

Academic Integrity and Academic Misconduct

UPR AS14 Appendix III - version 20.0

Policies superseded by this document

This document replaces version 19.0 of Appendix III, UPR AS14, with effect from 1 September 2026.

Summary of significant changes to the previous version

None. Changes to version 20.0 relate to UPR AS14, Apx 4 and Apx 5 only.

Glossary

A glossary of approved University terminology can be found in [UPR GV08](#).

For the purpose of this document, 'you/my' means 'the student/the student's'.

Table of contents

1	What is Academic Integrity?	2
2	What is Academic Misconduct?	3
2.2	Plagiarism	3
2.3	Self-Plagiarism/ duplicate submission	4
2.5	Collusion	4
2.6	Contract Cheating	4
2.7	Misappropriation of material submitted for assessment.....	4
2.8	Fabrication or Falsification of Data	4
2.9	Fake referencing	5
2.10	Making your work available for others to copy.....	5
2.11	Examination Misconduct	5
2.11.3	Use of unauthorised materials	5
2.11.4	Unauthorised use of examination materials	5
2.11.5	Use of technology in an examination	5
2.11.6	Copying	6
2.11.7	Communicating.....	6
2.11.8	Failure to comply with the instructions of an invigilator	6
2.11.9	Misuse of temporary absence	6
2.11.10	Disruptive behaviour	6
2.12	Ethics Misconduct	6
2.13	Breach of Professional Confidentiality	7
2.14	False Declarations	7
2.15	Impersonation	7

2.16	Bribery and / or intimidation in relation to assessment.....	7
2.17	Other conduct which constitutes cheating	7
3	Is it academic misconduct to ask another person to proof-read or check my work?..	7
4	How is academic misconduct proved?.....	8
5	What is the role of academic judgement in deciding whether academic misconduct has occurred?	9
6	The investigation of alleged academic misconduct.....	9
6.1	Who is responsible for investigating academic misconduct in your School?	9
6.2	What should a member of the University's staff do if they suspect that a student has committed an academic misconduct offence?	10
6.3	How will alleged academic misconduct be investigated?.....	10
6.4	What factors will be considered in deciding whether the academic misconduct should be dealt with at Stage 1, Stage 2 of Stage 3	10
6.5	Support for students with a health or disability related issue in relation to academic misconduct proceedings	11
7	Stage 1 investigation	11
7.9	Outcomes following academic misconduct under Stage 1.....	12
7.10	Appeals following a Stage 1 investigation	13
8	Stage 2 proceedings	13
8.12	Indicative penalties following Stage 2 proceedings.....	15
9	Stage 3 proceedings	17
9.5	Indicative penalties following a Stage 3 proceedings.....	18

1 What is Academic Integrity?

- 1.1 The University has a duty to maintain the standards of its awards and, in discharging this duty, it requires students to demonstrate academic integrity in all aspects of the assessment process. Academic Integrity involves:
- i producing work that is your own and keeping track of where you find ideas and information;
 - ii properly acknowledging the work of others and, where expressly permitted, properly acknowledging the use of artificial intelligence generated material. You should acknowledge all sources of information drawn upon in your own academic work according to the permission, citation and referencing practices of the discipline within which you are working;
 - iii ensuring that each student's contribution to group work is represented honestly;
 - iv encouraging others to behave with academic integrity;
 - v complying with your assessment instructions;
 - vi collaborating with others when appropriate but always producing your own work independently when required;

- vii following any relevant ethical requirements;
 - viii avoiding actions which would give you an unfair advantage over others; or
 - ix ensuring that you represent honestly the results of research or experimental data.
 - x never obtaining unauthorised external assistance in the creation of academic work
 - xi declaring when you have used academic work that you have previously submitted in another academic context and using it only with appropriate acknowledgment.
- 1.2 If your work lacks academic integrity, you may be guilty of academic misconduct.

2 What is Academic Misconduct?

- 2.1 ***Academic misconduct is any action which gains, attempts to gain, or assists others in gaining or attempting to gain unfair academic advantage.*** Whilst the University has attempted to present as comprehensive a list as possible, the list of academic misconduct offences set down below is not exhaustive.

2.2 Plagiarism

- 2.2.1 Plagiarism is presenting another person's work as your own work (whether deliberately or unintentionally) without acknowledging the source fully. To avoid plagiarism, you must always include referencing and citations for all the material you used in producing your assessment.
- 2.2.2 Plagiarism includes copying or paraphrasing work or ideas from any published or unpublished source (whether, for example, a textbook, journal, newspaper, the internet or other electronic media, lecture slides, hand-outs, or a fellow student's work) and presenting this for assessment without full acknowledgement of the source. Full acknowledgement means indicating clearly exactly which words and ideas have been copied or used, and where these words and ideas have come from.
- 2.2.3 Plagiarism applies not only to text, but to other media such as graphics, tables, formulae and computer code. For example, plagiarism will occur if you:
- copy word for word from sources (i.e. copy & paste);
 - use quotes without the use of quotation marks;
 - copy a sentence or paragraph into your assignment and change a few words or phrases to ones of similar meaning;
 - use software to change words or phrases in an attempt to avoid plagiarism;
 - use ideas (including structure and presentation) contained in another person's text without acknowledgement;
 - use images produced by another person or based substantially on the work of another person without acknowledgement; or
 - translate a source from another language and present it as your own original work.

2.3 Self-Plagiarism/ duplicate submission

Self-plagiarism (or duplicate or double submission) occurs when you submit the same piece of work, or a substantial part of it, for assessment on more than one occasion. This includes any submissions that you may have made at a previous institution. Self-plagiarism may include the re-use of text, research data, etc. This will be treated in the same way as other forms of plagiarism unless the original piece of work is referenced appropriately. Self-plagiarism will not normally include work submitted for reassessment/re-take within the same module or linked assignments where work submitted later forms part of a final project /dissertation.

- 2.4 Unauthorised use of artificially generated material (AI) in researching or presenting material for an assessment** is an academic misconduct offence if you use AI tools in producing your assessment unless the use of AI tools is expressly permitted. However, even if expressly permitted, where you do not declare that you have used an artificial intelligence tool(s) in the production of your assessment, or you are dishonest about the extent to which such tools have been used, you will have committed academic misconduct.

The extent to which assessment content is considered to be AI generated is a matter of academic judgement.

2.5 Collusion

Collusion occurs if you submit a piece of work done in collaboration with another student undertaking the same assessment as if the work was entirely your own. It is important to understand that if you willingly or carelessly make your work available to another student(s) in circumstances where they could submit your work as their own, both (or all) parties are guilty of collusion regardless of intention.

2.6 Contract Cheating

Contract cheating occurs when you arrange for help with an assessment such that there is reasonable doubt as to whose work the assessment represents, or you arrange for the assessment to be completed entirely by someone else and, in either case, then pass the work off as your own. Whilst contract cheating might involve buying either the whole or part of an assessment from, for example, a 'cheat site' such as an essay mill or auction site (e.g. the assignment is uploaded to a specialist website and people are asked to bid to write the assignment for you), it extends to input from a fellow student, friend, relative, or any other person, with or without payment of any kind.

2.7 Misappropriation of material submitted for assessment

If you access a fellow student's work to help you in writing up your assessment and, without their knowledge or permission then copy it or otherwise use it, you have misappropriated their material and have committed academic misconduct. This is also plagiarism.

2.8 Fabrication or Falsification of Data

Fabrication or falsification of data occurs if you make up (or manipulate) data or results and record or report on them in an assessment. It also includes claiming to have carried out experiments, observations, interviews or any form of research and/or data collection which you have not done or altering the results obtained.

2.9 Fake referencing

Fake referencing includes supplying fabricated citations. This offence includes AI generated fake references, whether or not you were aware that the references were fake.

2.10 Making your work available for others to copy

It is a form of academic misconduct for you to make your work available by posting it on the internet or making it available by other similar means, regardless of whether you receive a financial reward for making your work available. Making your work available includes leaving the work on your laptop or other device unattended in the Learning Resources Centre enabling another to copy the work.

2.11 Examination Misconduct

2.11.1 Examination includes in-class tests, written, oral and practical examinations, whether conducted face-to-face or online.

2.11.2 The following list of academic misconduct offences relating to examinations is not exhaustive.

2.11.3 Use of unauthorised materials

Use of unauthorised materials occurs if you bring into the examination room (or any other room in which a formal assessment is taking place) unauthorised aids including books, papers, notes, stationery or unauthorised material stored in the memory of, or accessible via, an electronic device regardless of whether you attempt to use these materials. Unauthorised material also includes writing on your hands, body, clothing, or on equipment such as calculators, water bottles and pens.

2.11.4 Unauthorised use of examination materials

Unauthorised use of examination materials occurs if you obtain or see, or attempt to obtain or see, a copy of an examination question paper or other form of assessment before the date and time of its authorised release (this covers both 'seen' and 'unseen' papers).

Unauthorised use of examination materials also occurs if you remove an examination script or examination stationery or other materials from the examination room (or any other room in which a formal assessment is taking place) unless specifically authorised by an invigilator or examiner.

2.11.5 Use of technology in an examination

You must not be in possession of technological or electronic devices such as mobile phones, smart watches and hidden earpieces/micro earbuds/mini cameras, regardless of whether there is evidence that such devices are switched on or used.

You must not be in possession of any calculator other than a UH approved calculator.

2.11.6 Copying

You must not copy from, or try to copy from, another examining student whether by looking over what the student has written or is writing or by asking the student for information in any form.

2.11.7 Communicating

You must not communicate with, or attempt to communicate with, any person other than an invigilator during an examination, regardless of whether such communication is verbal or non-verbal.

2.11.8 Failure to comply with the instructions of an invigilator

You must stop writing when instructed.

You must not continue to perform whatever task is being examined beyond the time allocated by the invigilator.

2.11.9 Misuse of temporary absence

Misuse of temporary absence occurs if you request temporary absence from an examination room (or other room in which a formal assessment is taking place) and thereby gain or attempt to gain access to information that may be relevant to the formal assessment.

2.11.10 Disruptive behaviour

Disruptive behaviour is behaviour that is considered to interfere with the running of an assessment to the detriment of another or other students or the invigilator.

2.12 Ethics Misconduct

Ethics misconduct occurs if you:

- i fail to comply with the University's ethics procedures;
- ii fail to obtain ethics approval prior to undertaking work involving human and animal participants (see UPR RE01¹);
- iii fail to comply with the terms and conditions of ethical approval that has been given for work involving human participants (see UPR RE01¹);
- iv fail to take appropriate risk assessments that lead to research being conducted in a way that threatens personal safety or the safety of others involved in the research or threatens national or international security;
- v provide false documentation including false participant consent forms;
- vi use data for research other than that for which consent has been given;
- vii misrepresent participants' views; or
- viii fail to seek advice from, or fail to comply with advice given by, the University's Animal Welfare and Ethical Review Body (AWERB) for work involving animals.

¹ UPR RE01 'Studies involving human participants'

2.13 Breach of Professional Confidentiality

Breach of confidentiality includes actions such as:

- i releasing a business client's commercial secrets or intellectual property;
- ii disclosing a patient's / service user's name in an assessment submission or disclosing details that would enable a patient or other service user to be identified; or
- ii disclosing participant names for a survey or focus group, when participants have been told that their responses will be anonymised. This is also ethics misconduct (see section 2.11).

2.14 False Declarations

False declarations involve making up evidence in support of a coursework extension, a Exceptional Circumstances claim or an Appeal. This includes for example, forging a signature on a medical certificate or a death certificate or altering the content of the certificate.

2.15 Impersonation

2.15.1 Impersonation involves:

- i getting, or attempting to get, someone else to take your assessment for you (online or in person); or
- ii taking, or attempting to take, an assessment for another student (online or in person).

2.15. The University may report this type of academic misconduct to the Police: impersonation is a type of fraud.

2.16 Bribery and / or intimidation in relation to assessment

Bribery or intimidation occur if you:

- i ask another student to complete your assessment in return for payment;
- ii force another student against their will to hand over their work for you to use in preparing your own assessment; or
- iii bribe or attempt to bribe an invigilator or examiner.

2.17 Other conduct which constitutes cheating

Cheating includes any other conduct not included in sections 2.2 to 2.15 where a student gains or attempts to gain an unfair, improper or dishonest advantage in the assessment process.

3 Is it academic misconduct to ask another person to proof-read or check my work?

3.1 The University expects that any piece of work submitted for assessment is the student's own work. Any use of a proof-reader (e.g. parent, friend etc) or proof-reading, translation or editing service must not affect how much of the work is your own.

- 3.2 Where you choose to ask another person to proof-read or check your work you must do so within the following rules:
- i you should declare that a proof-reader has been used on submission of your work, whether this is a person or through using an artificial intelligence tool;
 - ii where a proof-reader or proof-reading service is used, they may:
 - identify spelling and typographical errors;
 - identify poor grammar;
 - highlight formatting errors or inconsistencies;
 - identify errors in labelling of diagrams, charts or figures;
 - identify areas for possible improvement;
 - highlight a sentence or paragraph where the meaning is not clear; or
 - draw attention to repeated phrases or omitted words.
 - iii where a proof-reader or proof-reading service is used the proof-reader must not:
 - rewrite passages of text to clarify the meaning;
 - directly adjust or manipulate your work;
 - change any words or figures, except to correct spelling;
 - rewrite calculations, formulae, equations or computer code;
 - re-arrange or re-format content;
 - contribute any additional material to the original;
 - re-label diagrams, charts or figures;
 - implement or alter a referencing system or add to references; or
 - re-arrange or re-order sentences to improve the structure or argument.
 - iv proof-readers should not make any changes but merely identify, highlight or draw attention to changes to improve the quality of the work.
- 3.3 For some assessments and in some disciplines more generally, it may not be acceptable for any proof-reading by a third party to take place e.g. where use of English language, including correct grammar, is part of the assessment criteria. Where this is the case, you will be informed in advance of undertaking the assessment.

4 How is academic misconduct proved?

- 4.1 If disciplinary action is to be taken for academic misconduct (Stage 2 (see section 8) and Stage 3 (see section 9)), the burden of proving academic misconduct lies with the University. However, the standard of proof required is that of a balance of probabilities. A balance of probabilities means that it is more likely than not that academic misconduct has occurred.
- 4.2 Whilst exceptional circumstances may be relevant to the penalty applied for academic misconduct, exceptional circumstances cannot be a factor in deciding whether or not academic misconduct has occurred.

5 What is the role of academic judgement in deciding whether academic misconduct has occurred?

- 5.1 Academic judgment is the decision made by academic staff on the quality of the work itself or the criteria being applied. It is based on the scholarly and/or professional knowledge and expertise which academic staff and external examiners draw upon in reaching academic decisions about assessment.
- 5.2 Identifying suspected academic misconduct will often, but not always, involve academic judgment. Examples of academic judgment include:
- interpreting text matching software reports, such as Turnitin;
 - deciding whether the student's words or ideas represent common usage in the subject area;
 - deciding the extent of the plagiarism or other academic misconduct;
 - deciding whether the standard of work is so out of line with the student's other assessments that this suggests academic misconduct on the part of the student; or
 - deciding whether the student's notes and drafts support a case that the submitted work was produced by them.
- 5.3 Academic judgement will not apply to the process of working out what has actually taken place (i.e. question of fact). Examples of questions of fact include:
- whether a student's parent wrote the work for them;
 - whether student X has the identical text in their assessment because they colluded with student Y;
 - whether a student paid a student from the year above to do the work for them; or
 - whether there was intention to commit an academic misconduct offence.

6 The investigation of alleged academic misconduct

6.1 Who is responsible for investigating academic misconduct in your School?

- 6.1.1 Except where the alleged academic misconduct is a breach of ethics protocols (see sections 2.11, ii and iii, and UPR RE01¹), the Associate Dean of School (Academic Quality Assurance) is responsible for investigating academic misconduct within the School. The Associate Dean of School (Academic Quality Assurance) may delegate any investigation into academic misconduct to a School Academic Integrity Officer (SAIO).
- 6.1.2 Where the alleged academic misconduct is a breach of ethics protocols (see sections 2.11, ii and iii, and UPR RE01¹), the investigation into the academic misconduct is the responsibility of the Chair of the relevant Ethics Committee with Delegated Authority (ECDA) who may delegate the investigation to the Deputy Chair.

6.2 What should a member of the University's staff do if they suspect that a student has committed an academic misconduct offence?

- 6.2.1 The member of staff must report the matter to the Associate Dean of School (Academic Quality Assurance) or to the SAIO who has been appointed to investigate instances of academic misconduct on their module / programme.
- 6.2.1 All allegations of academic misconduct as defined in section 2 must be detailed in writing to the Associate Dean of School (Academic Quality Assurance) or SAIO and must, where required by the Associate Dean of School (Academic Quality Assurance) or SAIO, be accompanied by appropriate documentary evidence to support the allegation. In the case of a suspected breach of ethics protocol (see sections 2.11, ii and iii, and UPR RE01¹), the Associate Dean of School (Academic Quality Assurance) or SAIO must refer the matter to the Chair or Deputy Chair of the relevant ECDA for investigation.

6.3 How will alleged academic misconduct be investigated?

- 6.3.1 The Associate Dean of School (Academic Quality Assurance) or SAIO will carry out a preliminary investigation and decide whether no further action should be taken or whether the alleged academic misconduct will be dealt with at Stage 1 (see section 7), Stage 2 (see section 8) or Stage 3 (see section 9).
- 6.3.2 Where the alleged academic misconduct is a breach of ethics protocols (see sections 2.11, ii and iii, and UPR RE01¹), the Chair or Deputy Chair of the relevant ECDA decide whether no further action should be taken or whether the alleged misconduct will be dealt with under Stage 1 (see section 7), Stage 2 (see section 8) or Stage 3 (see section 9).
- 6.3.3 Where self-plagiarism, plagiarism or collusion occur in a formative assessment no disciplinary action will normally be taken against you but you are advised to seek support from your module tutor or personal tutor or equivalent.

6.4 What factors will be considered in deciding whether the academic misconduct should be dealt with at Stage 1, Stage 2 or Stage 3

The following factors will be considered by the Associate Dean of School (Academic Quality Assurance) or SAIO or, where the alleged academic misconduct is a breach of ethics protocols (see sections 2.11, ii and iii, and UPR RE01¹), by the Chair or Deputy Chair of the relevant ECDA:

- whether the student has committed an academic misconduct offence before;
- whether attempts at paraphrasing have been made;
- the extent to which you have engaged or not engaged with support for academic integrity;
- whether attempts at referencing technique have made (e.g. incorrect citation);
- how far the student is into their academic journey at the University;
- the level at which the student is studying;
- whether the assessment brief/assessment guidance was clear;
- the extent of the misconduct demonstrated by the student;
- conventions of the discipline or subject area;
- whether there is evidence that the student intended to commit an academic misconduct offence;
- whether the academic misconduct is identified across more than one module;

- whether the student had personal circumstances which affected their decision-making at the time;
- in the case of a student enrolled on a programme which leads to eligibility for professional registration and/or licence to practise, or where the programme requires the student to be registered with a professional body, whether the alleged academic misconduct raises questions of honesty and integrity which may call into question the student's fitness to practise.

6.5 Support for students with a health or disability related issue in relation to academic misconduct proceedings

- 6.5.1 If you have a declared health or disability-related issue, the University will make reasonable adjustments in respect of all academic misconduct proceedings, for example in preparation for attendance at meetings associated with the proceedings and with respect to the management of any action plan or penalty following proceedings.
- 6.5.2 Guidance should be sought by staff and students from the relevant Disability Advisor or Mental Wellbeing Advisor or from the Equality Office, and as appropriate, about further support during student academic misconduct proceedings.

7 Stage 1 investigation

- 7.1 Stage 1 is not in itself a disciplinary process, although, following a Stage 1 investigation, the matter may be referred to disciplinary proceedings at Stage 2 (see section 8) or Stage 3 (see section 9) or to proceedings under UPR SA15 'Student Fitness to Practise'. The administration of the Stage 1 process sits within the School.
- 7.2 A Stage 1 academic penalty may only be imposed:
- i after discussion with, and agreement from, the Associate Dean of School (Academic Quality Assurance) or SAIO (or the Chair or Deputy Chair of the relevant ECDA where the ethics misconduct (see sections 2.11, ii and iii, and UPR RE01¹) appears to be a technical breach); and
 - ii where the academic misconduct offence appears to be:
 - a a technical breach of ethics protocols (see sections 2.11, ii and iii, and UPR RE01¹); or
 - b self-plagiarism (see section 2.3); or
 - c plagiarism (see section 2.2); and/or
 - d collusion (see section 2.4); and
 - iii where the you have not previously been found to have committed an academic misconduct offence following a Stage 2 (see section 8) or Stage 3 (see section 9) disciplinary investigation.
- 7.3 The Associate Dean of School (Academic Quality Assurance) or SAIO will decide using the criteria in section 6.4 above whether the academic misconduct can be dealt with under Stage 1.
- 7.4 Alleged contract-cheating or other academic misconduct offences not included in 7.2 above, cannot be investigated under Stage 1.

- 7.5 You will be provided with the evidence of the alleged academic misconduct together with the intended academic decision. You will then be given the opportunity to discuss and explain the evidence of academic misconduct and /or the academic decision with the marker and/or the SAIO.
- 7.6 You may be required to discuss the work you have submitted and asked to explain how it was prepared, including how you went about writing it.
- 7.7 If you are found to have committed academic misconduct at Stage 1 you will be informed in writing:
- i that the relevant Module/Short Course Board will be notified of the academic decision regarding the assessment; and
 - ii that the incident of academic misconduct will not be entered onto your student record but that the SAIO will note the incident on the School's record of Stage 1 academic misconduct offences for monitoring purposes; and
 - iii where you can go for guidance on how to avoid academic misconduct in future; and
 - iv to contact your personal tutor or equivalent about how to access additional assessment support.
- 7.8 A Stage 1 investigation must be completed within ten (10) working days or as soon as possible thereafter of the matter being referred to the Associate Dean of School (Academic Quality Assurance) or SAIO.

7.9 Outcomes following academic misconduct under Stage 1

As Stage 1 is not a disciplinary process, the outcomes are purely academic decisions about the grades awarded and these are set down in the table below:

Academic Misconduct	Indicative academic decision
No case to answer	No change to the grade awarded
Plagiarism – where there is clear evidence (e.g. from relevant software, such as Turnitin) that plagiarism may have taken place and it is reasonable, in the circumstances, for the University to make this assumption.	Reduction in the grade reflecting no marks being awarded for plagiarised parts.
Self-plagiarism	Reduction in the grade reflecting no marks being awarded for self-plagiarised parts.
There is an unjustified similarity in the submission provided by the student with that of another /other students submitting the same assessment. Text matching software or other evidence shows that a student assessment has identical or similar	No marks awarded for similar or identical text.

text to one or more other students who have submitted work for the same assessment. This may be as a result of the students conferring or students may have taken the content from a common source.	
Technical Breach of Ethics Protocols (see sections 2.11, ii and iii, and UPR RE01 ¹)	Mark reduction but based on the marking criteria and academic judgement. Ethics Committee to input.

7.10 Appeals following a Stage 1 investigation

You may appeal to the Dean of School against a finding of fact in relation to the academic misconduct, but you cannot appeal against the academic judgement upon which the decision is based (see section 5 above). The appeal must be received by the Dean of School within **ten (10) working days** of the date on which you were sent the written notification of the outcome of a Stage 1 investigation.

8 Stage 2 proceedings

8.1 At Stage 2, the academic misconduct is regarded as a disciplinary matter to be dealt with by the School.

8.2 At the discretion of the Associate Dean of School (Academic Quality Assurance) or SAIO, any academic misconduct offence may be dealt with under Stage 2 where you are prepared to accept both the disciplinary warning AND the academic penalty, **except**:

- misappropriation of material submitted for assessment;
- bribery and / or intimidation relating to assessment;
- false declarations which amount to forgery of a signature;
- impersonation;
- if you are a student enrolled on a programme which leads to eligibility for professional registration and/or licence to practise or where the programme requires the student to be registered with a professional body and the alleged of academic misconduct raises questions of honesty and integrity which may call into question the student's fitness to practise. In this event the case will be referred to be dealt with under UPR SA15 'Student Fitness to Practise'.

8.3 The Associate Dean of School (Academic Quality Assurance) or SAIO (or the Chair or Deputy Chair of the relevant ECDA) will decide using the criteria in section 6.4 above, and the findings arising from any preliminary discussions with the student whether the academic misconduct can be dealt with under Stage 2. As part of the investigation you may receive a **Request to attend an Investigation Meeting** and /or a **Request to attend a Viva**.

- 8.4 Where the Associate Dean of School (Academic Quality Assurance) or SAIO (or the Chair or Deputy Chair of the relevant ECDA) considers it appropriate to deal with the academic misconduct under Stage 2, they will within ten (**10**) working days of the date on which the allegation was referred to them, or as soon as possible thereafter, inform you, in writing, by means of a **Letter of Notification** of the alleged academic misconduct and the underlying facts that have been provided to support the allegation.
- 8.5 The letter will provide you with three options and a requirement to respond within five (**5**) working days of the date of the **Letter of Notification** (not the date of its receipt by you):
- 1 you wish to admit the academic misconduct offence and for the matter to be resolved under Stage 2 by accepting a disciplinary warning and the academic penalty detailed in the letter; or
 - 2 you refute the allegation(s) with the consequence that the matter is to be resolved under Stage 3 (see section 9) by referral to a Student Academic Misconduct Panel.
 - 3 you wish to discuss the allegation(s) before you select option 1 or 2 and you are available for a meeting with the Associate Dean (Academic Quality Assurance) or SAIO (or the Chair or Deputy Chair of the relevant ECDA in the case of an alleged breach of ethics protocols (see sections 2.11, ii and iii, and UPR RE01¹)).
- 8.6 Where you wish to discuss the allegation in a meeting, a member of the Academic Misconduct team will make a written record of any meeting between you and the Associate Dean of School (Academic Quality Assurance) or SAIO (or the Chair or Deputy Chair of the relevant ECDA in the case of an alleged breach of ethics protocols (see sections 2.11, ii and iii, and UPR RE01¹)).
- 8.7 If you fail to respond to the **Letter of Notification** within ten (10) working days of the date of the **Letter of Notification** and/or you request a meeting and then fail to attend after being given a reasonable opportunity to do so and/or otherwise fail to engage with the processes outlined in this policy, the University will consider whether it already has sufficient evidence to impose an academic penalty. If, in its absolute discretion, the University considers this to be the case, then it will apply the appropriate academic penalty and a disciplinary warning will be issued to you based on the University's academic judgement regarding the nature and extent of the academic misconduct committed. However, you may request that this decision be reviewed (if you have additional evidence in support of your case), within ten (10) working days of receiving notification of the decision, by requesting the allegation be referred to be considered under Stage 3 (see section 9) at a Student Academic Misconduct Panel, provided that you attend the hearing, engage with the processes set out in this policy, and answer the case against you.
- 8.8 If you wish to accept the allegation and the penalty following the meeting, you will have five (**5**) working days to send written acceptance of the allegation and the recommended penalty to the Associate Dean of School (Academic Quality Assurance) or SAIO (or the Chair or Deputy Chair of the relevant ECDA in the case of an alleged breach of ethics protocols (see sections 2.11, ii and iii, and UPR RE01¹) via the Academic Misconduct team.

- 8.9 If the acceptance is not received by the Academic Misconduct team within five (5) working days of the date of the meeting, the allegation will be referred to be considered under Stage 3 (see section 9) at a Student Academic Misconduct Panel.
- 8.10 Where you accept the allegation and the penalty either initially or following a meeting with the Associate Dean of School (Academic Quality Assurance) or SAIO (or the Chair or Deputy Chair of the relevant ECDA in the case of an alleged breach of ethics protocols (see sections 2.11, ii and iii, and UPR RE01¹), the Academic Misconduct team will inform the Associate Dean of School (Academic Quality Assurance) or SAIO (or the Chair or Deputy Chair of the relevant ECDA in the case of an alleged breach of ethics protocols (see sections 2.11, ii and iii, and UPR RE01¹), the module leader and the Chair/Clerk of the relevant Short Course/Module Board by means of a **Stage 2 Letter of Decision**.
- 8.11 Where you refute the allegation(s) either initially or following a meeting with the Associate Dean of School (Academic Quality Assurance) or SAIO (or the Chair or Deputy Chair of the relevant ECDA in the case of an alleged breach of ethics protocols (see sections 2.11, ii and iii, and UPR RE01¹), the Academic Misconduct team will inform you by means of a **Letter of Referral to Stage 3** that the allegation will be dealt with under Stage 3 (see section 9). They will also inform the Associate Dean of School (Academic Quality Assurance) / SAIO (or the Chair or Deputy Chair of the relevant ECDA in the case of an alleged breach of ethics protocols (see sections 2.11, ii and iii, and UPR RE01¹), the Module Leader and the Chair/Clerk of the relevant Module /Short Course Board that consideration of your grade for the module(s) is to be deferred to await the outcome of the hearing by the Student Academic Misconduct Panel (SAMP).
- 8.12 **Indicative penalties following Stage 2 proceedings**

Academic Misconduct	Range of penalties
Plagiarism	No marks awarded for plagiarised text or a grade of 0 awarded for the assessment, depending on the extent of the plagiarism; AND a disciplinary warning placed your record; AND a requirement to access support and guidance as directed by the Associate Dean of School (Academic Quality Assurance) or SAIO in consultation with your personal tutor or equivalent.
Self-plagiarism	No marks awarded for self-plagiarised text or a grade of 0 awarded for the assessment depending on the extent of the self- plagiarism; AND a disciplinary warning placed your record; AND a requirement to access support and guidance complete as directed by the Associate Dean of School (Academic Quality Assurance) or SAIO in consultation with your personal tutor or equivalent.

Collusion	No marks awarded for similar or identical text or a grade of 0 awarded for the assessment depending on the extent of the identical text; AND a disciplinary warning placed your record; AND a requirement to access support and guidance complete as directed by the Associate Dean of School (Academic Quality Assurance) or SAIO in consultation with your personal tutor or equivalent.
Making your work available for another to copy (where no collusion applies because you are not currently studying on the module)	A disciplinary warning placed on your record;
Contract cheating	A grade of 0 for the module; AND a disciplinary warning placed your record; AND a requirement to access support and guidance as directed by the Associate Dean of School (Academic Quality Assurance) or SAIO in consultation with your personal tutor or equivalent.
Academic Misconduct	Range of penalties
Examination misconduct including in-class tests, written, oral and practical examinations, whether conducted face-to-face or online.	A grade of 0 for the assessment; AND a disciplinary warning placed on your record; AND a requirement to access support and guidance as directed by the Associate Dean of School (Academic Quality Assurance) or SAIO in consultation with your personal tutor or equivalent.
Fabrication or falsification of data	A grade of 0 for the assessment; AND a disciplinary warning placed your record; AND a requirement to access support and guidance as directed by the Associate Dean of School (Academic Quality Assurance) or SAIO in consultation with your personal tutor or equivalent.

Fake referencing	A grade of 0 for the assessment; AND a disciplinary warning placed on your record; AND a requirement to access support and guidance as directed by the Associate Dean of School (Academic Quality Assurance) or SAIO in consultation with your personal tutor or equivalent.
Breach of professional confidentiality	A grade of 0 for the assessment; AND a disciplinary warning placed on your record; AND a requirement to access support and guidance as directed by the Associate Dean of School (Academic Quality Assurance) or SAIO in consultation with your personal tutor or equivalent.
Breach of Ethics protocols (see sections 2.11, ii and iii, and UPR RE01 ¹)	See UPR RE01
False Declarations (except false declarations in the form of forgery of a signature which are Stage 3 offences)	A disciplinary warning placed on your record; AND a requirement to access support and guidance as directed by the Associate Dean of School (Academic Quality Assurance) or SAIO in consultation with your personal tutor or equivalent.
Academic Misconduct	Range of penalties
Other academic misconduct where a student gains or attempts to gain an unfair, improper or dishonest advantage in the assessment process.	A grade of 0 for the assessment; AND a disciplinary warning placed on your record; AND a requirement to access support and guidance as directed by the Associate Dean of School (Academic Quality Assurance) or SAIO in consultation with your personal tutor or equivalent.

9 Stage 3 proceedings

- 9.1 At Stage 3, the alleged academic misconduct is regarded as a serious disciplinary matter to be considered in a formal hearing by a Student Academic Misconduct Panel (SAMP) (see section 10, UPR SA13 'Student Discipline').

9.2 An alleged academic misconduct offence will be dealt with under Stage 3 for one or more of the following reasons:

- i the academic misconduct is:
 - a contract cheating;
 - b misappropriation of material submitted for assessment;
 - c impersonation;
 - d forgery of a signature;
 - e bribery and / or intimidation in relation to an assessment; or
- ii the case of academic misconduct, not included in section i above, is considered by the Associate Dean of School (Academic Quality Assurance) or SAIO to be, on its particular facts, a serious disciplinary matter that is not appropriately considered under Stage 1 (see section 7) or Stage 2 (see section 8); and/or
- iii you have already been given a disciplinary warning by the School for a previous offence of academic misconduct and there are no exceptional circumstances to justify dealing with a subsequent case of academic misconduct under Stage 2 (see section 8); or
- iv you are unwilling to accept or fail to give notification of acceptance of a disciplinary warning together with the academic penalty from Stage 2 (see section 8).

9.3 Where the academic misconduct is to be dealt with under Stage 3, the Academic Misconduct team will, within ten (**10**) working days, or as soon as possible thereafter, of the decision to pursue the allegation of academic misconduct under Stage 3, send you a **Letter of Referral**. This will provide you with details of the allegation and a summary of the investigation outcome. Within a further five (**5**) working days from the **Letter of Referral** or as soon as possible thereafter, you will receive from Student Procedures a **Letter of Notification** specifying the date, time and location of the Student Academic Misconduct Panel Hearing.

9.4 After the conclusion of the Student Academic Misconduct Panel Hearing, the Chair of the Student Academic Misconduct Panel will inform you of the outcome of the Hearing by way of a **Stage 3 Letter of Decision**. This will be copied to the Associate Dean of School (Academic Quality Assurance) or SAIO, the Programme leader, the Module Leader and the Chair/Clerk of the Module Board.

9.5 Indicative penalties following a Stage 3 proceedings

Academic Misconduct	Range of penalties
No case to answer	The grade awarded for the assessment stands
Plagiarism	A grade of 0 awarded for the assessment; AND a final University disciplinary warning placed on your record or suspension from studies or permanent exclusion from the University.

	Where the penalty is suspension, you will be asked to undertake a prescribed task or a series of sessions to support you in your future studies. A second or subsequent Stage 3 offence will automatically result in a suspension or permanent exclusion from the University.
Self-plagiarism	A grade of 0 awarded for the assessment; AND a final University disciplinary warning placed on your record or suspension from studies or permanent exclusion from the University. Where the penalty is suspension the student will be asked to undertake a prescribed task or series of sessions to support you in your future studies. A second or subsequent Stage 3 offence will automatically result in a suspension or permanent exclusion from the University.
Collusion	A grade of 0 awarded for the assessment; AND a final University disciplinary warning placed on your record or suspension from studies or permanent exclusion from the University. Where the penalty is suspension the student will be asked to undertake a prescribed task or series of sessions to support you in your future studies. A second or subsequent Stage 3 offence will automatically result in a suspension or permanent exclusion from the University.
Academic Misconduct	Range of penalties
Examination misconduct including in-class tests, written, oral and practical examinations, whether conducted face-to-face or online.	A grade of 0 awarded for the assessment; AND a final University disciplinary warning placed on your record OR suspension from studies OR permanent exclusion from the University. Where the penalty is suspension the student will be asked to undertake a prescribed task or series of sessions to support you in your future studies. A second or subsequent Stage 3 offence will automatically result in a suspension or permanent exclusion from the University.

Misappropriation of material submitted for assessment	A grade of 0 for the module; AND a final University disciplinary warning placed on your record or suspension from studies or permanent exclusion from the University. Where the penalty is suspension the student will be asked to undertake a prescribed task or series of sessions to support you in your future studies. A second or subsequent Stage 3 offence will automatically result in a suspension or permanent exclusion from the University.
Contract Cheating	A grade of 0 for the module; AND a final University disciplinary warning placed on your record or suspension from studies or permanent exclusion from the University. Where the penalty is suspension you will be asked to undertake a prescribed task or series of sessions to support you in your future studies. A second contract cheating offence will automatically result in permanent exclusion from the University. A second or subsequent Stage 3 offence (other than contract cheating) will automatically result in a suspension or permanent exclusion from the University.
Academic Misconduct	Range of penalties
Bribery and / or intimidation in relation to assessments.	A grade of 0 for the module where relevant to the offence; AND a final University disciplinary warning placed on your record or suspension from studies or permanent exclusion from the University. Where the penalty is suspension the student will be asked to undertake a-prescribed task or series of sessions to support you in your future studies. A second or subsequent Stage 3 offence will automatically result in suspension or permanent exclusion from the University.

Fabrication or falsification of data	A grade of 0 awarded for the assessment or, depending on the extent of fabrication or falsification, a grade of 0 for the module; AND a final University disciplinary warning placed on your record or suspension from studies or permanent exclusion from the University. Where the penalty is suspension you will be asked to undertake a prescribed task or series of sessions to support you in your future studies. A second or subsequent Stage 3 offence will automatically result in a suspension or permanent exclusion from the University.
Fake referencing	A grade of 0 awarded for the assessment, AND a final University disciplinary warning placed on your or suspension from studies or permanent exclusion from the University. Where the penalty is suspension you will be asked to undertake a prescribed task or series of sessions to support you in your future studies. A second or subsequent Stage 3 offence will automatically result in a suspension or permanent exclusion from the University.
Academic Misconduct	Range of penalties
Making your work available for another to copy (where no collusion applies because you are not currently studying on the module)	A final University warning placed on your record or suspension from studies or permanent exclusion from the University. Where the penalty is suspension you will be asked to undertake a prescribed task or series of sessions to support you in your future studies. A second or subsequent Stage 3 offence will automatically result in a suspension or permanent exclusion from the University.
Breach of professional confidentiality	A grade of 0 for the assessment; AND a final University disciplinary warning placed on your record or suspension from studies or permanent exclusion from the University.

	Where the penalty is suspension you will be asked to undertake a prescribed task or series of sessions to support you in your future studies. A second or subsequent Stage 3 offence will automatically result in a suspension or permanent exclusion from the University.
False Declarations (including forged signatures)	A grade of 0 for the assessment(s) for the purpose of which the false declaration was obtained; AND a final University warning placed on your record or suspension from studies or permanent exclusion from the University. A second or subsequent Stage 3 offence will automatically result in a suspension or permanent exclusion from the University.
Impersonation	Permanent exclusion from the University AND a grade of 0 in the relevant module for the student whose identity has been impersonated.
Breach of Ethics protocols (see sections 2.11, ii and iii, and UPR RE01 ¹)	See UPR RE01

Academic Misconduct	Range of penalties
Other academic misconduct where a student gains or attempts to gain an unfair, improper or dishonest advantage in the assessment process.	A grade of 0 for the assessment or for the module depending on the seriousness of the offence (where relevant to the misconduct offence); AND a final University disciplinary warning placed on your record OR suspension from studies OR exclusion permanently from the University. Where the penalty is you will be asked to undertake a prescribed task or series of sessions to support you in your future studies. A second or subsequent Stage 3 offence will automatically result in a suspension or permanent exclusion from the University.

9.6 The Student Academic Misconduct Panel will take into account the following factors in deciding penalties:

- whether you have committed academic misconduct before;
- whether you admitted the academic misconduct at the earliest opportunity;
- whether you show remorse for the academic misconduct;
- whether you had compelling personal circumstances which affected their decision making at the time;
- the extent to which you have engaged or not engaged with support for academic integrity;
- how far you are into their academic journey at the University;
- any visa implications for international students; and
- any career implications.

Dr Matthew Andrews
Secretary and Registrar
Signed: **1 August 2026**

Alternative format

If you need this document in an alternative format, please email us at governanceservices@herts.ac.uk.