to be replaced on formal documents by grade 0%.
- d) All confirmed offences for research programmes will be recorded on the student record and remain throughout the student's registration at ACM.
- e) All records of disproved offences must be deleted from the student record.
- f) A student may appeal against the decision of the Assessment Board to impose a penalty by following the Academic Appeals policy and procedure.
- g) If a student submits multiple assessments within a similar timeframe (and will not have had the opportunity to have had feedback) and has committed the same type of offence, the appropriate penalty will be applied to all the assessments as a simultaneous offence.

11 Categories, Actions and Penalties

Table A

Penalty	Examples	Key Indicators	Actions
Category A MINOR MISCONDUCT (POOR ACADEMIC PRACTICE)	- Reproducing an existing concept or idea unintentionally or without proper referencing - Failure to adequately reference sources at Level 4, including incomplete or incorrectly cited bibliographies, footnotes and/or quotations - Several sentences of direct copying without acknowledging the source - Several instances of inappropriate or unacknowledged paraphrasing - Unacknowledged proofreading by another	- The student has not yet learnt about the importance of referencing or has misunderstood the referencing or paraphrasing principles - The student's conduct appears unintentional and on an insignificant level. - The student is at Foundation or FHEQ Level 4 of university education - The student is not used to UK academic culture	- The assessor will mark the work, but the mark/grade may be reduced to reflect a student's failure to address the assessment criteria in areas of collation of sources and their citation leading to the work being overly derivative/overly reliant on external sources; or failure to gain appropriate ethical approval(s) for work that is deemed ethically low risk. - The student may be required to redo the assessment at the next assessment opportunity if

	- person - Unacknowledged help with English language accuracy - The work is overly derivative/overly reliant on external sources.		the downgrading results in the assessment and the overall module being failed. - Tutorial support and guidance to help the student understand what is and is not acceptable <u>and</u> - Written advice to the student on where they can seek help (such as the Digital Librarian) - Warning regarding penalties for academic misconduct offences
Category B MODERATE MISCONDUCT	- Unethical use of generative artificial intelligence - Several paragraphs of direct copying without acknowledging the source (including one's own previously submitted work on another assignment or AI generated text) - At any FHEQ level, references, research and/or in-text citations are found to be fabricated wholly or in part. - Failure to adequately reference sources at Level 5 and above, including incomplete or incorrectly cited bibliographies, footnotes and/or quotations - Several paragraphs of unacknowledged paraphrasing of another person's thoughts, ideas or text or that which is generated by AI tools. - An assignment that has been substantially translated into English by another person or through the use of AI tools. - An assignment that has been substantially edited by another person or AI Tool. - Deliberately submitting the same piece of work for assessment for more than one assignment - Collusion	- The student's conduct appears intentional but on a small scale - The student's conduct appears unintentional but is on a significant scale	- Normally a mark of P at the module level with the opportunity to resubmit (where further attempts have not been exhausted) and the resubmission will be capped at 40% - Where all attempts at the module are exhausted, the Assessment Board will normally, subject to Programme Regulations, award P for the whole module with the opportunity to re-enrol in the module or an appropriate alternative with full fees applicable - Warning that further breaches of academic integrity will have serious consequences for the student's final qualification
Category C	Unethical use of generative artificial	The student's behaviour appears intentional and on a	Normally a mark of P at the module level with the

SERIOUS MISCONDUCT	intelligence • Large sections of unacknowledged paraphrasing of another person's ideas or text • Presentation of the work of other students without acknowledgement • Presentation of the work of commercial or industry practitioners without acknowledgement • At any FHEQ level, references, research and/or in-text citations are found to be fabricated wholly or in part. • Deliberate failure to adequately reference sources at Level 5 or above, including incomplete or incorrectly cited bibliographies, footnotes and/or quotations • Deliberate falsifying of data or sources, or using another person's work without permission • Breach of Examination Room rules • Repeated Moderate and/or Serious Misconduct, particularly if the student has been previously reprimanded • False declarations in order to receive special consideration by Assessment Boards, including deferrals and requests for exemption from work	significant scale • The student has intended to deceive the person marking the work and/or undermine the integrity of the assessment • The student would benefit significantly from the offence • The student's behaviour would significantly affect the integrity of the university's awards • The student may have been warned/reprimanded for previous attempts to deceive	opportunity to resubmit (where further attempts have not been exhausted) and the resubmission will be capped at 40% as per the academic regulations. • Where a student has already been given an opportunity to resubmit and all attempts are exhausted, the Assessment Board will normally, subject to Programme Regulations, award P for the whole module with the opportunity to re-enrol in the module or an appropriate alternative with full fees applicable. <i>Or, in cases of the most serious misconduct (Category C)</i> • All modules at that level/stage will be marked with a P with an opportunity to re-enrol in that level/stage. All re-enrolled modules will be capped at 40% on a passing grade and full fees will be applicable • Exceptionally, the Assessment Board may, at its discretion and with reasonable cause, decide that a student may not be reassessed
---------------------------	--	---	---

Category D GROSS MISCONDUCT	• Unethical use of generative artificial intelligence • Submitting an assignment purchased or downloaded from the internet (e.g. the use of the services of an essay mill) • Commissioning another person to produce a piece of work • Theft of the work of another/other student(s) • Theft of the work of commercial or industry practitioners • Copyright/Intellectual Property Theft • Fraud or deception, including impersonation and misrepresentation of identity • Acts of violence or vandalism • Breach of Examination Room Rules • Repeated Serious Misconduct, particularly if the student has been previously reprimanded	• Any offence in which the student commits physical violence, malicious abuse, theft, fraud or other fundamental breach of trust, including substantial plagiarism in a postgraduate dissertation, purchasing or commissioning of work, will be regarded as gross misconduct and may therefore lead to deregistration from the programme. See also the Student Conduct and Discipline Policy	• A mark of P at the module level with a re-enrolment in the module, capped at 40% on a passing grade and with full fees applicable OR • A lower level award OR • Deregistration from the programme • Revoking a previously awarded qualification
------------------------------------	---	--	--

Note: All cases will sit on a sliding scale of severity. There may be situations where what would normally be considered a minor offence will more appropriately be considered as serious misconduct, due, for example, to the extent of the deliberation and intention to deceive. These examples should therefore be used as a guide to help the relevant stakeholders identify procedures, keeping in mind that an element of academic judgement will always be required in determining the level of academic misconduct and the appropriate action to take.

(Where the component contributes up to 20 % of the overall module, a lesser penalty may apply)

12 Fee and delivery implications

12.1 Requirement to re-enrol in a module or a substitute module may incur additional fees and possible disruption to the student's original delivery schedule. Interruption to, or deregistration from, enrolment to the programme of study may also incur issues with regard to student loan access and/or funding. Students should refer to the Finance Policy for details regarding fee liability, available at www.acm.ac.uk/policies/

13 Appeals

13.1 If a student wishes to appeal a decision made by ACM regarding academic integrity, they should follow ACM's Academic Appeals policy and procedure, available at www.acm.ac.uk/policies/

13.2 The purpose of the appeal stage following a decision made by ACM regarding academic integrity is not to provide a full rehearing of the case. Its primary function is to determine whether the initial decision was reached fairly, reasonably, and in accordance with

the institution's procedures. Consequently, the Appeal Panel will only consider an appeal where there is clear evidence of a material procedural irregularity, bias or perception of bias, new material evidence that could not reasonably have been provided earlier, or where the penalty imposed was disproportionate to the offence. Appeals based solely on a disagreement with the original findings will not be considered.

14 Policy Document Responsible Parties

14.1 The policy lead is responsible for the cyclical monitoring and review of this policy in liaison with the Policy Review Committee. The Academic Integrity & Misconduct policy lead is:

- Head of Assessments

14.2 Decisions and appropriate actions in support of the implementation of the Policy will be authorised by the following designated staff:

- Head of Quality and Standards
- Quality Assurance and Enhancement Manager
- Executive Dean of Education
- Dean of Academic Practice and Enhancement
- Head of Assessments

15 References

15.1 Internal references:

- Academic Appeals Policy and Procedure
- Research Ethics Policy
- Finance Policy
- Student Use of Artificial Intelligence Policy

15.2 External references:

- Office for Students (OfS): Regulatory Framework for Higher Education in England
- OfS Conditions B1 to B6
- Office of the Independent Adjudicator (OIA) Good Practice Frameworks

16 Date of Approval and Next Review

Version	2.0
Approved on	01 September 2026
Approved by	Academic Board

Next Review	August 2027
-------------	-------------