

14. ACADEMIC INTEGRITY PROCEDURE

This section of the Student Regulations Framework applies to all taught programmes of Plymouth Marjon University, whether undergraduate or postgraduate, to all research degree students and to all apprentices enrolled on the University's apprenticeship programmes, who are classified as 'students' and referred to accordingly throughout this Procedure.

14.1 Academic Integrity

1. Academic Integrity relates to ethical practice in all areas of academic activity and professional conduct. Academic Integrity is guided by adherence to agreed principles that ensure fairness and create an atmosphere of trust and mutual respect. It assumes a level of honesty and rigour that enables academic activities - such as teaching, learning, assessment and publication - to function for the benefit of all members of the University and the external community.
2. Plymouth Marjon University seeks to foster an intellectual and ethical environment based on the principles of academic integrity. Students who embrace academic integrity understand that there are conventions of academic practice that both display and ensure academic integrity and that they must:
 - properly acknowledge and cite all use of the words, results or ideas of others.
 - properly acknowledge all those who have contributed to a piece of work.
 - ensure that all work submitted as their own - as part of an assessment or other academic activity - is produced without the aid of impermissible materials or impermissible collaboration.

- ensure that data and results are obtained by ethical means and reported accurately, without suppressing any results inconsistent with their interpretation or conclusions.
- treat all other students in an ethical manner by neither facilitating academic dishonesty by others nor by obstructing their academic progress.

It is necessary to follow these principles in order to ensure that:

- everyone is given credit for their ideas, words, results, and other academic activity.
 - all student work is fairly evaluated and no student has an inappropriate advantage over others.
 - each student's intellectual and professional development is ensured.
 - each student is supported towards a successful transition to graduate employment and future careers, as employers will expect graduates to have acquired the attitudes and behaviours that academic integrity demands.
 - the reputation of the University for integrity in its teaching and research is maintained and enhanced.
3. The acquisition of relevant study skills - such as effective note-taking, ability to critically evaluate other writers' theories and concepts and presentation skills - will help students to understand these conventions. Students are responsible for engaging with programme-level discussions and any available training, familiarising themselves with relevant guidance, and maintaining the academic integrity of their work, including seeking clarification where required.
 4. Failure to adhere to these principles leads to poor academic practice. It can also lead to an offence of academic misconduct and, in serious cases, can threaten the reputation of the University. Every member of the University community therefore has a responsibility to ensure that the highest standards

of academic integrity are upheld. The following procedures set out the processes that will be followed where academic misconduct is suspected, and the penalties that will be applied where academic misconduct has been determined (upheld), which can ultimately involve the cancellation of credit and/or expulsion.

14.2 Academic Misconduct – general principles

1. The University recognises three particular areas of misconduct, as follows:

- Personal misconduct
- Professional misconduct
- Academic misconduct

Academic Misconduct is defined in greater detail below. Personal and Professional Misconduct are the subject of separate procedures (see Section 15 of this [Framework](#)). A particular case of alleged misconduct might span more than one of these areas.

2. The University is committed to safeguarding the standard and integrity of its awards by the prevention and/or detection and punishment of academic misconduct in assessed work. Accordingly, students are expected to display academic integrity by not acting in any way that is likely to gain unfair academic advantage in an assessment. Where a student acts in this way, an offence of academic misconduct has been committed. **Regardless of their intentions, any student who breaches these regulations will be considered to have committed academic misconduct.**
3. Where a penalty may be applied, students will be given the opportunity to present any mitigating circumstances or factors that they consider to be relevant. Such factors will not normally be taken into account when determining whether academic misconduct has occurred, but will normally be considered when deciding an appropriate penalty where academic misconduct has been determined.

Mitigating factors might include:

- It is a first offence.
 - The student admitted the offence at the earliest opportunity.
 - The student has expressed remorse.
 - The student was found in possession of unauthorised material in an exam or in-class test but did not intend to gain an advantage.
 - The student has compelling personal circumstances that affected their judgement.
4. Academic misconduct can be investigated at any time, and where it is proven after an award is made the University reserves the right to withdraw that award.
 5. Cases of alleged academic misconduct are investigated by way of a two-stage process. At each stage, additional and more severe penalties become available. The cancellation of credit becomes available at the second and final stage.
 6. Every student is assigned to an Academic Department and is accountable to the Academic Director of that Department. This will be the Academic Department in which the majority of a student's programme of study is based.
 7. All students will be invited to attend the interviews associated with these procedures. Where attendance is not possible, then correspondence may be used in place of the interview and the procedures may be modified to reflect this, subject to the agreement of the Academic Standards Officer or nominee.
 8. The University determines allegations of academic misconduct on the basis of the **balance of probabilities, supported by reliable evidence**, rather than the criteria of beyond reasonable doubt which applies in criminal cases. Any consideration of, and subsequent determination regarding, academic misconduct during these procedures ultimately remains a matter of academic judgement.

9. The determination that the formal stage (Stage One or Two of these procedures) should be initiated does not represent a decision that academic misconduct has occurred.
10. These procedures do not apply to formative submissions, although the same principles of academic integrity are expected to be maintained.
11. In the context of this procedure, and in relation to any penalty imposed, subsequent offences are offences that do not occur in the same assessment period (for example, Semester or Term). Where a student has two or more allegations in the same assessment period, these will be considered concurrently (where possible).

14.3 Rights of Students and Support

1. Students suspected of academic misconduct have the right to:
 - Confidential advice and support throughout the process;
 - Fair treatment and respect;
 - Timely processing of their case;
 - Access to all evidence considered in their case;
 - Clear information about the process.
2. The University recognises that involvement in academic integrity and misconduct proceedings can be stressful. Students are encouraged to make use of support throughout their involvement with these procedures and should feel able to raise queries at any point, whether that is through the University's Student Wellbeing and Support team, the Marjon Student Union, or other sources.
3. A student who has been invited to an investigatory meeting, interview, or hearing as part of these procedures has the right to be joined by an accompanying person for the purpose of providing advice and support. The

accompanying person can only be heard during the meeting with the agreement of both the student and the member of staff chairing or leading the meeting, interview, or hearing, as appropriate.

The name and status of any accompanying person must normally be notified to the University within the timescales set out in these procedures, and their attendance is subject to the University's prior consent.

4. These Procedures are internal to the University and therefore legal representation will not normally be permitted, although a reasoned request for legal representation can be made by a student and will be considered. The University reserves the right to refuse the request if the circumstances are not deemed exceptional.
5. The University can make reasonable adjustments to the procedures on a case-by-case basis, as appropriate, to take account of the individual needs of students. Reasonable adjustments shall be made to the procedures to ensure fairness for students with a disability. Students should make any reasonable adjustments known to the University so that these can be implemented. A record will be kept of any adjustments made.

14.4 Acceptable Behaviour

The University has a duty to ensure the safety and well-being of its staff and will, for example, not accept communication that is abusive, offensive, defamatory, aggressive, threatening, coercive, intimidating, unreasonably persistent or demanding. Whatever the outcome of any investigations, the University will not tolerate any form of intimidation, victimisation or discrimination against any student(s) or members of the University community involved in these investigations. This applies both to students and their supporters. Where such behaviour is displayed by a student it might, therefore, constitute an instance of student misconduct in its own right. Where such behaviour is displayed by the supporter of a student, the University reserves the right to limit or terminate its correspondence with that individual.

14.5 Confidentiality and Disclosure

1. Information regarding students who are subject to academic misconduct proceedings will be handled confidentially and disclosed only on a need-to-know basis. Disclosure will be limited to those involved in investigating, determining, administering, or recording the outcome of a case, as appropriate.
2. At the Formal Stages (Stage One and Two) of these Procedures, the Academic Director (or nominee), or the Chair respectively, may consult relevant staff or students, where necessary, ahead of an interview or hearing. In such cases, only information strictly necessary for the purpose of the consultation will be shared.

A written record of any such consultation must be made and included in the case documentation. This record must be provided to the student facing the allegation(s) within the applicable timeframes.

Individuals consulted must be informed in advance of how any information they provide may be used and shared.

3. Academic Departments and Faculties may, where necessary, discuss anonymised cases for the purposes of standardising and calibrating their approach. The Quality and Academic Standards Unit may also provide advice on any relevant precedent, on an anonymised basis.
4. The University handles reference requests from employers based on their professional standards. If a reference request comes from a health or education provider, any recent or ongoing disciplinary actions, or referrals to the Disclosure and Barring Service (DBS), may be disclosed to the employer if requested.

Disciplinary action does not refer to an allegation being made against a student, nor to the opening of misconduct proceedings (as these do not, in themselves, constitute disciplinary action). Rather, it refers to a finding that misconduct has occurred, determined on the balance of probabilities.

Information provided should be relevant, limited, factual, and justifiable in all cases.

14.6 Definitions of Academic Misconduct

Examples of behaviour that could be construed as academic misconduct (please note that these are not exhaustive) include:

- **Plagiarism** – when a student takes and uses as their own, the thoughts, writing, visual material or inventions of others without proper attribution (in contravention of the [guidance on referencing](#)).
- **Self-plagiarism** - this involves the submission of material already prepared for one assessment task for another such task. A piece of work may only be submitted for assessment once. Submitting the same piece of work twice (or a significant part of it), will be regarded as an offence of ‘self-plagiarism’. A student who intends to quote an excerpt from material that has already been submitted for another assessment task should seek the advice of the Module Leader before doing so. Any such excerpt must be appropriately referenced (see [guidance on referencing](#)).
- **Unauthorised collusion** – when students join together to pass off as the work of one (or a specified number of people) the work of more than one (or a specified number of people). Where students are required to work in groups as part of an assessment, module tutors are expected to make it explicit in their instructions whether the students should produce common or individual work and the extent of permissible collaboration. Taking a copy of another student’s work without their permission also amounts to unauthorised collusion, although sanctions will only apply in such cases to the student who copied the work.
- **Cheating in an examination or other summative assessment.** This includes, but is not limited to, circumstances where a student:

- Brings into an examination any books, notes, equipment, materials, or devices (or any means of accessing information of value) that have **not been explicitly authorised**;
- Fails to comply with the instructions provided in relation to conduct in examinations;
- Copies, or attempts to copy, from another candidate;
- Obtains, attempts to obtain, or seeks access to an examination paper or assessment material in advance of its authorised release.

Where a student is permitted to leave an examination room temporarily, they must not, during that period, consult any person or source, or otherwise access information relating to the content of the examination.

- **Unauthorised Content Generation**

- Contract cheating:

When a student submits work that has been produced in whole or part by another person and/or organisation on their behalf. This may include the purchase of an assessment from an organisation or an individual (including use of essay mills or buying work online), or an unpaid contribution from a partner, friend or family member. A student who makes available work to another student (of the University or elsewhere) also commits this offence, whether in exchange for financial gain or otherwise.

- Inappropriate Use of Artificial Intelligence:

Includes work generated by artificial intelligence tools and then claimed as the student's own writing. This includes but is not limited to sites such as ChatGPT. These sites themselves may be useful tools when used appropriately but it is the manner in which they are used that may constitute a breach of Academic Integrity. Students should refer to assessment briefs and seek advice as needed.

- **Fabrication** – when a student makes up data or other such content, manipulates content and/or tampers with documentation to gain an unfair academic advantage. Fabrication also occurs when a student falsely claims to have conducted experiments, observations, interviews or any form of research which they have not, in fact, carried out.
- **Impersonation** – when a student enters into an arrangement with another person who fraudulently represents them at an examination or test. Please note that where an offence of impersonation takes place, both the impersonator (if a student of the University) and the student impersonated will be the subject of misconduct procedures.
- **Unethical conduct** – when a student fails to gain ethical approval where appropriate, coerces or bribes project participants and/or breaches confidentiality with regard to information on individuals gathered during data collection, or otherwise breaches ethical codes of practice that are applicable to the student's programme of study.

14.7 Initial Considerations and Preliminary Investigation

1. Any person who - either during the marking period or at any time thereafter - identifies or suspects a breach of the Academic Integrity Procedure by a student, must refer the matter to the relevant Programme/Programme Area/Subject Area Leader. Academic integrity concerns will normally be considered within the Academic Department in which the majority of the student's programme of study is located. Where a programme spans two Academic Departments, the referral should be made to the relevant Leader in that Department.

Where the matter relates to a module delivered outside that Department, subject-specialist advice may be sought where appropriate; however, a decision on whether the matter should proceed further can normally be made without specialist subject input.

2. Academic judgement will be used to identify where there may be a cause for concern regarding academic integrity. Methods used to inform this judgement may vary depending on the type of assessment.
3. Where an academic integrity concern is identified, the Module Leader and Programme/Programme Area/Subject Area Leader may first discuss the matter to determine whether it constitutes **Poor Academic Practice**, as defined in Section 14.8.1 of these Procedures. Where there is agreement that the concern meets this definition, it will be addressed informally and as a developmental matter rather than a disciplinary offence, in accordance with Section 14.8 (Poor Academic Practice).

Where Poor Academic Practice has been identified, the Programme/Programme Area/Subject Area Leader (or the Module Leader, where authorised by the Programme Leader) should notify the student in writing, in accordance with Section 14.8.7. **A separate meeting with the student to determine the 'appropriate course of action' (as in Section 14.7.7 – 14.7.10 of these procedures) is not deemed to be necessary where there is a clear agreement between the Module Leader and Programme/Programme Area/Subject Area Leader.** However, the Programme/Programme Area/Subject Area Leader will normally offer the student the opportunity to meet with an appropriate member of academic staff as part of the Poor Academic Practice stage, to support the development of their academic skills (see Section 14.8.4).

4. **Assessment-related Concerns**

Where applicable, if the standard or style of a student's assessed work differs from their previous submissions and raises concerns about authenticity (for example, suspected contract cheating), the matter may need to be considered under Stage One or Two of these procedures, as appropriate.

In such cases, the individual identifying the concern should provide the Programme/Programme Area/Subject Area Leader, in the first instance, with relevant documentation. Where applicable, this should include comparative

material (such as other work submitted by the student during the academic year) and any other supporting evidence, which may include reports generated by academic misconduct detection software.

In cases of suspected plagiarism, the individual identifying the concern should clearly highlight the specific sections of the assessment submission where issues are suspected and provide details of the sources from which the content is believed to have been taken, matching the source material to the student's work where possible.

Where text-matching software is used, it should be recognised that tools such as Turnitin constitute aids to the identification of potential plagiarism and do not necessarily, in themselves, constitute evidence of plagiarism. The determination of whether plagiarism has occurred is a matter of academic judgement. A high similarity score does not necessarily indicate plagiarism, and a low score does not confirm its absence. Further evidence or contextual consideration may therefore be required.

5. Exam-related Concerns

Where a concern arises during an examination, the student will normally be informed at the end of the examination that the matter will be considered further and that they will receive follow-up communication from the Programme/Programme Area/Subject Area Leader or, where appropriate, the Academic Director (or a nominee). The student will also be signposted to appropriate support services, including Student Wellbeing and Support and Marjon Student Union.

The principal invigilator, in consultation with at least one other invigilator or member of staff, will prepare a report for the Programme/Programme Area/Subject Area Leader's consideration. Where the Programme/Programme Area/Subject Area Leader considers that the concern may indicate moderate or serious academic misconduct (refer to Table of Academic Misconduct Categories and Penalties, Section 14.12.1), the matter, including the report, will be referred to the Academic Director (or a nominee) for consideration under Stage One or Two of these procedures, as appropriate.

6. While concerns are under consideration through these procedures, whether at an informal stage or at a formal stage (Stage One or Stage Two), the assessment in question should be recorded with a mark of 1s. Where it is not possible to complete the relevant stage of the procedure before an assessment board convenes, the mark of 1s should be submitted and a progression code of 'Held' applied pending the outcome of the process.
7. **Written Notification and Programme/Programme Area/Subject Area Leader meeting to determine appropriate course of action**

Where an academic integrity concern is identified - and it is unclear whether the matter requires any further action, constitutes Poor Academic Practice or potential academic misconduct - the Programme/Programme Area/Subject Area Leader will invite the student to a meeting to determine the appropriate course of action (see 14.7.9 for possible courses of action).

The meeting with the student should take place as soon as reasonably practicable following referral to the Programme/Programme Area/Subject Area Leader; however, the student must be given no fewer than five working days' notice.

The Programme/Programme Area/Subject Area Leader will notify the student by email that academic integrity concerns have been raised in relation to their work, outlining the nature of those concerns (for example, *suspected first-time minor instance of plagiarism*) and identifying the relevant piece(s) of work.

The written notification will confirm a date and time for a meeting to take place to determine the appropriate course of action. Where the minimum notice period of five working days is not met, the meeting shall only proceed at the stated date and time with the student's consent.

The written notification will include any relevant supporting evidence, a link to these procedures, and signposting to appropriate support services, including Student Wellbeing and Support and Marjon Student Union. It will confirm that,

where a penalty may be applied, the student can present any mitigating circumstances or factors they consider relevant, and that the student has the right to be joined by an accompanying person, as set out in Section 14.3.3. The name and status of any accompanying person should normally be provided to the University at least two working days before the meeting

Where a student is registered on a **Foundation Year** or **Level 4 of a three-year programme** and **first-time, minor academic misconduct is suspected**, the email will inform the student that:

- if they accept the allegation, and do not challenge the evidence or the proposed penalty, a penalty may be applied after the meeting in line with Sections 14.9 and 14.12.1; and
 - by accepting a penalty at this stage, the outcome will be recorded on the student record and may be considered if there are any future concerns relating to academic misconduct or fitness to practise (where applicable to a professional programme).
8. The Programme/Programme Area/Subject Area Leader may contact the student in advance of issuing the email in order to arrange a date and time for the meeting and to forewarn the student that written notification will follow.
9. Following the meeting, the Programme/Programme Area/Subject Area Leader may determine one of the following courses of action:
- No further action required. Where an academic integrity concern is found to have arisen in error, no further action will be taken. For example, a student registered with the University's Disability and Inclusion Advice Service may legitimately use assistive technologies to mitigate disability-related barriers that incorporate AI-enabled features, which can result in text with stylistic differences.

The Programme/Programme Area/Subject Area Leader will inform the student that no further action will be taken and should confirm this in writing by email

following the meeting. The email should be copied to the Quality and Academic Standards Unit for case-monitoring purposes; however, no record will be made on the student record.

- **Poor Academic Practice – Refer to Section 14.8.** This only applies where the concern meets the definition of Poor Academic Practice set out in Section 14.8.1 and where the student has not previously progressed through the Poor Academic Practice stage. This stage will normally apply only at Foundation Year and Level 4 of a three-year programme of study.
- **Programme-level Determination of first-time, minor academic misconduct (Foundation Year and Level 4 of a three-year programme) – Refer to Section 14.9**

This applies only where the Programme/Programme Area/Subject Area Leader determines that the concern is more serious than Poor Academic Practice but is **a first-time, minor instance of academic misconduct** at **Foundation Year or Level 4 of a three-year programme**.

The case may be handled at programme level, **with a minor penalty applied and without the need for a formal investigation, if all of the following apply:**

- the student has engaged in a meeting with the Programme/Programme Area/Subject Area Leader;
- there is clear and unambiguous evidence of minor academic misconduct;
- there are **no material questions of fact** to be determined; and
- the student **does not dispute** the allegation, the evidence, or the proposed penalty;
- the student has been given the opportunity to present any mitigating circumstances or factors they consider relevant (refer to Section 14.2.3).

Where any of these are disputed, the case must proceed under the formal procedures.

- **Alleged minor, moderate or serious instance of academic misconduct to be investigated under the formal procedures** – Where an alleged instance of academic misconduct is considered minor but does not fully meet the criteria for handling at the Programme-Level Determination stage, or where the alleged instance of academic misconduct is considered moderate or serious, the Programme/Programme Area/Subject Area Leader will refer the case, including any available supporting evidence, to the Academic Director (or nominee) for formal investigation.

The Programme/Programme Area/Subject Area Leader will inform the student of the referral and advise them that they will be contacted by the Academic Director, or an appointed nominee.

10. Where a student does not respond to an invitation to meet with the Programme/Programme Area/Subject Area Leader within five working days, or declines to attend such a meeting, the Programme/Programme Area/Subject Area Leader may proceed to determine the appropriate course of action, based on the available information. In these circumstances, the matter **cannot** be dealt with under the Programme-level Determination of first-time, minor academic misconduct (Foundation Year and Level 4 of a three-year programme) stage (Section 14.9), as the student has not engaged in a meeting. The case will therefore normally proceed to the Formal Stage. The Programme/Programme Area/Subject Area Leader will notify the student in writing of the next steps, taking into account the student's non-response or decision not to attend the meeting.

14.8 Poor Academic Practice

1. This procedure acknowledges that - at the early stages of a student's academic journey - skills in academic writing and the use of academic conventions are still developing. As a result, instances of **Poor Academic Practice** may occur.

For the purposes of this procedure, Poor Academic Practice is defined as **low-level academic integrity infringements or failures to apply expected academic conventions that are judged to arise from a lack of familiarity with the requirements of higher education-level assessment. This may include the submission of work that does not appropriately reference or cite sources of research, ideas, data, or words.**

Examples of Poor Academic Practice may include, but are not limited to:

- Incomplete or inaccurate referencing;
- Incorrect or inconsistent use of quotations;
- Minor failures to acknowledge sources;
- Small-scale unacknowledged use of artificial intelligence, subject to the Programme/Programme Area/Subject Area Leader's judgement, taking into account the nature of the programme and the assessment;
- At a very early stage of an assessment, voluntarily surrendering unauthorised materials that the student was unaware they possessed;
- The possession of unauthorised materials, which are so minor in content that they would unlikely provide any meaningful benefit to the student;
- Collaboration between students resulting in minor similarities in structure, sources, or copied text, where there remains sufficient evidence of independent authorship and originality within each student's submission.

Poor Academic Practice will normally apply only at Foundation Year and Level 4 of a three-year programme of study. However, discretion may be exercised at Level 5 and above where students are at an early stage in developing academic integrity in relation to UK higher education standards, such as direct-entry students or those newly enrolled on Master's-level programmes.

2. Where Poor Academic Practice is identified by the Programme/Programme Area/Subject Area Leader (see Section 14.7.3 and 14.8.1), and where the academic integrity concern does not meet the threshold for potential academic misconduct as defined in Section 14.6, the matter may be addressed through the Poor Academic Practice Stage. In such cases, there is no requirement for the concern to progress to the formal stages of these Procedures.
3. Students will not be penalised for Poor Academic Practice on the first occasion. Instead, they will normally be supported to understand the issue, reflect on their practice, and develop their academic skills. Poor Academic Practice on a first occasion is therefore treated as a developmental matter rather than a disciplinary offence.
4. The Programme/Programme Area/Subject Area Leader will normally offer the student the opportunity to meet with an appropriate member of academic staff, typically their Personal Development Tutor (PDT), to discuss the issue and to support the development of their academic skills. Where appropriate, the student may also be referred to the Academic Skills Team and directed to relevant learning modules, academic skills resources, and/or educational opportunities. The student may be required to complete a specified academic integrity learning activity.
5. No penalties are applied as part of the Poor Academic Practice process. Once the Programme/Programme Area/Subject Area Leader has confirmed that the concerns constitute Poor Academic Practice, the marker will take the Poor Academic Practice into account within the marking process. Where appropriate, the work may fail on academic or pedagogic grounds.

6. As part of this process, the student will be informed that any future academic integrity concerns may be considered under the formal academic misconduct procedures.
7. The Programme/Programme Area/Subject Area Leader (or the Module Leader, where authorised by the Programme Leader) should notify the student in writing that Poor Academic Practice has been identified. This communication may include guidance to relevant resources and/or educational support. The Registry and Programme Support Office and the Quality and Academic Standards Unit should be copied in for academic integrity monitoring purposes.
8. Poor Academic Practice will be recorded centrally by Registry Services, and a record will also be retained within the Academic Department, in order that this information may be considered in the context of any future instances of suspected academic misconduct.

14.9 Programme-Level Determination of First-Time Minor Academic Misconduct (Foundation Year and Level 4 of a three-year-programme)

1. This stage applies only where the Programme/Programme Area/Subject Area Leader determines that the concern is more serious than Poor Academic Practice but is a **first-time, minor** instance of academic misconduct at **Foundation Year** or **Level 4 of a three-year programme**.

The case may be handled at programme level only, **with a minor penalty applied** and **without the need for a formal investigation, if all of the following apply:**

- the student has engaged in a meeting with the Programme/Programme Area/Subject Area Leader;
- there is clear and unambiguous evidence of minor academic misconduct;

- there are no material questions of fact to be determined;
- the student does not dispute the allegation, the evidence, or the proposed penalty;
- the student has been given the opportunity to present any mitigating circumstances or factors they consider relevant (refer to Section 14.2.3).

Where any of these are disputed, the case must proceed under the formal procedures.

This approach enables straightforward cases to be managed proportionately at programme level, without the need for a formal investigation.

2. In such cases, the Programme/Programme Area/Subject Area Leader may determine, following a meeting with the student (**refer to Section 14.7.7 - 14.7.9**), that **minor** academic misconduct has occurred and may apply an appropriate penalty in accordance with Section 14.12.1(a).

A formal warning applied as a penalty at this Programme-Level Determination stage reflects a first-time minor offence and that matters were resolved without formal investigation, by agreement.

As part of this outcome, the student may be required to undertake an Academic Integrity Tutorial, and will also normally be signposted to appropriate learning modules and/or academic skills resources, where relevant.

3. The written decision should normally be issued to the student within five working days of the meeting with the Programme/Programme Area/Subject Area Leader. It should clearly set out the decision reached, penalty applied, and the reason(s) for both.

The written decision will inform the student that the outcome will be recorded on their student record, which may be considered if future concerns arise relating to academic misconduct or fitness to practise (where applicable to a

professional programme). It will also advise them of their right to appeal. As academic misconduct has been determined, the student has a right of appeal in accordance with Section 14.13.6 (Appeals Relating to Programme-Level Determination of First-Time Minor Academic Misconduct) of these procedures.

A copy of the written decision should be provided to relevant staff, including the Registry and Programme Support Office and the Quality and Academic Standards Unit, to ensure that a central record is maintained. As academic misconduct has been determined, the Registry and Programme Support Office will record the outcome on the student record.

4. In accordance with Section 14.13.6 of these procedures, where a student subsequently submits an appeal following the programme-level determination stage, and valid grounds are identified, the case will normally progress to **Stage One (Section 14.10) of the formal procedures**, and the student will be invited to attend an interview. The interview will not involve any individual who participated in the original decision-making process.

Formal Stages

14.10 Stage One Procedures: Alleged Minor and Moderate Instances of Academic Misconduct

1. Stage One Procedures will apply where the alleged academic misconduct represents a **minor** or **moderate offence**, as normally categorised in the table set out in **Section 14.12.1(a) and (b)**, although this categorisation is not exhaustive.

Stage One Procedures will also apply where the alleged academic misconduct represents a **first-time, minor** instance of academic misconduct at **Foundation Year** or **Level 4 of a three-year programme**, and where the criteria set out in Section 14.9 for handling at the Programme-Level Determination Stage are not fully met.

The Academic Director in which the majority of the student's programme resides will normally undertake the Stage One procedures (if not also involved in the delivery of the programme), but may also nominate another Academic Director, or an Associate Dean, to undertake this task. The procedures will be carried out by an individual who has had no prior involvement in the case.

2. The Programme/Programme Area/Subject Area Leader will forward the relevant evidence and documentation to the Academic Director (or nominee) for investigation (refer to Section 14.7.4 – 14.7.5).
3. The Academic Director (or nominee) may, where they deem necessary, consult relevant staff or students during the investigation. Only information strictly necessary for the purpose of the consultation will be shared.

A written record of any such consultation must be made and included in the case documentation. This record must be provided to the student facing the allegation(s) within the applicable timeframes (see Section 14.10.5).

Individuals consulted must be informed in advance how any information they provide may be used and shared.

4. In cases where, in the academic judgement of the Academic Director (or nominee), the potential severity of an offence of academic misconduct identified at Stage One would justify suspension from the University, the cancellation of credit (covering one or more modules affected by the academic misconduct) or expulsion, they shall refer the matter directly to Stage Two without interview (on the prior advice of the Academic Standards Officer if appropriate), providing a written rationale in the context of their incident report. Otherwise, they shall invite the student to a Stage One interview, which will allow the student an opportunity to understand the allegation(s), review the evidence, respond, and present any mitigating circumstances or factors that they believe should be considered (refer to Section 14.2.3).
5. The student should be informed in writing of the date, time, and location of the interview at least five working days in advance. The notification will outline the nature of the allegation(s) being investigated (for example, suspected contract

cheating), identify the piece(s) of work to which it relates, and confirm who will attend the interview. At the same time, the student will be provided with the relevant evidence, a copy of these Procedures, information about available support services (including Student Wellbeing and Support and Marjon Student Union), and advice regarding their right to be joined by an accompanying person.

The written notification will also explain that if academic misconduct is determined, this may be taken into account should similar concerns arise in the future.

6. Where the minimum notice period of five working days is not met, the interview shall only proceed at the stated date and time with the student's consent. The meeting may take place either in person or virtually at the discretion of the Academic Director (or nominee).
7. An accompanying person may attend the interview to provide advice and support to the student, as set out in Section 14.3.3. The name and status of any accompanying person must normally be notified to the University no less than two working days in advance of the interview, and attendance is subject to the University's prior consent.
8. Where a student does not respond to an invitation to attend an interview, or fails to attend without good reason, the Academic Director (or nominee) may proceed in the student's absence. In such cases, they may decide, on the balance of probabilities and on the basis of the evidence available, whether academic misconduct has occurred (minor or moderate) and, where it is determined (upheld), impose an appropriate penalty in accordance with the table set out in Section 14.12.1(a) or (b).
9. Interviews may be scheduled at any point during the calendar year; however, reasonable steps will be taken to arrange the interview at a time when the student would normally be expected to be present at the University.

10. The interview will proceed in the presence of at least one other member of the Faculty, normally the member of the Academic Department who identified the suspected academic misconduct, as well as any other witnesses as appropriate. A member of the Registry and Programme Support Office will normally be in attendance.
11. Potential outcomes following interview:
- Academic misconduct is not determined (not upheld). There is insufficient evidence to justify a finding of academic misconduct, and no further action is required. Student may be signposted to appropriate learning modules and/or academic skills resources, where relevant. No right of appeal.
 - **Minor** academic misconduct is determined (upheld) on the 'balance of probabilities', with an appropriate penalty applied in accordance with the table in Section 14.12.1(a). The student may be required to undertake an Academic Integrity Tutorial and will also be signposted to appropriate learning modules and/or academic skills resources, where relevant. The student has a right of appeal.
 - **Moderate** academic misconduct is determined (upheld) on the 'balance of probabilities', with an appropriate penalty applied in accordance with the table in Section 14.12.1(b). The student may be required to undertake an Academic Integrity Tutorial. The student will also be signposted to appropriate learning modules and/or academic skills resources, where relevant. Student has a right of appeal.

Penalties **will not apply to the resit period**. If academic misconduct is determined (upheld) during the resit period, the assessment will normally be marked as failed. No further resit opportunity will be granted in line with Section 6 of the Student Regulations Framework.

12. On the basis of the information gained at interview, the Academic Director (or nominee) may also refer the matter to Stage Two if they now consider that the potential severity of an offence of academic misconduct identified at Stage One would justify suspension from the University, the cancellation of credit

(covering one or more modules affected by gross academic misconduct) or expulsion.

13. The **written decision** should normally be issued to the student within five working days of the interview. It should set out clearly the decision reached, any penalty applied, and the reason(s) for both.

If academic misconduct is determined (upheld), the written decision will inform the student that the outcome will be recorded on their student record and may be considered if there are any future concerns relating to academic misconduct or fitness to practise (where applicable to a professional programme). The written decision will also advise the student of their right to appeal.

A right of appeal arises only where a determination has been made that the student has committed academic misconduct. In such cases, the student may appeal against the decision and/or the penalty imposed, in accordance with Section 14.13 of these procedures.

A copy of the written decision should be provided to relevant staff, including relevant academic staff, the Registry and Programme Support Office and the Quality and Academic Standards Unit, to ensure that a central record is maintained. Where academic misconduct is established, the Registry and Programme Support Office will record the outcome on the student record.

14.11 Stage Two procedures: Alleged Serious Instances of Academic Misconduct

1. Stage Two procedures will apply where the alleged academic misconduct represents a **serious offence**, as normally categorised in the table in Section 14.12.1(c), although this categorisation is not exhaustive. Stage Two may also apply where the severity of an offence identified at Stage One is such that it may justify **suspension** from the University or one of its delivery partner organisations (where applicable), the **cancellation of credit** (covering one or more modules affected by gross academic misconduct) or **expulsion**. The

Academic Director (or nominee), or a senior equivalent member of staff within a delivery partner organisation (where applicable), will provide a written rationale for recommending a formal hearing at Stage Two of the Procedures to the Academic Registrar.

2. In all cases the rationale must state the name(s) of the student(s) against whom the allegation/s is/are made and the nature of the alleged academic misconduct, with a brief description and all available evidence. It should also include the names of any witnesses who may be able to support the allegation/s and the name and role of the person signing the report.
3. The Academic Registrar will instruct the Academic Standards Officer (or nominee) to convene an Academic Misconduct Panel. This Panel shall comprise:
 - An appropriately qualified and experienced senior member of academic staff (typically a Dean), from the roster of Student Casework practitioners approved by the Academic Registrar, who has no involvement with the student (to act as the Chair)
 - An appropriately qualified and experienced senior member of academic staff, from the roster of Student Casework practitioners approved by the Academic Registrar, who has had no involvement with the student
 - A member of the Executive Committee of the Student Union, normally the President or Deputy President, who has had no involvement with the student

The Academic Standards Officer or nominee will act as Secretary to the Panel and proceedings may also be recorded, either electronically or by a minute taker, by mutual agreement. The Panel will not meet unless all members and the Secretary are present. The Academic Standards Officer or nominee will endeavour to ensure that the Panel includes at least one male and one female member.

4. Before a Panel meeting is convened, the Chair will review the available evidence and request any additional evidence that they consider to be appropriate via the Academic Standards Officer or nominee. This will also be circulated to all parties involved within the applicable timeframes.
5. The Chair may, where they deem necessary, consult relevant staff or students ahead of the Panel meeting. Only information strictly necessary for the purpose of the consultation will be shared.

A written record of any such consultation must be made and included in the case documentation. This record must be provided to the student facing the allegation(s) within the applicable timeframes. (see Section 14.11.9).

Individuals consulted must be informed in advance of how any information they provide may be used and shared.

6. The student shall be informed of the date, time and location of the meeting of the Panel not less than ten working days in advance. They will also be provided with a copy of these procedures, information about available support services (including Student Wellbeing and Support and Marjon Student Union), advice regarding their right to call witnesses and to be joined by an accompanying person. This deadline can only be reduced with the student's written consent. They will be invited to appear in person but, in exceptional circumstances, the hearing may take place at the discretion of the Chair, advised by the Academic Registrar, in their absence or may be conducted virtually in whole or in part.

The invitation letter will also explain that if academic misconduct is determined on the balance of probabilities, this will be recorded on the student record and may be taken into account if similar concerns arise in the future.

7. A Panel can be scheduled at any time in the calendar year; however, reasonable steps will be taken to schedule this at a point in the year when the student would normally be present in the University.
8. The student may be joined by an accompanying person, who is permitted to attend to provide advice and support to the student, as set out in Section

14.3.3. The name and status of any accompanying person must normally be notified to the Academic Standards Officer or nominee no less than five working days in advance of the hearing. The student may also choose to call witnesses in their defence, including employees of the University where appropriate.

9. The Academic Standards Officer or nominee shall normally circulate the list of witnesses to be called, and all relevant documentation, to all parties not less than five working days before the meeting. Where this is not possible, the Academic Standards Office or nominee will advise the student who will have the right to request a postponement. Additional papers supplied by, or on behalf of, the student will be circulated thereafter with the proviso that, in exceptional circumstances, the Panel may decide to adjourn a hearing in order to secure a written response.
10. The refusal or failure of a student to attend will not invalidate the Panel's proceedings, provided that they have been given sufficient notice as set out above.
11. At the outset of the hearing the Chair of the Panel shall identify the issues to be determined, the persons entitled to attend the hearing, and the documents supplied to the Panel. They will also ask the student to confirm that they have understood the procedures and have no concerns regarding the procedure.
12. The author of the incident report, or a nominee, will then outline the case against the student. If a witness has been invited to attend, the Chair will then invite them to give evidence. When multiple witnesses are involved, they will normally be invited to attend the hearing in separate time slots. Members of the Panel may question witnesses directly. The student, or their accompanying person at the student's request, may question the author of the incident report (or nominee) and the witnesses through the Chair.
13. The Chair shall then invite the student to respond. The Chair and other members of the Panel may question the student on the statement and/or the documentary evidence. Witnesses may question the student through the Chair.

14. At the conclusion, the Chair shall offer the student the opportunity of making a closing statement (which should not introduce new evidence), once the witnesses have left, before the Panel considers its decision in private. In all cases, the student shall have a right to make a final statement to the Panel before it considers its decision, in which they are able to present any mitigating circumstances or factors that they believe should be taken into account (refer to Section 14.2.3). This can be made by the student's accompanying person at the student's request.
15. Potential outcomes following the hearing:
- Academic misconduct is not determined (not upheld). There is insufficient evidence to justify a finding of academic misconduct, and no further action is required. Student may be signposted to appropriate learning modules and/or academic skills resources, where relevant. No right of appeal.
 - **Minor** academic misconduct is determined (upheld) on the 'balance of probabilities', with an appropriate penalty applied in accordance with Section 14.12.1(a). The student may be required to undertake an Academic Integrity Tutorial and will also normally be signposted to appropriate learning modules and/or academic skills resources, where relevant. The student has a right of appeal.
 - **Moderate** academic misconduct is determined (upheld) on the 'balance of probabilities', with an appropriate penalty applied in accordance with Section 14.12.1(b). The student may be required to undertake an Academic Integrity Tutorial, and will also normally be signposted to appropriate learning modules and/or academic skills resources, where relevant. The student has a right of appeal.
 - **Serious** academic misconduct is determined (upheld) on the 'balance of probabilities', with an appropriate penalty applied in accordance with Section 14.12.1. In addition to the penalties available at Stage One (as set out in Sections 14.12.1(a) and (b)), the Panel may impose one or more of the penalties listed in Section 14.12.1(c), as below:

- suspension from the University, for a maximum period of one academic session. The student may be required to undertake an Academic Integrity Tutorial prior to their return to study, and will also normally be signposted to appropriate learning modules and/or academic skills resources, where relevant.
- the cancellation of credit (covering one or more modules) with or without the possibility to retake the modules for a capped or uncapped module mark as determined by the Panel. The student may be required to undertake an Academic Integrity Tutorial, and will also normally be signposted to appropriate learning.
- expulsion from the University (actual or suspended). If the penalty is suspended expulsion, the student may be required to undertake an Academic Integrity Tutorial and will also normally be signposted to appropriate learning.

The student has a right of appeal.

16. The resultant Stage Two decision letter will be drafted by the Academic Standards Officer or nominee for the approval of the Chair. It shall also constitute the official record of the hearing including, where this is applicable, the reasons for imposing a specific penalty or penalties and an explanation as to why a lesser penalty was unsuitable. If academic misconduct is determined (upheld), the written decision will inform the student that the outcome will be recorded on their student record and may be considered if there are any future concerns relating to academic misconduct or fitness to practise (where applicable to a professional programme). The written decision will also advise the student of their right to appeal.

A right of appeal arises only where a determination has been made that the student has committed academic misconduct. In such cases, the student may appeal against the decision and/or the penalty imposed, in accordance with Section 14.13 of these procedures.

Relevant staff will be notified of the decision, including the appropriate academic staff and the Registry and Programme Support Office for the central record. Where academic misconduct is established, the Registry and Programme Support Office will record the outcome on the student record.

17. The letter will normally be sent to the student within ten working days of the hearing and within forty working days of the commencement of the Academic Integrity Procedure. If this is not possible, exceptionally, the student will be kept informed. Where a decision has been taken to suspend or expel a student, it will take immediate effect.
18. The University may inform the Independent Safeguarding Agency or any other Professional, Statutory or Regulatory Body of the outcome of any Stage Two misconduct proceedings, where applicable. If it intends to do so, it will include notification of that decision within the decision letter.

14.12 Academic Misconduct Categories and Penalties

1. Table of Academic Misconduct Categories and Penalties

(a) Minor					
Category	Indicative nature of misconduct	Level	Penalty (first offence)	Penalty (subsequent offences)**	Potential Procedural Stage for Case Handling
Self-plagiarism	Student has submitted material already prepared for one assessment task for another task <i>(N.B. in some instances it may be appropriate to quote an excerpt from material already submitted for another assessment task, but student should seek advice of the Module Leader before doing so. Any such excerpt must be appropriately referenced).</i>	All	Formal Academic Integrity Warning (penalty) *Work is marked on its merits, discounting plagiarised sections	Resit new piece of assessment (i.e. new title) for a mark capped at the pass rate.	Programme-level Determination of first-time, minor academic misconduct (Foundation Year and Level 4 of a Three-Year programme, first offence only) Stage One
Plagiarism	Unreferenced, paraphrased or verbatim. Student has taken idea from a source and has paraphrased this, without acknowledging the original source or without sufficient attribution of ideas. This can	Foundation Year and Level 4 of a Three-Year Programme	Formal Academic Integrity Warning (penalty) *Work is marked on its merits, discounting plagiarised sections	Resit new piece of assessment (i.e. new title) for a mark capped at the pass rate.	Programme-level Determination of first-time, minor academic misconduct (Foundation Year and Level 4 of a Three-Year Programme, first offence only)

	include using 'word spinner' software tools.				Stage One
Unauthorised collusion	Students have worked together on an assessment and submit the shared work as if it were completed by one person (or a specified number of people), rather than by all those who contributed.	Foundation Year and Level 4 of a Three-Year Programme	Formal Academic Integrity Warning (penalty) *Work is marked on its merits, discounting highlighted sections	Resit new piece of assessment (i.e. new title) for a mark capped at the pass rate.	Programme-level Determination of first-time, minor academic misconduct (Foundation Year and Level 4 of a Three-Year Programme, first offence only) Stage One
Cheating in an examination	The removal of any material from the examination room other than items which were brought into the room by the candidate or the question paper, where permitted.	All	Formal Academic Integrity Warning (penalty). Exam is marked.	Resit new exam for a mark capped at the pass rate.	Programme-level Determination of first-time, minor academic misconduct (Foundation Year and Level 4 of a Three-Year Programme, first offence only) Stage One
(b) Moderate					
Category	Indicative nature of misconduct	Level	Penalty (first offence)	Penalty (subsequent offences)**	Potential Procedural Stage for Case Handling
Plagiarism	Unreferenced, paraphrased or verbatim. Student has taken idea from a source and has paraphrased this, without acknowledging the original source or without sufficient attribution of ideas. This can	Levels 5, 6 and 7	Resit new piece of assessment (i.e. new title) for a mark capped at the pass rate.	Resit new piece of assessment (i.e. new title). Module capped at pass mark.	Stage One

	include using 'word spinner' software tools.				
Unauthorised collusion	Students have worked together on an assessment and submit the shared work as if it were completed by one person (or a specified number of people), rather than by all those who contributed. Taking a copy of another student's work without their permission.	Levels 5, 6 and 7	Resit new piece of assessment (i.e. new title) for a mark capped at the pass rate.	Resit new piece of assessment (i.e. new title). Module capped at pass mark.	Stage One
Cheating in an examination	Obtaining or seeking to obtain examination papers prior to the examination, unless the paper has been provided as a 'seen' examination.	All	Resit new exam for a mark capped at the pass rate.	Any subsequent allegation would be treated as a Serious matter and considered at Stage Two.	Stage One
	Copying from another candidate or from any unauthorised material, including by use of an electrical device. Communicating or attempting to communicate with other candidates or with any person(s) except the invigilator, including by use of an electrical device.	Foundation Year and Level 4 of a Three-Year Programme	Resit new exam for a capped mark.	Any subsequent allegation would be treated as a Serious matter and considered at Stage Two.	Stage One

Cheating in an examination	Student brings books, notes or other material, equipment of value in answering examination questions, or any means of accessing information of value in answering questions, without explicit authorisation, but does not use them (including where such items are confiscated prior to the start of the examination).	All	Resit new exam for a mark capped at the pass rate.	Any subsequent allegation would be treated as a Serious matter and considered at Stage Two.	Stage One
Unauthorised Content Generation	Contract Cheating: Student's work has been produced in whole or part by another person and/or organisation on their behalf. Inappropriate Use of Artificial Intelligence: Student's work contains material generated using artificial intelligence tools that has been presented as the student's own work.	All	Resit new piece of assessment (i.e. new title) for a capped mark.	Resit new piece of assessment (i.e. new title). Module capped at pass mark.	Stage One

(c) Serious			
Category/indicative nature of misconduct <i>Serious offences may include, but are not limited to:</i>	Level	Penalty	Potential Procedural Stage for Case Handling
A first or subsequent case of: • Fabrication: ○ student has made up data or other such content, manipulated content and/or tampered with documentation to gain an unfair academic advantage. ○ student has falsely claimed to have conducted experiments, observations, interviews or any form of research which they have not carried out. • Impersonation – student has entered into an arrangement with another person to fraudulently represent them at an exam or test. The impersonator, if a student, will also be the subject of misconduct procedures. • Unethical conduct – student has failed to gain ethical approval where appropriate, coerced or bribed project participants and/or breached confidentiality regarding information on individuals gathered during data collection, or has otherwise breached ethical codes of	All	Where serious academic misconduct is determined (upheld), in addition to the minor and moderate penalties, the Stage Two Panel may impose one or more of the penalties listed below: • suspension from the University, for a maximum period of one academic session. • the cancellation of credit (covering one or more modules) with or without the possibility to retake the modules for a capped or uncapped module mark as determined by the Panel • expulsion from the University (actual or suspended).	Stage Two

practice applicable to their programme of study.			
Three or more cases of misconduct (any offence)	All		
- A first or subsequent case of cheating in an exam at Level 5 or above, as follows: - Copying from another candidate or from any unauthorised material, including by use of an electrical device. - Communicating or attempting to communicate with other candidates or with any person(s) except the invigilator, including by use of an electrical device.	Level 5, 6, 7		
- A second or subsequent case of cheating in an exam at Foundation Year or Level 4 of a Three-Year Programme as follows: - Copying from another candidate or from any unauthorised material, including by use of an electrical device. - Communicating or attempting to communicate with other candidates or with any person(s) except the invigilator, including by use of an electrical device.	Foundation Year and Level 4 of a Three-Year Programme		

• A second or subsequent case of cheating in an exam at any level as follows: - Obtaining or seeking to obtain examination papers prior to the examination, unless the paper has been provided as a 'seen' examination. - Student brings books, notes or other material, equipment of value in answering examination questions, or any means of accessing information of value in answering questions, without explicit authorisation, but does not use them (including where such items are confiscated prior to the start of the examination).	All		
--	-----	--	--

2. ***Mark on Merits:** Where it has been determined that plagiarism, self-plagiarism or unauthorised collusion has occurred in a student's assignment as a first offence, the marker should normally discount any plagiarised or otherwise highlighted text or sections, as appropriate, and award a mark based on the academic value of the work that remains. This shall not be regarded as a penalty. The mark awarded is the academic judgement of the marker. The student should be advised on how to improve their performance.
3. Where a **formal academic integrity warning** has been applied as a penalty under Section 14.9 (Programme-level Determination stage) of these procedures, this reflects a **first-time minor offence** and that matters were resolved without formal investigation, by agreement.
4. In all cases where academic misconduct is determined (upheld), students may be **required to undertake an Academic Integrity Tutorial**.
5. ****In the context of this procedure, and in relation to any penalty imposed, subsequent offences are offences that do not occur in the same assessment period** (for example, Semester or Term). Where a student has two or more allegations in the same assessment period, these will be considered concurrently (where possible).
6. ****The penalties indicated for subsequent offences** in the penalties table (Section 14.12.1) refer to what would be typical for a second offence. If a student has had **three or more** cases of misconduct, it is considered that the case would normally be handled at Stage Two of these procedures depending on the severity of the suspected academic misconduct. Such cases would normally be regarded as serious.
7. ****Subsequent offences** can occur at any level i.e., if a student has one offence at Level 5, then commits an offence in Level 6, the Level 6 case would be a subsequent offence.
8. ****A subsequent offence** is any further finding of academic misconduct, regardless of the nature/type of academic misconduct involved.

9. The Academic Director (or nominee) at Stage One or the Panel at Stage Two will normally recommend the standard penalties as per the above table (Section 14.12.1). However, each case must be considered on its merits, and the penalty may be varied in such circumstances where the suggested penalty is deemed to be too lenient or too harsh to ensure that the outcome is not disproportionate to the offence. **However, a serious penalty (as per Section 14.12.1[c]) may not be applied at Stage One of these procedures.**
10. Mitigating factors will **not normally be relevant to whether a student has committed academic misconduct** but may be taken into account when deciding on the penalty if academic misconduct is upheld (refer to Section 14.2.3).
11. There may be occasions when particular factors mean that a case should be handled at a subsequent stage (i.e. Stage Two rather than Stage One). The level of consideration and finding of academic misconduct is ultimately a matter of academic judgement.
12. All proven cases of academic misconduct where the penalty requires submission of a new piece of assessment shall be considered as failure of the module. Students will normally be required to submit a new piece of work at the normal time for resit work, subject to the requirements for Retrieval of Failure set out in Sections 6.5.1 and 6.6.1 of the Student Regulations Framework. Resubmission will normally involve a new assessment task (e.g. new essay title) in line with Section 6.3 of this framework (Retrieval of Failure – Resit and Deferral). However, in the case of an honours project or a reflective piece of assessment, students may be allowed to revise and resubmit their original work.
13. Once a penalty has been applied, the normal academic regulations will apply. For example, where a student receives a Formal Academic Integrity Warning and their work is marked on its academic merits, excluding any highlighted sections, the work may still be deemed a fail. If this was the student's first

attempt, they would remain entitled to a resit, which would be capped at the pass mark.

14. If academic misconduct is established **during the resit period**, the assessment will be marked as failed. No further resit opportunity will be granted in line with Section 6 of this Framework.

14.13 Right of Appeal

1. Where, under these procedures, it is determined that a student has committed academic misconduct, the student has the right to appeal against the decision and/or any penalty imposed, on one or more of the following grounds:
 - That the procedures were not followed properly
 - That the decision maker(s) reached an unreasonable decision
 - That the student has new material evidence that they were unable, for valid reasons, to provide earlier in the process
 - That there is bias or reasonable perception of bias during the procedure
 - That the penalty imposed was disproportionate, or not permitted under the procedures

Any such appeal must be submitted in writing to the Academic Standards Officer or nominee, within ten working days of the date of the letter communicating the decision.

2. The Academic Standards Officer or nominee will refer the appeal to an appropriately qualified and experienced senior member of academic staff - from the roster of Student Casework practitioners approved by the Academic Registrar - and who has had no previous involvement with the student, for their consideration. The appeal stage will normally be concluded within fifteen working days of the receipt of the appeal. If a delay is envisaged, the

appellant will be notified in writing before the end of the fifteen working day period.

3. If valid grounds to proceed with the appeal are not found, the University's Academic Integrity Procedure will have been exhausted, and the Academic Standards Officer or nominee will advise the student accordingly.
4. If valid grounds for doing so are identified, the Academic Standards Officer or nominee will reconvene the original decision-making body with new membership of a similar status (except where an appeal is submitted against the decision and/or penalty imposed at the Programme-Level Determination Stage; see Section 14.13.6). This will always lead to an additional interview or hearing, under the procedures appropriate to the relevant Stage, which will not involve the participation of anyone involved in the original decision. In all such cases, the appeal process may lead to the confirmation, reduction or quashing of the penalty originally imposed, but not to an increased penalty. This re-hearing will be final and there will be no further right of appeal thereafter.
5. The student will be notified in writing of the decision, normally within five working days of the interview or hearing, in accordance with the procedures appropriate at the relevant stage. The decision letter will confirm that the University's Academic Integrity Procedure has been exhausted.
6. **Appeals Relating to Programme-Level Determination of First-Time Minor Academic Misconduct (Foundation Year and Level 4 of a three-year-programme) Stage:**

Where a student subsequently submits an appeal following the Programme-Level Determination stage (Section 14.9 of these procedures), and valid grounds are identified, the case will normally progress to Stage One (Section 14.10) of the formal procedures, and the student will be invited to attend an interview. The interview will not involve any individual who participated in the original decision-making process.

In all such cases, the appeal outcome may result in the confirmation, reduction, or quashing of the original penalty, but will not result in an increased penalty. The outcome of the appeal will be final and there will be no further right of appeal.

The student will be notified in writing of the decision, normally within five working days of the hearing, in accordance with the procedures appropriate at the relevant stage. The decision letter will confirm that the University's Academic Integrity Procedure has been exhausted.

14.14 Office of the Independent Adjudicator for Higher Education

1. If a student remains dissatisfied after the appropriate internal processes have been exhausted, they can ask the Office of the Independent Adjudicator for Higher Education (OIA) to review their case. For full details please contact <http://www.oiahe.org.uk>.
2. The University must issue a Completion of Procedures letter in order for the OIA to review a case of academic misconduct. A Completion of Procedures letter will be issued automatically where valid grounds for re-hearing the case are not found at the review stage and otherwise on request. However, where a Completion of Procedures letter is issued before the review stage has been conducted, the letter will make it clear that the student has not completed the University's internal processes. All requests for review must be made to the OIA within twelve months of the date of issue of a Completion of Procedures letter.

14.15 Annual Report

Each year, the Academic Standards Officer or nominee submits a report on student casework to Senate, detailing (anonymously) general matters or

issues arising from recent academic misconduct cases. Additional reports are also submitted to the Finance and Resources Committee of the Board of Governors on a regular basis. Senate will forward recommendations to other relevant University committees so that broad concerns can be shared, and appropriate action taken.

14.16 Procedures at Partner Organisations

1. In accordance with the expectations set out in the UK Quality Code For Higher Education and the University's Collaborative Provision Regulations and Procedures, all students registered for the University's awards have the ultimate right to complain to the University, irrespective of where they are studying. This right of complaint, however, is not absolute and is subject to the precise wording of the partnership agreement.
2. The partner organisation, accordingly, should ensure that clear information and guidance with regard to academic misconduct is made available to all students registered for the University's awards. This should include clear information about the sequence of processes involved and make clear the channels through which dissatisfied students can contact the University directly.
3. Once the internal procedures of the partner organisation have been fully exhausted, students who wish to take their case to the University for review should ask the Academic Standards Officer in writing if they are eligible to do so. Students may request a review of the decision on the following grounds only:
 - That the procedures were not followed properly
 - That the decision maker(s) reached an unreasonable decision
 - That the student has new material evidence that they were unable, for valid reasons, to provide earlier in the process

- That there is bias or reasonable perception of bias during the procedure
 - That the penalty imposed was disproportionate, or not permitted under the procedures
4. If a case is eligible for review, the Academic Standards Officer will refer the challenge to an appropriately qualified and experienced senior member of academic staff, from the roster of Student Casework practitioners approved by the Academic Registrar, who has no involvement with the partnership. If the challenge is upheld, the case will be referred back to the partner organisation to be reheard under its own procedures. Otherwise, the University will not refer the case back to the partner organisation to be reheard and the Academic Standards Officer will advise the student accordingly. This will include advice with regard to a student's further right of appeal to the Office of the Independent Adjudicator (OIA).
 5. If, at Stage One of a partner's procedure, the Academic Director (or nominee), or senior equivalent within the partner organisation considers that the potential severity of an identified academic misconduct offence would warrant **suspension** from the partner organisation, the **cancellation of credit** (covering one or more modules affected by gross academic misconduct) or **expulsion**, the partner organisation shall refer the matter to **Stage Two** of this procedure (on the prior advice of the University's Academic Standards Officer if appropriate), **for the Stage Two process to be handled directly by the University.**

A written rationale supporting the recommendation for a Stage Two formal hearing, submitted as an incident report for the attention of the Academic Registrar, must accompany the partner organisation's referral. This must state the name(s) of the student(s) against whom the allegation/s is/are made and the nature of the alleged academic misconduct, with a brief description of it and all available evidence. It should also include the names of any witnesses who can support the allegation/s and the name and role of the person signing the report.

Document Title	Plymouth Marjon University Student Regulations Framework – Section 14 Academic Integrity Procedure
Document Reference	L:\Student Regulations Framework\Student Regulations Framework 2026-27
Version	1.16
Issuing Authority	Senate
Custodian	Academic Standards Officer
Document Date	15th September 2016
Last Amended	25th August 2026
Sensitivity	Unclassified
Circulation	Website
Effective from	September 2026
Review Date	Ongoing
Effective until	September 2027
History	Updated annually and subject to routine ongoing revision, informed by the Good Practice Framework. Significant revision for 2026-27, including: • Introduction of staged penalties; • Introduction of <i>Poor Academic Practice Stage</i>, and a <i>Programme Level Determination of First-Time Minor Academic Misconduct (Foundation Year and Level 4 of a three-year-programme) Stage</i>;

- Additional clarification regarding Mitigating Factors; Rights of Students and Support; Acceptable Behaviour; Confidentiality and Disclosure; Initial Considerations and Preliminary Investigation;
- Formal investigation stages are set out in Stage One and Two of the procedure;
- If, at Stage One, the Academic Director (or nominee), or senior equivalent within a **partner organisation**, considers that an academic misconduct offence may warrant suspension, cancellation of credit for one or more affected modules, or expulsion, the case should be referred to Stage Two of this procedure, with the Stage Two process managed directly by the University; and
- Clarification of the indicative types of misconduct that may warrant progression to a Stage Two Panel as potential serious academic misconduct, while recognising that this is not an exhaustive list.

Equality Impact Assessment Updated Equality Analysis Form to be submitted.