



UCFB*

Academic Integrity and Academic Misconduct Policy

Owner:	Head of Academic Quality
Author:	Academic Quality Officer (Resolutions)
Version Number:	5.0
Approved Date:	10 June 2026
Approved By:	Academic Board
Date of Commencement:	1 September 2026
Date of Last Review:	May 2026
Date for Next Review:	May 2027

*UCFB is a trading name of University Campus of Football Business Limited

1. Purpose

- 1.1 This Policy outlines how academic integrity is safeguarded and how academic misconduct is managed at UCFB, to ensure that all decisions are taken in an honest, transparent and respectful manner.
- 1.2 As a learning community, UCFB recognises that the principles of truth, honesty and mutual respect are central to the pursuit of knowledge. Behaviour that undermines those principles diminishes us, both individually and collectively, and devalues the institution's work. UCFB is therefore committed to ensuring that every member of the community is made aware of their responsibilities in maintaining the highest standards of academic integrity and of the steps necessary to protect those standards.
- 1.3 UCFB is committed to ensuring that students have a good understanding of what good academic practice is and therefore how to avoid academic malpractice.
- 1.4 UCFB is committed to academic integrity and will take firm action against any student who breaches these regulations. All students are responsible for ensuring that every element of their studies is their own work and are following the regulations for the proper conduct of assessments. No credit will be awarded for work which is found to have breached these academic misconduct regulations.

2. Scope

- 2.1 This Policy, and associated procedures, applies to all students, who have a suspected case of academic misconduct, and are registered or enrolled on undergraduate and taught postgraduate courses, irrespective of study mode, at UCFB toward University of East London (UEL) degrees.
- 2.2 A student cannot initiate an academic misconduct action against another student; this can only be done by an academic member of staff.

3. Policy Statement and Principles

3.1 Statement

- 3.1.1 All UCFB students are expected to adhere to the standards of behaviour required of them as a member of the UCFB and UEL communities. UCFB and UEL have a range of policies and procedures in place to manage breaches of student codes of conduct, student contracts or other codes of practice.
- 3.1.2 Academic integrity refers to a: "moral code or ethical code which includes values such as avoidance of cheating and plagiarism, as well as maintenance of academic standards, honesty and rigour in research" ([Office for the Independent Adjudicator of Higher Education](#).)
- 3.1.3 UCFB considers high standards of academic integrity to be central to the confidence in, and consistency of, our provision, and the academic work of all our students and graduates.

3.2 Principles

- 3.2.1 The approach taken by UCFB relating to academic integrity is based upon the values of honesty, integrity, responsibility, trust, respect, and fairness and guided by the following principles:

- a) Each of us takes responsibility for our own work;
 - b) We treat the work of others with respect and in accordance with good academic practice;
 - c) We recognise that not all students will be familiar with such practice, and we are committed to providing support in a variety of ways so that they are able to learn the skills necessary for academic success;
 - d) Our teaching and support staff will reinforce these learning opportunities by exhibiting and promoting academic integrity in all areas of their professional practice;
 - e) Teaching staff will be encouraged to design assessments that minimise the opportunity to breach academic integrity;
 - f) No credit will be awarded to any work that breaches our regulations; and
 - g) All proven instances of academic misconduct will be penalised.
- 3.2.2 Academic misconduct is defined as a practice that leads to an unfair advantage in an assessment for the purposes of achieving a personal gain. Examples of such misconduct are given in Annex 1: Definitions (below). The list is not exhaustive and the use of any form of unfair or dishonest practice in assessment can be considered potential misconduct.
- 3.2.3 In determining whether allegation(s) of academic misconduct can be proven, they must be proven on the **balance of probability**.

3.3 Responsible Officers

- 3.3.1 The Responsible Officer plays a key role in upholding academic integrity within their Academic Centre. As members of UCFB academic staff, they work closely with Module Leaders, Course Leaders, the Resolutions Team and other designated officers to address reported cases of academic misconduct. This includes reviewing cases during Academic Misconduct Panels, considering cases that have been appeals and outlining available support to prevent future incidents and supporting the fair application of this Policy.
- 3.3.2 All academics will act as Responsible Officers to evaluate cases of academic misconduct within each Centre.
- 3.3.3 Responsible Officers are members of UCFB academic staff. They will work closely with Module Leaders, and the Resolutions Team to manage incidents of reported academic misconduct within their Academic Centre.
- 3.3.4 Where possible, UCFB will seek to ensure that Responsible Officers reflect the diversity of the institution.

4. Academic Misconduct Procedure

4.1 Reporting

- 4.1.1 If a marker, also known as "the Identifier," suspects that academic misconduct has occurred, they should inform the relevant Module Leader and Responsible Officer **within five working days** of detection. In consultation with the Identifier, the Module Leader and Responsible Officer will review the reported circumstances and any relevant materials to determine if academic misconduct may have taken place. This determination should be completed **within ten working days** of the initial identification.
- 4.1.2 If the Identifier is also the Module Leader, the Course Leader should be consulted.
- 4.1.3 If there is a difference of opinion and a decision cannot be reached, the allegation will be referred to a second Responsible Officer outside of the Academic Centre who will make the final decision on whether or not there is academic misconduct.
- 4.1.4 Academic misconduct regulations do not apply in an instance where no extension claim is either made or granted.
- 4.1.5 If the Identifier and Module

Leader have not found evidence that misconduct may have occurred, the work will be marked as normal.

- 4.1.6 If the Identifier, Module Leader, and Responsible Officer agree that there is a case to answer the Identifier must complete the Initial Discovery form. Submission of the online form will notify both the student and identifier, instructing the student to organise an initial meeting with the Identifier within five **working days**. This meeting will also be attended by a Responsible Officer. Where a Responsible Officer cannot attend, the meeting will be recorded and made available to the Resolutions Team for review.
- 4.1.7 Submission of the online form will also notify the Identifier as to if the student has previously been issued with a penalty sanction. This will aid in deciding the future sanction should the Initial Discovery meeting determine that academic misconduct has taken place.
- 4.1.8 The student will be entitled to be accompanied to the meeting by a relative, friend, colleague, or a Student Union Advisor. The accompanying person cannot be a professional legal representative who has been employed to act on the student's behalf, nor can they act in the capacity of a legal advisor. The accompanying person can comment, assist, and help to present evidence, but cannot answer questions on the student's behalf.

4.2 Initial Meeting between Identifier, Responsible Officer and Student

- 4.2.1 During the initial meeting, the Identifier will be required to document the meeting, student responses and their suggested outcome using the online Academic Misconduct Record form. A tariff of outcomes can be found in section 4.2.11. The Academic Misconduct Record form should be completed within the meeting, but must be submitted **within five working days** from the meeting taking place.
- 4.2.2 At the initial meeting, the student will be reminded of the academic misconduct regulations (including the tariff of penalties), showing how they have breached the regulations and advised on how to adhere to them in the future. The Identifier will present the evidence which could consist of the source material, a report from Turnitin or another programme or method used to detect similarity to a published source. The student will be invited to make further comments.
- 4.2.3 Where acceptance occurs in relation to an undergraduate or taught postgraduate course, the appropriate penalty will be proposed by the Identifier in agreement with the Responsible Officer via the Academic Misconduct Record form and the assessment concerned will incur the penalty once issued by the Resolutions Team as stipulated in Section 5 below.
- 4.2.4 Students are required to confirm their acceptance that they have breached these regulations by explicitly agreeing, in this meeting, that they understand how they have breached these regulations, undertake all necessary steps to ensure that they do not do so again and understand that any further instance of academic misconduct is likely to lead to a serious penalty.
- 4.2.5 The Identifier will inform the Resolutions Team, who will be responsible for notifying the student formally of the outcome and retaining the record of the meeting.
- 4.2.6 Where a student attends the initial meeting and either:
 - a) feels that there are unique and particular circumstances that mitigate or explain the allegation(s); and/or
 - b) does not admit academic misconduct because they have suitable grounds to challenge the decision

the student is required to explicitly outline these grounds during the meeting for consideration of a lower penalty by the Identifier in conjunction with the Responsible Officer.

- 4.2.6.1 Where the student remains dissatisfied with the outcome arrived at and believes they have grounds for the case to be considered by an Academic Misconduct Panel, the student must submit an evidence based proposal form to the Resolutions Team via the online form **within ten working days of receipt of the outcome.**
- 4.2.6.2 Should the submission from the student be received outside of the stipulated time period, the Resolutions Team will write to the student informing them that the time allowed to submit a proposal has lapsed, therefore the original penalty will remain.
- 4.2.6.3 Where the proposal is received within the stipulated time period, the Resolutions Team will forward the proposal to a Responsible Officer from an Academic Centre other than that of the student.
- 4.2.6.4 The Responsible Officer will review the proposal and decide whether there are sufficient grounds for the case to be considered by an Academic Misconduct Panel. This decision must be made **within ten working days of receipt of the proposal by the Responsible Officer** of In the event that the Responsible Officer is unable to determine if there are sufficient grounds, the opinion of a second Responsible Officer must be sought. If neither Responsible Officer can determine if there are sufficient grounds the proposal shall proceed to an Academic Misconduct Panel.
- 4.2.6.5 In reaching their decision as to whether there are sufficient grounds for the case to be considered by an Academic Misconduct Panel, the Responsible Officer(s) will consider the full range of issues relating to the student's proposal along with the details of the alleged breach.
- 4.2.6.6 Where the proposal does not provide sufficient grounds to allow the student's case to proceed to an Academic Misconduct Panel, the reviewing Responsible Officer(s) will, **within ten working days of receiving the proposal**, complete a written report providing their decision and explanation for their decision. This will be forwarded to the Resolutions Team via resolutions@ucfb.ac.uk, who will inform the student **within three working days of receipt** and confirm that the proposed penalty will be applied and issue a Completion of Procedure letter.
- 4.2.6.7 The decision of the reviewing Responsible Officer(s) will be final and there shall be no right of appeal. Students will instead be referred to the Office of the Independent Adjudicator (OIA). The Completion of Procedure letter will be required to submit a claim with the OIA.
- 4.2.6.8 If the proposal is deemed valid by the reviewing Responsible Officer(s), the matter will be considered by an Academic Misconduct Panel. The student will be informed of this, in writing, by the Resolutions Team **within three working days of receipt and confirmation of the Responsible Officer(s) decision.**
- 4.2.6.9 This written notification will also inform the student that any case heard by an Academic Misconduct Panel may result in the awarding of a more severe penalty than that originally proposed.
- 4.2.7 If academic misconduct has been alleged because a marker/Identifier suspects that the work submitted is not entirely the student's own work, and it is deemed appropriate (e.g., in cases where it has not been possible to identify the sources from which the work (or parts of it) has (or have) been taken), then

a viva voce interview may be incorporated within the initial meeting with the Identifier and Responsible Officer. The student will be informed in advance that a viva voce interview will be taking place in accordance with institutional guidance in conducting viva voce interviews in relation to academic misconduct.

- 4.2.8 This initial meeting may take place via MS Teams. For viva voce interviews, all parties will be expected to enable their webcam.
- 4.2.9 If the student does not attend the initial meeting at the scheduled date and time, or if they refuse to participate, the Identifier will review any reasons provided to determine if they are valid. If valid, proceedings may be adjourned to a later date. Only one adjournment will be permitted on valid grounds, with further adjournments allowed only in exceptional cases at the discretion of the Resolutions Team and the Identifier.
- 4.2.10 If the student fails to attend the meeting without giving prior notice or supplying a valid reason, the Identifier should complete the online Academic Misconduct Record form in the student's absence, including a suggested outcome. This penalty will be applied automatically, and the student will be notified of the outcome and any penalties in writing, in line with these procedures by the Resolutions Team.
- 4.2.11 The initial meeting may result in one of the following outcomes:

Outcome	Action	Action Detail
No Case	No further action required	a) The assessment will be marked and released with feedback provided; b) The grade is released with no penalty; and c) Academic Misconduct Record Form completed by Identifier and submitted to Resolutions Team for recording.
Poor Academic Practice	Handled via marking process	a) The assessment will be marked and released with feedback provided; b) The mark discounted sufficiently to reflect the degree of poor academic practice; and c) Academic Misconduct Record Form completed by Identifier and submitted to Resolutions Team for recording.
Academic Misconduct	Offence made and further action required	a) The assessment annotation remains; b) Academic Misconduct Record Form completed, with all relevant evidence and submitted to Resolutions Team for recording; c) Identifier and Responsible Officer conduct initial meeting(s); and determine a penalty, based on the severity of the academic misconduct, with the potential for an Academic Misconduct Panel to be convened.

- 4.2.12 The Resolutions Team will review the initial meeting outcomes to ensure that they conform with academic misconduct regulations and precedent and provide advice accordingly. However, the Identifier and Responsible Officer will maintain responsibility for determining the initial meeting outcomes.
- 4.2.13 The Resolutions Team will communicate the outcome of the initial meeting(s) to the student, including any penalties to apply, subject to UEL Assessment/Progression Board confirmation.

4.3 Referrals to an Academic Misconduct Panel

- 4.3.1 An Academic Misconduct Panel will take place if:
- a) If misconduct has occurred in a previous assessment which received a Level B2 penalty;
 - b) If the offence occurred in an examination;
 - c) For any other serious offence attracting a high penalty (Level C and above); and/or
 - d) For any other case as deemed necessary by the Responsible Officer.

4.4 Academic Misconduct Panels

- 4.4.1 Academic Misconduct Panels will be convened when required by the Resolutions Team, to investigate the facts of a case and/or to determine the appropriate penalty.
- 4.4.2 The constitution of the Academic Misconduct Panel should be:
- a) Three members of UCFB academic staff, of which the Chair will be a member of the Senior Academic Leadership team and
 - b) a student representative nominated by the Students' Union (were appropriate and dependent on availability)
- 4.4.3 Where possible, UCFB will seek to ensure that the composition of the panel reflects the character and diversity of our institution, including UEL Academic Link Tutors.
- 4.4.4 In cases considering allegations that may warrant Level C or D penalties, the panel should feature a Head of Service or Department as Chair e.g., member of the Senior Academic Leadership Team, Head of Academic Quality etc.
- 4.4.5 The Academic Misconduct Panel shall, as far as is practicable, be constituted of persons who have no prior knowledge of the student or misconduct concerned.
- 4.4.6 All relevant documentation and written submissions, including statements from witnesses unable to attend the panel, such as examination invigilators, to be considered by Academic Misconduct Panels must be sent to the Resolutions Team **at least seven working days before the date of the panel.**
- 4.4.7 All relevant records of the initial meeting(s) shall be made available to the Academic Misconduct Panel, together with all relevant correspondence from the Resolutions Team **at least five working days before the panel meeting.**
- 4.4.8 The Resolutions Team will circulate the evidence file to members of the Academic Misconduct Panel; the student; the relevant Identifier and any other colleague(s) from the relevant Academic Centre, who will present the case at the Academic Misconduct Panel.
- 4.4.9 In cases such as collusion, where two or more students have an allegation of academic misconduct, UCFB may decide to deal with these cases together.
- 4.4.10 The student will be entitled to be accompanied to the meeting by a relative, friend, colleague, or a Student Union Advisor. The accompanying person cannot be a professional legal representative who has been employed to act on the student's behalf, nor can they act in the capacity of a legal advisor. The accompanying person can comment, assist, and help to present evidence, but cannot answer questions on the student's behalf.
- 4.4.11 **At least five working days before the panel,** the student must inform the Resolutions Team of any person accompanying them. If details of the accompanying person are not provided at least five working days prior, the Chair has the right to demand that they be removed from the panel.
- 4.4.12 The student may be permitted to call witnesses to support their case. The Chair of the Academic Misconduct Panel has the authority to approve witnesses and

ensure that their evidence is relevant. If a witness cannot attend, Academic Misconduct Panel Chairs may sometimes accept written statements in lieu of in-person attendance. Witnesses are not permitted to: act as character witnesses; advocate on behalf of the student; or answer questions on the student's behalf. The Student must notify the Resolutions Team of any witnesses they intend to call at least five working days before the Panel meeting.

- 4.4.13 The Academic Misconduct Panel shall have the right to call and to question witnesses in the presence of the student (and relative, friend, colleague or a Student Union Advisor if present).
- 4.4.14 If the student does not attend the scheduled panel, the panel will review any reasons provided for their absence. If no reasons are given, or if the reasons are deemed invalid, the panel will proceed in the student's absence, and the student will be considered to have accepted the findings and any resulting penalty. If valid reasons are provided, a single adjournment may be granted, with further adjournments allowed only in exceptional cases at the discretion of the Panel Chair.
- 4.4.15 If the Identifier (or nominee) does not appear at the date and time scheduled for the Academic Misconduct Panel, a written statement may be accepted for consideration by the Panel in their absence.
- 4.4.16 The Panel will be organised and carried out through Microsoft Teams unless otherwise requested or deemed necessary by the Chair of the Panel or the Resolutions Team.
- 4.4.17 The Academic Misconduct Panel shall consider its findings in private and shall submit a written report to the Resolutions Team, which will then provide the student with the findings. The outcome will then be presented to the relevant Progression Board, as soon as is practicable following its deliberations.
- 4.4.18 In determining whether the allegation(s) can be proven, the Panel must be satisfied that the allegation(s) is/are **proven on the balance of probability**.
- 4.4.19 In reaching its conclusions on whether the allegation(s) can be proven, the Academic Misconduct Panel shall consider fully any relevant input from staff familiar with the student's circumstances and/or previous performance.
- 4.4.20 Should an Academic Misconduct Panel be unable to reach an agreed decision, the Chair will determine a final decision.
- 4.4.21 If the student is found to have breached these regulations, the Panel will impose a penalty in accordance with the penalty tariff noted in Section 5.
- 4.4.22 An annual report will be made available to the UCFB Academic Board to monitor consistency of academic breaches across the institution.
- 4.4.23 Where a Panel decides that a student should be expelled, a full report on the matter should be submitted to the UEL Vice-Chancellor & President via the UEL Student Conduct Team, with the recommendation that any student concerned be expelled under the general disciplinary powers of the Vice-Chancellor & President.

5. Penalties for Academic Misconduct

5.1 Criteria for determining the penalty for academic misconduct

- 5.1.1 In determining the sanction to be imposed, the Module Leader, Responsible Officer and Academic Misconduct Panel will assess the seriousness of the academic misconduct using the following criteria:
 - a) Pre-meditation: Deliberate or intended misconduct will normally be considered more serious than that which has arisen inadvertently;

- b) Previous history: A previous history of academic misconduct will normally be considered as being more serious than a first instance of academic misconduct;
- c) Theft, falsification and work purchased from third parties: Academic misconduct involving theft (e.g., stealing a piece of coursework from another student), the falsification of another person's work or ideas, the purchase of work from a third party, or the use of a "cheat site", irrespective of whether it involves human agency or is generated by artificial intelligence, will normally be considered more serious than that involving the authorised but unattributed use of another person's work;
- d) Academic misconduct that has an adverse effect on other students' standing or well-being will be considered more serious than misconduct that affects only the offender.
- e) Miscellaneous: Any other relevant factors pertinent to individual cases may be considered in the penalty; and
- f) Work-Based Learning Opportunity (WBLO) fraud: WBLO fraud is a type of fraudulent activity that typically involves individuals and organisations misrepresenting or exploiting opportunities related to work WBLOs.

5.2 **Tariff of Penalties for Academic Misconduct**

- 5.2.1 In determining the penalty, the Module Leader, Responsible Officer, and Academic Misconduct Panel shall have due regard of the need to:
 - a) maintain the academic standards of UCFB and UEL;
 - b) deal equitably with students; and
 - c) apply proportional penalties in all circumstances.
- 5.2.2 The tariff of penalties for academic misconduct is set out in Annex 2: Tariff of penalties for academic misconduct (below).

5.3 **Additional Key Academic Misconduct Penalty Issues – UG and PG Courses**

- 5.3.1 A student whose mobile telephone or electronic device sounds during an examination may be issued with the appropriate penalty, provided that there is no evidence that they have behaved in a pre-meditated dishonest way.
- 5.3.2 Where a student takes any module in place of a module failed as a result of academic misconduct, the mark for that module will be capped at the minimum pass mark.
- 5.3.3 Where a student has previously received a Level A1 pass or fail or A2 Penalty for an instance of academic misconduct of a type significantly different from that currently alleged, the decision as to whether it remains appropriate to impose the next most severe penalty in the tariff, should be considered.
- 5.3.4 Upheld allegations of academic misconduct resulting in a Level B, C, and D penalty for an undergraduate student will be recorded on the transcript and UCFB may also notify any relevant professional body. For postgraduate students, misconduct resulting in a level C or D penalty will be recorded on the transcript and UCFB may also notify any relevant professional body. Where a student is found to have breached academic misconduct regulations more than once over a short period of time, the level of penalty to be imposed should be fully considered in light of the circumstances, types of misconduct and timings of misconduct.
- 5.3.5 Academic Misconduct penalties will not be carried forward where there is a change in qualification level from undergraduate to postgraduate study.
- 5.3.6 For the purposes of these regulations, students on foundation courses and integrated master's courses will be treated as a single qualification level.

- 5.3.7 Any module with a level B, C, or level D recorded breach, on any previous assessment attempt, cannot be pass compensated. Any module with a Level A1 fail and A2 penalty recorded breach can be pass compensated.

6. Appeals Against the Decision of an Academic Misconduct Panel

- 6.1 An appeal is not a re-hearing of the case previously presented under the relevant procedure. It is solely a review of that process, or procedure, which is intended to establish whether the conduct of that process under the relevant procedure, prior to the appeal, was fair and had been conducted properly, and that the decisions made were not the result of perversity of judgement in the face of the evidence presented.
- 6.2 There shall be no appeal against the decision of the Academic Misconduct Panel except on the grounds that:
- a) There is new and material evidence which the student was, for exceptional reasons, unable to present to the Academic Misconduct Panel;
 - b) The procedures were not complied with, to the extent that it was questionable whether the outcome would have been different had the procedures been complied with;
 - c) There is documented evidence of bias on the part of the members of the Academic Misconduct Panel or its Officer; and/or
 - d) The penalty imposed exceeded that available to the Academic Misconduct Panel.
- 6.3 An appeal can only be made against the decision of the Academic Misconduct Panel and not of any outcomes issued earlier in the process.
- 6.4 No new evidence may be given at an appeal hearing, except where it can be shown that there were justifiable reasons why it had not been presented previously and, if it had been presented previously, would have been likely to have been material to the decision(s) made. Such justification is to be provided as part of the application to appeal.
- 6.5 Any student wishing to appeal must submit to the Director of Student and Academic Services (or nominee), a written notice stating the ground(s) of appeal **within 20 working days of the date upon which they were informed of the Academic Misconduct Panel's decision.**
- 6.6 If accepted by the Director of Student and Academic Services (or nominee), an Appeal Panel may be constituted of:
- a) The Chair will normally be a member of the Senior Academic Leadership Team
 - b) Two academic staff members; and
 - b) Student Union President or nominee (Union (were appropriate and dependent on availability).)
- 6.7 Where possible UCFB shall seek to ensure that the composition of the panel reflects the diversity and character of the institution.
- 6.8 The panel shall, where practicable, be composed of members who are unlikely to know personally any student whose case it may consider.
- 6.9 A member of the Resolutions Team will act as the Officer to the panel and will be responsible for keeping a written record of the decisions made.
- 6.10 The Appeal Panel shall have the power to:
- a) adjourn the hearing to a future date;
 - b) confirm the penalty imposed;
 - c) moderate the penalty imposed to a lesser penalty, the Panel may not impose a greater penalty;
 - d) uphold the appeal and overturn a decision to impose a penalty; or
 - e) refer any case to a disciplinary or Fitness to Study proceeding.

6.11 Appeal Panel Proceedings:

- 6.11.1 The Officer will invite both parties to attend the appeal hearing, informing them of the date, time, and venue. The two parties will be the student and the Chair of the Academic Misconduct Panel which is the subject of the appeal. There shall be no other persons invited to attend the hearing, save that the student may be accompanied (see Section 6.11.2).
- 6.11.2 The student will be entitled to be accompanied to the meeting by a relative, friend, colleague, or a Student Union Advisor. The accompanying person cannot be a professional legal representative who has been employed to act on the student's behalf, nor can they act in the capacity of a legal advisor. The accompanying person can comment, assist, and help to present evidence, but cannot answer questions on the student's behalf.
- 6.11.3 **At least ten working days prior to the hearing**, the Officer will circulate the case papers to the members of the Appeal Panel, the appellant and the Chair of the relevant Academic Panel.
- 6.11.4 The Chair of the relevant Academic Misconduct Panel shall be invited to submit a response to the appeal, which should be received **at least five working days prior to the hearing**. The Secretary shall circulate the response to the members of the Appeal Panel and the appellant (and friend, relative or representative) **at least three working days prior to the hearing**.
- 6.11.5 In the event of late papers being received by the Officer, or previously uncirculated papers being presented by either side at the hearing, the Chair of the Appeal Panel shall decide whether they should be admitted, taking into account that, should such admission be permitted, it should not be to the disadvantage of either party.
- 6.11.6 The appellant may elect not to appear in person before the Appeal Panel. In such cases, the Appeal Panel will decide the appeal on the basis of written submissions. If, however, a written submission is not clear, the Panel will arrive at a decision on the basis of the evidence available to it.
- 6.11.7 Should the appellant fail to appear at the hearing without reasonable cause or explanation, the Appeal Panel will hear the appeal in absentia and decide based on the evidence available to it.
- 6.11.8 The Appeal Panel, having regard to all of the written and verbal evidence provided, will decide whether the decision being appealed was fair, reasonable and proportionate.
- 6.11.9 In the event of the Appeal Panel not being able to reach a unanimous decision, there will be a majority conclusion.
- 6.11.10 The decision of the Panel will be final and there shall be no further right of appeal. **Within ten working days of the appeal hearing**, Resolutions will, on behalf of the Panel, issue to the appellant and the Chair of the relevant Academic Misconduct Panel, a Completion of Procedures letter which will set out its reasons for either dismissing or upholding the appeal. No further correspondence shall be entered into.

7. Office of the Independent Adjudicator for Higher Education:

- 7.1 In the event that the student remains dissatisfied with the final outcome after the internal UCFB procedures have been completed, they may lodge a request for external review directly with the Office of the Independent Adjudicator for Higher Education (OIA).
- 7.2 Any request for OIA review must be submitted to them within 12 months of the Completion of Procedures letter being received by the student. The OIA will not

- 7.3 usually review complaints which have not been considered by UCFB in the first instance.
- 7.4 The Office of the Independent Adjudicator for Higher Education may be contacted via:
- Telephone: 0118-959-9813
 - E-mail: enquiries@oiahe.org
 - Website: <https://www.oiahe.org.uk/students/>
 - Postal address: Office of the Independent Adjudicator - Second Floor; Abbey Gate; 57-75 Kings Road; Reading, RG1 3AB.

8. Behaviour During the Academic Misconduct Investigation Process

- 8.1 UCFB has zero tolerance towards those whose behaviour is considered to be unacceptable and will take action in this respect. Unacceptable behaviour includes communicating with UCFB in a malicious, vexatious, or aggressive manner for example:
- Making frivolous claims, or multiple claims regarding the same subject;
 - Acting in a threatening manner either verbally, through an e-mail or by letter; and/or
 - Making claims that are knowingly false or unfounded.
- 8.2 If the behaviour of a student is unacceptable, UCFB will usually tell the student why their behaviour is considered as such and will allow an opportunity to amend it. If the behaviour continues, procedures may be implemented in accordance with the [UCFB Student Code of Conduct Policy](#)

9. Policy Updates

- 9.1 This Policy will be reviewed and updated on a regular basis as directed by the UCFB Institutional Academic Policy Review Schedule and in line with changes required by the awarding partner .

Annex 1: Definitions

Term	Definition
Academic Integrity	The honour code of academia. It means that you uphold specific values and ideas associated with good scholarship.
Academic Misconduct	is defined as practice which leads to unfair advantage in an assessment for the purposes of achieving personal gain. Examples of such misconduct are given in the section below: the list is not exhaustive and the use of any form of unfair or dishonest practice in assessment can be considered potential misconduct.
Academic Misconduct in Examinations	includes, but is not limited to the following for examinations, including viva voces and examinations conducted online: a. Obtaining information from any other person or source, except those materials explicitly permitted. b. Importation of materials or devices other than those which are specifically permitted under the regulations applying to the examination. c. Use of materials or devices other than those which are specifically permitted under the regulations applying to the examination. d. Refusing, when asked, to surrender any materials requested by an invigilator. e. Copying the work of another candidate. f. Disruptive behaviour during the examination. g. Obtaining, or seeking to obtain, access to unseen examination questions prior to the examination. h. Offering an inducement to invigilators and/or staff and or/ other persons connected with assessment. i. Failure to observe the instructions of an invigilator or seeking to intimidate the invigilator. j. Impersonating or attempting to impersonate another candidate or being knowingly impersonated. k. Using Generative Artificial Intelligence software, such as ChatGPT or QuillBot, to generate answers without referencing the source of information.
Collusion	Occurs when work that has been created in collaboration with another is submitted as one's own work, or one person shares their work with others who submit all, or parts, as their own work.
Contract Cheating	Occurs when work is submitted as the person's own but is, or includes, work commissioned or produced by third parties i.e., essay mills, ghostwriting companies, and other sources.

Term	Definition
Coursework Submitted for Assessment	For coursework submissions, academic misconduct includes, but is not limited to the following: a. Including written, visual, or oral material in your work without giving suitable acknowledgement to its creator and/or author. b. The submission or presentation of another person's work that has been offered to you for your use, but which is not your own work. c. Including concepts, ideas or theories in your work paraphrased from a source without correct citation. d. The submission of work that the student has previously submitted, without suitable acknowledgement of the source of their previous work. e. Quoting the work of other students, except for published work. This includes examples housed on the VLE as a learning resource. f. Being party to any arrangement whereby the work of one candidate is represented as that of another. g. The submission of work as your own which has been purchased, or otherwise obtained from others, whether this is from other students, online services, 'cheat sites', or other agents or sources that sell or provide assignments irrespective of if this is AI Generated. h. Practices such as 'cutting and pasting' or otherwise copying segments of text into your own work, without clearly indicating that the text is a quotation. i. For work not intended to be submitted as a collaborative assessment: producing work with one or more students, using study practices that mean the submitted work is nearly identical, overall or in part, to that of other students. i. Attempts to circumvent the similarity checking programmes which UCFB use (including the use of spinning websites to rephrase text). j. Offering an inducement to staff and/or other persons connected with assessment. k. Falsifying data and references in any assessment.
Generative Artificial Intelligence (AI)	The use of Generative Artificial Intelligence (AI) tools to produce content that is submitted as work claimed to be original to the student is not permitted and deemed to be serious academic misconduct. The use of Generative Artificial Intelligence (AI) for spelling, grammar or structuring purposes should be appropriately referenced within assignment submissions, failure to do so would be deemed Poor Academic Practice rather than inappropriate use of Generative Artificial Intelligence (AI). Examples of Generative AI include, but are not limited to, ChatGPT, Grammarly, DALL-E and QuillBot.
Plagiarism	Using parts of or whole materials of work created by someone else without acknowledgment or relevant permission and presenting it as your own work.

Term	Definition
Poor Academic Practice	is defined as work that the student has produced which is poorly referenced or incorrectly referenced resulting from misunderstanding or lack of confidence using academic conventions. Examples include, but are limited to: • Incomplete or incorrect citations. • An attempt to show that the content/concepts were not the student's own. • 1 or 2 sentences of direct copying without acknowledging the source. • Over reliance on references and sources. • Inappropriate paraphrasing- which does not include the following: a) If a passage of text replicates a published source with only a few words having been altered, this will be treated as if the entire passage of text had been copied, and is therefore Academic Misconduct, not poor academic practice. b) If a substantial portion of the text mirrors the structure of a published source, with alterations to the wording but maintenance of the detailed sequence of information, this will be treated as not being the original work of the student, and is therefore Academic Misconduct, not poor academic practice. The outcome of work that is poor academic practice is that it should be dealt with as part of the marking and feedback process, not the academic misconduct process. • Failure to appropriately reference the use of Generative Artificial Intelligence (AI) tools for spelling, grammar or structuring purposes.
Self-Plagiarism	When work that has already been submitted for assessment either to UCFB, or another institution, and is then used again in another assessment.

Annex 2: Tariff of penalties for academic misconduct

Academic Misconduct Penalties – UG and PG Programmes	
Level A1 - First instance of minor offence involving plagiarism allegations only. A student who plagiarises for the first time will be issued with a Level A1 Penalty, providing that there is no evidence that they have behaved in a pre-meditated dishonest way.	Level A2: First instance of minor offence involving collusion or self – plagiarism allegations only. A student who colludes or self-plagiarises for the first time will be issued with a Level A2 Penalty, providing that there is no evidence of pre-meditated dishonesty.
Penalty Outcome: Level A1 Pass - The student will be issued with a capped pass mark for the relevant component. Or Level A1 Fail - If the extent of the academic misconduct means that the work is a fail, the student will be issued with a mark of 0 against the relevant component. - The student will be permitted to retake this component at the next assessment point. - The relevant module will be capped at the pass mark. If a mark of zero is issued during a reassessment opportunity, this may impact the student's ability to continue their course as per clauses 7.6.5 and 14.4.5 in Part 3 of the UEL Manual of General Regulations. A Level A1 Penalty is neither recorded on a transcript, nor reported to a professional body. Indicative Misconduct: First time offences of plagiarism where there is no evidence of pre-meditated dishonesty.	Penalty Outcome: Level A2 - The student will be issued with a mark of 0 for the relevant assessment component - The student will be permitted to retake this component at the next assessment point. - The relevant module will be capped at pass mark. If a mark of zero is issued during a reassessment opportunity, this may impact the student's ability to continue their course as per clauses 7.6.5 and 14.4.5 in Part 3 of the UEL Manual of General Regulations. A Level A2 Penalty is neither recorded on a transcript, nor reported to a professional body. Indicative Misconduct: First time offences of collusion or self-plagiarism NB: A first time offence by a student where they have misused Generative Artificial Intelligence (AI) could be an A2, if leniency for a first-time offence was being applied to make the penalty educational rather than punitive.

Academic Misconduct Penalties – UG and PG Programmes

Level B1: First instance of serious academic misconduct and/or any academic misconduct following a Level A Penalty	Level B2: Further instance of serious academic misconduct and/or any academic misconduct following a Level B1 Penalty
Penalty Outcome: • The student will be issued with a mark of 0 for the relevant assessment component. • The student will be permitted to retake this component at the next assessment point. • The relevant module will be capped at the pass mark. Where a Level B1 penalty is issued at the reassessment point, this may impact the student's ability to continue their course as per clauses 7.6.5 and 14.4.5 in Part 3 of the UEL Manual of General Regulations. Indicative Misconduct: • Attempting to copy from another student in an examination. • Importing prohibited materials of any type into an examination room. • Any instance of academic misconduct that has been preceded by a Level A penalty. • A first instance where there is evidence of pre-meditated dishonesty. This may include the Generative Artificial Intelligence (AI).	Penalty Outcome: • The student will be issued with a mark of 0 for the relevant assessment component. • The student will be permitted to retake this component at the next assessment point. • The relevant module will be capped at the pass mark. Where a Level B2 penalty is issued at the reassessment point, this may impact the student's ability to continue their course as per clauses 7.6.5 and 14.4.5 in Part 3 of the UEL Manual of General Regulations. Indicative Misconduct: • Attempting to copy from another student in an examination. • Importing prohibited materials of any type into an examination room. • Any instance of academic misconduct that has been preceded by a Level A penalty. • A first instance where there is evidence of pre-meditated dishonesty. This may include the Generative Artificial Intelligence (AI).

Academic Misconduct Penalties – UG and PG Programmes

Level C: First instance of serious academic misconduct involving gross premeditated dishonesty and/or any academic misconduct following a Level B2 Penalty (to be reviewed at an Academic Misconduct Panel)	
Penalty Outcome: • The student will be issued with a mark of 0 for the relevant assessment component. • The student will be permitted to retake the component at the next assessment point. • The overall module mark will be capped at the pass mark. • The student will be suspended from their studies for the next academic year.	Indicative Misconduct: • Any instance of academic misconduct that has been preceded by a Level B2 penalty. • A serious instance where the student has acted in a grossly dishonest way (this might pertain to academic misconduct such as theft, forgery, bribery, impersonation).

Level D: Any academic misconduct following a Level C Penalty (to be reviewed by an Academic Misconduct Panel)**Penalty Outcome:**

- The student will be issued with a mark of 0 for the relevant assessment component.
- Expulsion with immediate effect.

Misconduct:

- Any instance of academic misconduct that has been preceded by a Level C penalty, or any instance of academic misconduct deemed to merit this penalty.

Additional Key Academic Misconduct Penalty Issues

A student whose mobile telephone or electronic device sounds during an examination may be issued with a Level A Penalty, provided there is no evidence that they have behaved in a pre-meditated, dishonest way. The work concerned may be given a mark of 0.

Where a student takes any module in place of a module failed as a result of academic misconduct, the mark for that module will be capped at the minimum pass mark.

Where a student is found to have breached the Academic Integrity and Academic Misconduct Policy more than once over a short period of time, the level of penalty to be imposed should be fully considered in light of the circumstances, types of misconduct and timings of misconduct.

Academic Misconduct Penalties will not be carried forward where there is a change in qualification level from undergraduate to postgraduate study.

Any module with a Level A or Level B recorded breach cannot be pass compensated where that breach occurred on the latest assessment attempt. If the breach occurred on a previous assessment attempt to the one being considered by the assessment board, the module can still be pass compensated.

Any module with a Level C or Level D recorded breach, on any previous assessment attempt, cannot be pass compensated.