

Regulations Governing Academic Integrity

Introduction

These Regulations aim to encourage a "learning community" at the University in which our students and staff learn from one another while conducting themselves with courtesy, integrity, honesty, and mutual respect. The University recognises the importance of education to help students and staff understand and maintain academic integrity.

Students may obtain free, independent, and confidential advice about academic integrity at any point from the [Students' Union Advice Centre](#). Additional information and [guidance](#) can be found in the University's Quality Handbook.

For students studying at an overseas institution, localised arrangements may need to be applied.

These Regulations outline the usual timescales. Please note that when 'working days' are referred to; this excludes weekends, bank holidays and University closure days.

These Regulations are made subject to the Charter, Statutes and Ordinances of the University.

These Regulations are divided into two sections:

Section A: sets out the definition, scope and application of these Regulations and the principles to be applied in all cases.

Section B: outlines the Procedure to be followed in all cases of suspected breaches of academic integrity.

Section A: Definition, scope, application and principles

1. What is Academic Integrity?

1.1 Academic integrity is integral to studying at University and a guiding principle of academic life. At its most basic, academic integrity describes acting with honesty and responsibility in one's own academic work (which throughout these Regulations means work undertaken for formative and summative assessments, your research outputs, your academic practice, and your academic working relations with others). Maintaining academic integrity therefore requires:

- 1.1.1 Appropriately acknowledging 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;
- 1.1.2 Never seeking to obtain unfair advantage for yourself or another in any form of academic work or examination;
- 1.1.3 Collaborating with others when appropriate but always producing your own work independently when required;
- 1.1.4 Never obtaining unauthorised external assistance in the creation of academic work;

- 1.1.5 Always presenting accurate data and information in your academic work;
 - 1.1.6 Declaring when you have used academic work that you have previously submitted in another academic context and using it only with appropriate acknowledgment;
 - 1.1.7 Complying with all ethical requirements for the academic work that you undertake, including the [University's Ethics Policy](#);
 - 1.1.8 Complying with and undertaking your research responsibly, following all necessary regulatory, legal, and professional obligations.
- 1.2 The University recognises that students may act, or assist others to act, in a manner inconsistent with the statements above. If such actions result from error, inexperience or lack of understanding and are limited in scope or their effect on the academic work concerned, they may be deemed poor academic practice rather than a breach of these Regulations. Under all other circumstances, such actions will constitute a breach of these Regulations.
- 1.3 The University specifically recognises each of the following as a breach of these Regulations. Examples of each breach can be found in [guidance](#) available in the University's Quality Handbook. There may be other types of breach of academic integrity that are not specifically referred to here, and some breaches may fall into more than one category. Specific breaches are:
- 1.3.1 *Plagiarism* is the use of ideas, intellectual property, or work of others (including that of another student) without appropriate acknowledgement and/or indication, thereby presenting someone else's work and/or ideas as your own.
 - 1.3.2 Cheating is any action before, during, or after an examination or assessment by which you seek to gain unfair advantage or assist another student to do so. This includes the possession of unauthorised material or technology during an examination and attempting to access unseen assessment materials in advance of an examination.
 - 1.3.3 Collusion is working with another student or students in an unauthorised way to create academic work that should be created by a student independently.
 - 1.3.4 External authorship/assistance is where a student obtains, or attempts to obtain, unauthorised input from another or others with their work. This may include asking for unauthorised assistance with assessments or engaging with essay mills or any other form of contract cheating, whether that input is obtained on a commercial basis or not.
 - 1.3.5 Falsification is any attempt to present fictitious or distorted data, evidence, references, experimental results, or other material and/or knowingly to make use of such material.
 - 1.3.6 Recycling (sometimes referred to as 'self-plagiarism') is where a piece of work that has already been submitted for assessment, is resubmitted, in whole or in part, for assessment in the same or in a different programme of study without appropriate acknowledgement and/or permission.
 - 1.3.7 Breaching ethical standards is failing to comply with your ethical obligations when carrying out your academic work as set out in the University Ethics Policy and the

applicable ethical requirements for your subject area, such as failing to obtain free and informed consent, or failing to declare conflicts of interest or partiality.

- 1.3.8 *Misconduct in research* includes a failure to comply with appropriate ethical, legal and professional frameworks, obligations and standards as described in the [University Research Integrity Statement](#).

2. Whose conduct may be investigated under these Regulations?

- 2.1 The conduct of any person who is, or was, at the time of the suspected breach of academic integrity to be investigated, enrolled as a student at the University (including students in nominal registration and studying off campus for any reason) may be investigated under these Regulations. These Regulations apply to students on all programmes of study.
- 2.2 These Regulations may also apply (at the University's discretion) to students enrolled at another institution but who are visiting the University to carry out some of their studies under the direction of the University. The applicability of these Regulations will, however, be subject to the terms of the agreement entered into between the University and the other institution and these students may also be referred to their institution to initiate proceedings under the Regulations of that institution.
- 2.3 At any time, the University may take action against a former student. Former students will be subject to the Regulations that were in place when they first registered as a student at the University on the programme to which the suspected breach relates.

3. Responsibilities

- 3.1 Except in cases for which a matter has been reserved for a decision by Senate, Senate hereby delegates responsibility for the application of these Regulations to the Deans and their senior staff.
- 3.2 The Dean (or nominee) of each Faculty will appoint a Faculty Academic Integrity Officer who will liaise with School Academic Integrity Officers (AIOs), their Associate Dean (Education) and the Quality, Standards and Accreditation Team in advising on and developing Academic Integrity Policy and Regulation.
- 3.3 The Head of each School (or nominee) will nominate one or more AIOs for their School and ensure internal processes meet the procedural elements of these Regulations.

4. Disclosure of Information

- 4.1 The University will process all personal information in accordance with its [Data Protection Policy](#).
- 4.2 The University will disclose all information related to a case:
- 4.2.1 to inform the student of the allegations made and give them an opportunity to respond; or
 - 4.2.2 to allow an investigation to be conducted; or
 - 4.2.3 to disclose information about an outcome under these Regulations; or

- 4.2.4 for the discharge of its duties (including contractual obligations owed to third parties) or as required by law.
- 4.3 Audio and/or visual recordings of Academic Integrity meetings (AI Meetings) and AI Panel hearings are normally not permitted. If, owing to exceptional circumstances, it is agreed in advance by the student, as well as the AIO (for AI Meetings) or the Chair of the AI Panel, that a recording is permitted, it is on condition that the recording is confidential, must not be copied, shared with any third party, published or disseminated, and that it will be deleted when the notes of the AI meeting or AI Panel have been agreed. The recording will be made by the AIO or the Chair of the AI Panel and a complete copy of the recording must be provided to the Student as soon as practicable after the recording is made.

5. Outcomes

- 5.1 The outcome of an AI investigation is decided on the basis of the evidence available and the balance of probabilities.
- 5.2 The AIO or AI Panel will decide whether there has been a breach. The AIO or AI Panel should refer to the [University's Academic Integrity Guidance](#) for information about appropriate outcomes in various situations:
- 5.2.1 If there is no evidence of a breach or of poor academic practice, then the No Breach outcome will be applied, and no further action will be taken.
- 5.2.2 If there is evidence of poor academic practice but not of a breach, then the student will be signposted to relevant additional learning opportunities (Additional Learning), with the aim of preventing a further occurrence. No further action will be taken but it will be noted in the student's record that the student has been signposted to Additional Learning.
- 5.2.3 If there is a breach, one or more penalties will be applied.
- 5.3 The penalties for breaches of academic integrity are set out below. Illustrations of penalties appropriate to different types of breaches are located in the [University's Academic Integrity Guidance](#) and may be periodically updated by the University.
- 5.4 The University may:
- 5.4.1 Issue a written warning (which should not be applied with any other penalty);
- 5.4.2 Exclude credit for words, ideas, or other material presented that have been identified as being in breach of these Regulations, but award credit for any such content that has not been affected by the breach;
- 5.4.3 Require the student to resubmit the piece of work only addressing the identified issues for a reduced maximum mark (normally the pass mark) within a specified timescale. Guidance must be given regarding the scope and nature of the required changes.
- 5.4.4 Prohibit the analysis or use of data if the data collection or data analysis was conducted in breach of a student's obligations. In such cases, the student may also receive a reduced maximum mark on the piece of work eventually submitted;

- 5.4.5 Award a mark of zero (0) (or equivalent) for the piece of work;
- 5.4.6 Impose a mark of zero (0) (or equivalent) for the Module that the piece of work contributes towards;
- 5.4.7 Impose a mark of zero (0) (or equivalent) for the Part;
- 5.4.8 In addition to imposing one of the penalties above; remove the right of Referral (and not of Repeat) where it would otherwise exist;
- 5.4.9 Reduce the student's degree class;
- 5.4.10 For research students:
 - a) For progression reviews or the thesis for examination, require the student to resubmit the report or thesis addressing the identified issues within a specified timescale. Guidance must be given regarding the scope and nature of the required changes;
 - b) Give the student permission to apply within a specified time for the award of the degree of MPhil (or an appropriate exit award) instead, which submission may include re-examination and a viva voce;
 - c) Prohibit the analysis or use of data if the data collection or analysis was conducted in breach of a student's obligations. This applies to any research output (including, but not limited to, manuscripts and research datasets) as well as progression reviews and the thesis for examination;
 - d) Require the submission of a retraction request for published or submitted research outputs (including, but not limited to, manuscripts and research datasets) submitted as a result of their studies, if those outputs contain material produced in breach of their obligations. If appropriate, the University may contact the editor/publisher or appropriate entity directly with details of the issue and request the retraction.
- 5.4.11 Terminate a programme;
- 5.4.12 Withdraw an Award.
- 5.5 The AIO or AI Panel should take prior signposting to Additional Learning and any prior breach, or breaches, of these Regulations into consideration in deciding the penalty to be imposed for a subsequent breach of these Regulations.
- 5.6 The AIO or AI Panel should ensure that any penalty imposed does not have a disproportionate impact on a student's progression as far as is known at the time of imposing the penalty.

6. Appeals

- 6.1 An appeal against a decision made by an AI Panel may be made under the [Regulations Governing Academic Appeals by Students](#).

7. Recording, Monitoring and Reporting

- 7.1 The University will record, monitor, and report academic integrity outcomes. Such monitoring may identify trends, inform other University practices, procedures, or activities, and enable the sharing of information across Schools, as may be required.
- 7.2 Records of breaches will be maintained in line with the University's [Retention of Assessment Material and Student Records Policy](#).
- 7.3 Records of academic integrity breaches, or where students have been signposted to Additional Learning will not appear on a student's transcript (diploma supplement).
- 7.4 The University will disclose the nature of a breach and the penalty imposed by it to parties outside the University when it considers it necessary to do so. Signposting to Additional Learning will not be disclosed unless required by a regulatory body.
- 7.5 Students may be required to declare proven breaches of academic integrity on applications for future study or employment.

8. Relationship with other Regulations

- 8.1 If a breach of these Regulations involves other University Regulations or policies, the matter should continue to progress through the Procedures in Section B and upon conclusion, the outcome and details of the investigation should be submitted to the body responsible for the application of the other University Regulations or policies.
- 8.2 If, in the opinion of the Head of Academic Appeals and Student Complaints, the risk to public safety, the interests of the student, and/or the need to maintain trust in a particular profession would be better served, the Procedure in Section B may be suspended for a reasonable period of time for the application of the other University Regulations or policies.

Section B: The Procedure

AI meetings and Panel hearings may be held via a University-supported videoconferencing platform (e.g., Microsoft Teams), or other appropriate means, by prior arrangement and with agreement by the Student and the AIO or Chair of the AI Panel.

Reasonable adjustments to this procedure may be made, when appropriate, for students with additional needs, or to allow for other factors that would otherwise place a student at a disadvantage.

All stages of this procedure (including the administration of an appeal) will be conducted by the School responsible for the assessed piece of work (the "Host School"). Communication will be sent by the Curriculum and Quality Assurance (CQA) team in the Host Faculty. If the Host School and the School in which the student is enrolled (the "Home School") are not the same, the CQA Team in the student's Home Faculty must be kept informed throughout by the CQA team in the Host Faculty.

1. Support

- 1.1 During all stages described in these Regulations, students are encouraged to speak with the [Students' Union Advice Centre](#) for support in relation to the procedure below. Students may be accompanied to an AI Meeting or AI Panel hearing by another Member of the University (usually either a member of staff or a fellow student who is independent from the case), or by an advisor from the Students' Union Advice Centre. The Member or advisor will be known as the Companion.
- 1.2 The role of the Companion is not to offer formal representation but to offer support and advice to the student. The Companion may ask questions to aid the understanding of the student, or to seek clarification, if helpful, but must not answer questions on the student's behalf.
- 1.3 Only in exceptional circumstances, and by prior arrangement with the AIO or Chair of the AI Panel, may a student be accompanied by someone who is neither a Member of the University nor a Students' Union Advisor.

2. Notification of Breach and Initial Review

- 2.1 Any suspected breach of these Regulations must be referred to an AIO of the Host School as soon as reasonably practicable.
- 2.2 The AIO will consult with the CQA Team in their own Faculty to confirm whether the student has been signposted to Additional Learning or received any previous penalties for Academic Integrity, and the nature of the breach(es) if any, and other potentially relevant factors (e.g., the student is a repeating student).
- 2.3 The AIO will consider the allegations made together with any evidence provided to them and, in understanding the scope of the case, may review any or all academic work previously submitted by the student during their current programme of study.
- 2.4 Following the initial review, the AIO will decide, as soon as practicable, on one of the following courses of action, that:
 - 2.4.1 no further action is required; or

- 2.4.2 the student should be signposted to Additional Learning; or
 - 2.4.3 the student should be sent a letter containing a proposed penalty; or
 - 2.4.4 the student should be invited to attend an AI Meeting.
- 2.5 An AIO must hold an AI Meeting if:
- 2.5.1 they feel the nature of the case requires additional input or investigation; or
 - 2.5.2 they propose to impose a penalty that would have an effect on the student's progression as far as is known at the time that the penalty would be imposed; or
 - 2.5.3 the student requests an AI Meeting.

3. No Further Action

- 3.1 If the AIO finds insufficient evidence of a breach or insufficient evidence of poor academic practice, the student's work will be processed within the normal academic feedback procedures.
- 3.2 No record of the investigation will be noted on the student's record.

4. Additional Learning

- 4.1 If the AIO finds that there is evidence of poor academic practice but not of a breach, the AIO will make a recommendation for the student to be signposted to Additional Learning with the aim of preventing a further occurrence. No further action will be taken but it will be noted in the student's record that the student has been signposted to Additional Learning.
- 4.2 The CQA team in the Host Faculty will ensure the student receives signposting to the relevant Additional Learning resources, as advised by the AIO.
- 4.3 The CQA team in the Host Faculty will notify the person responsible for providing feedback to the student on the academic work in question (e.g., the marker), the student's Personal Academic Tutor (PAT) or supervisor, and the CQA team in the Home Faculty as soon as practicable.
- 4.4 The student's PAT or supervisor will be encouraged to discuss the student's learning and understanding of academic integrity at their next meeting.

5. Proposed Penalty letter

- 5.1 If the AIO decides that a breach has taken place, they have the discretion to propose a penalty and offer the student the opportunity to accept the penalty proposed without the need for an AI meeting if:
 - 5.1.1 There is no record of a penalty prior to submitting the piece of academic work or sitting the assessment; and
 - 5.1.2 The proposed penalty falls into the categories of Section A 5.4.1, 5.4.2 or 5.4.3; and
 - 5.1.3 The AIO is of the view that the case can be addressed without the need for an AI Meeting.

- 5.2 The CQA Team in the Host Faculty will notify the student of the decision of the AIO (including any proposed penalty) normally within five (5) working days of the suspected breach being identified. As part of the notification, the student will be advised of additional sources of support and advice. The notification will be copied to the relevant Module Lead (if applicable), the School Office/Graduate School Office and the student's PAT or supervisor.
- 5.3 The Student will have five (5) working days in which to respond to the CQA team with their decision. The student may either:
- 5.3.1 accept the findings and penalty; or
 - 5.3.2 request an AI Meeting; or
 - 5.3.3 request and be allowed five (5) further working days to notify the CQA team of their decision.
- 5.4 If a student does not respond to the notification detailed in Section B 5.2 above within the five (5) working day deadline and does not contact the University to request additional time, the penalty will be imposed and will be recorded into the student's record.
- 5.5 The request, by students, for additional time should be applied for within five (5) working days of the notification being sent.
- 5.6 Where a student accepts the penalty, or if the penalty is imposed under paragraph 5.4, a record of the breach and the penalty imposed will be recorded into the student's record. The notification will be copied to the relevant Module Lead (if applicable), the School Office/Graduate School Office and the student's PAT or supervisor, and any other staff as necessary.

6. AI Meeting

Notification of AI Meeting and exchange of information

- 6.1 If an AI Meeting is required, the Host CQA Team will arrange the meeting between the student and the AIO. The notification will normally be sent within five (5) working days of the suspected breach being raised, or the request from the student. The AI Meeting will take place between five (5) and ten (10) working days from the date of the notification or request. The student will be sent the evidence that the AIO will present at the meeting. The notification of the meeting and the existing evidence will be copied to the Module Lead and the student's PAT or supervisor, for information.
- 6.2 A student will normally respond within five (5) working days of the date of the notification providing any additional information and/or evidence that they will rely on at the meeting. The student may request up to five (5) further working days if they need to obtain advice or gather evidence. If the extended deadline is later than the meeting date, the meeting must be rearranged.
- 6.3 Students should confirm their attendance (in person or via agreed alternative means) with the CQA team in advance of the meeting. If a student fails to confirm their attendance or fails to attend the AI Meeting without good reason, the AIO will impose an outcome on the basis of the available evidence.

- 6.4 The AIO may take advice on specific issues as deemed necessary but must inform the examiners of a thesis, where they are already appointed, when imposing a penalty for cases involving a thesis.

Conduct of the Meeting

- 6.5 The meeting will be attended by the student, the student's Companion (if any, as set out in section B1), the AIO, and a note-taker. An additional member of staff may be permitted to attend the meeting as an observer with the prior agreement of the AIO and the student, for training purposes.
- 6.6 The meeting is confidential. It is expected that attendees will take reasonable steps to maintain this confidentiality.
- 6.7 The CQA Team in the Host Faculty will arrange for a note taker to record a summary of the main points of discussion.
- 6.8 If the nature of the investigation requires specialist knowledge, the AIO may also invite a member of staff to attend as a subject expert. In such cases, the student should be notified of this in advance of the meeting. The additional member of staff may ask the student questions related to the material and provide clarification to the AIO, but will not participate in decision-making about the case.
- 6.9 The meeting may serve one or more purposes including, but not limited to, a further investigation or discussion of the suspected breach and consideration of the evidence the student has submitted (see B6.2 above) as well as identification of how the student should maintain academic integrity in their future academic work and working practices.
- 6.10 At the meeting, the AIO will describe the purpose of the meeting, including the nature of the suspected breach.
- 6.11 The student, and their companion (if any), may be required to verify their identity.
- 6.12 The student will be given the opportunity to make a statement and discuss the evidence they have submitted, as well as respond to the evidence presented by the AIO. A copy of any written statement should be made available to the note taker. The student may confer privately with their Companion at any point during the AI Meeting.

Outcome of the AI Meeting

- 6.13 Following the meeting, the AIO will decide on the outcome:
- 6.14 Find that there has been no breach and
- a. take no further action; or
 - b. signpost the student to Additional Learning.
- 6.15 Find that there has been a breach, and
- a. subject to Section B 6.17 and B 6.18, impose one or more penalties; or
 - b. request that an AI Panel be convened to determine the penalty; or
- 6.16 Make no finding and refer the matter directly to an AI Panel for consideration.

- 6.17 An AIO must not impose one or more of the penalties in Section A5.4.6, 5.4.7, 5.4.8, 5.4.9, 5.4.10 (b-d), 5.4.11 or 5.4.12. In such cases an AI Panel must be convened to determine the penalty.
- 6.18 For research students, penalties 5.4.2, 5.4.3, 5.4.4, 5.4.5, 5.4.6, 5.4.7, 5.4.8 and 5.4.9 must not be applied to progression reviews or the thesis for examination.
- 6.19 In all cases the AIO must give reasons for the outcome selected and (where this applies) the reasons for not having selected a lesser outcome.
- 6.20 The CQA Team in the Host Faculty will notify the student of the outcome decided by the AIO (including any penalty given) normally within five (5) working days of the AI Meeting. The CQA team in the Home Faculty will record the penalty (if any) in the student's record.
- 6.21 A summary of the main points of discussion at the AI Meeting should be retained by the Host Faculty and a copy sent to the student along with the outcome, normally within five (5) working days, with a copy being placed in the student's file. Where the student disputes the summary, they may submit their own record which will be appended to the notes.

7. AI Panel

Convening an AI Panel

- 7.1 The student may dispute the outcome of the AI Meeting and/or the penalty imposed by the AIO as a result of the AI Meeting and may request to refer the matter to an AI Panel. The request must be submitted to the CQA Team in the Host Faculty, in writing. The student's written request will include the reasons for the dispute, indicate the evidence the student intends to rely upon and will normally be made within five (5) working days of the outcome of the AI Meeting being sent. The student may request an extension, but this should be applied for within five (5) working days of the AI meeting outcome and/or notification of the penalty imposed by the AIO having been sent.
- 7.2 An AI Panel must also be convened if requested by an AIO (in the circumstances set out in Section B 6.15b, 6.16 and 6.17 above). The AIO will provide the CQA team in the Host Faculty with the information necessary for the notification below and indicate if an appropriate penalty could be:
- termination of the student's programme of study, or
 - a recommendation to Senate for the withdrawal of an Award, or
 - a reduction in degree classification.

Notification and Exchange of Information

- 7.3 The CQA team in the Host Faculty will give the student written notice of the date, time, place, and purpose of the AI Panel meeting. The written notice will also include a summary of the nature of the suspected breach.
- 7.4 The AI Panel will be held as soon as reasonably practicable and normally within twenty (20) working days of the date of the notification being sent.

- 7.5 At least five (5) working days in advance of the AI Panel meeting, both the student and the University (via the CQA team in the Host Faculty) will supply to each other, where appropriate:
- A summary of the information each intends to present to the AI Panel;
 - A copy of any documents or other evidence that each party intends to rely on;
 - A copy of any witness statements;
 - The list of any witnesses names each party intends to call. The final decision in relation to an agreed list of witnesses will sit with the Chair.
- 7.6 Students should confirm their attendance (in person or via agreed alternative means) with the CQA team in advance of the meeting.
- 7.7 A student must make every effort to confirm their attendance and to attend an AI Panel. If a student fails to confirm their attendance or attend the AI Panel without good reason, the AI Panel will make a decision on the basis of the available evidence.

Members of and representatives at the AI Panel

- 7.8 The AI Panel hearing will be attended by the Panel members, the student, the student's Companion (if any, as set out in section B1), the School Representative (normally the AIO who identified the suspected breach), and a note-taker.
- 7.9 The AI Panel will usually comprise at least three (3) members as follows:

For taught students, or students on taught elements of programmes:

- 7.9.1 The Chair: this will be the Chair of a Board of Examiners (or nominee) from the Host School;
- 7.9.2 An AIO from a School independent of the case; and
- 7.9.3 A member of academic staff from the Home Faculty

For research students

- 7.9.4 The Chair: this will be the Faculty Director of the Graduate School (or nominee) of the student's Host Faculty;
- 7.9.5 Faculty Director of the Graduate School (or nominee) from a Faculty independent of the case; and
- 7.9.6 An AIO from a Faculty independent of the case.
- 7.9.7 The Chair may co-opt additional members of staff to the AI Panel.
- 7.10 Decisions of the AI Panel shall be made by a simple majority vote, with the Chair having a casting vote.
- 7.11 If the AIO has indicated that an appropriate penalty could be termination of the programme of study, a recommendation to Senate for the withdrawal of an Award, or a reduction in degree classification,

the Dean or nominee (usually the Associate Dean (Education/Research)) from the Home Faculty will normally join the panel as an additional member.

- 7.12 The Chair may take advice on specific issues as deemed necessary but must inform the examiners of a thesis, where they are already appointed, when imposing a penalty for cases involving a thesis.
- 7.13 Where a student is following a programme offered jointly with another institution, or an exchange programme or similar, reference should be made to the agreement to confirm the regulations under which the student's case should be pursued and AI Panel members may be varied accordingly.
- 7.14 The AIO involved in the AI Meeting, the member of staff responsible for identifying the suspected breach, and the student's PAT, must not be a member of the AI Panel and will not be involved in the decision of the AI Panel.
- 7.15 The CQA Team in the Host Faculty will arrange for a note taker to record a summary of the main points of discussion.

Conduct of the AI Panel Hearing

- 7.16 The duration of an AI Panel hearing will vary from case to case but must be proportionate to the nature and scope of the suspected breach, any facts in dispute, and the number of witnesses (if any) to be called.
- 7.17 The AI Panel hearing is confidential. It is expected that all attendees will take reasonable steps to maintain this confidentiality.
- 7.18 At the AI Panel hearing, the Chair will describe the purpose of convening the panel and introduce the members of the Panel.
- 7.19 The student, and their companion (if any), may be required to verify their identity.
- 7.20 The School Representative will describe the suspected breach and present supporting evidence.
- 7.21 The student will be given the opportunity to respond and present any evidence of their own. The student may confer privately with their Companion at any time during the hearing.
- 7.22 The School Representative and/or student may present witnesses or witness statements.
- 7.23 The School Representative and student will be given the opportunity to respond to any information given by a witness. The Panel may recall witnesses as it sees fit.
- 7.24 The School Representative will not cross-examine a witness or ask the student questions directly.
- 7.25 A student will not normally be permitted to cross-examine a witness unless, in exceptional circumstances, the Chair decides that a fair hearing could not be held otherwise or if the likely penalty to be imposed by the University is one of termination of the Programme, withdrawal of an Award, or a reduction in degree classification.
- 7.26 The School Representative may respond to statements made by the student.
- 7.27 Members of the AI Panel will ask the School Representative, witness(es), and/or student questions to clarify points where necessary.

- 7.28 The student will be given the opportunity to respond to any additional points made by the School Representative and/or witness(es).
- 7.29 The student, their Companion, and the School Representative will then leave the hearing at the same time and the AI Panel will discuss its decision in private. Although the note taker will remain present, notes will not be made of this discussion.
- 7.30 The University may adjourn the AI Panel hearing if further investigations need to be carried out or for additional witnesses to be called or for additional new information/evidence to be obtained. The student will be given a reasonable opportunity to consider any new information/evidence obtained before the AI Panel is reconvened.

Outcome of the AI Panel Hearing

- 7.31 The AI Panel may:
- a. Find that there is no breach, and
 - 1.1 take no further action; or
 - 1.2 signpost the student to Additional Learning.
 - b. Confirm a finding of breach of these Regulations and impose one or more of the penalties in Section A.
- 7.32 In all cases the AI Panel must give reasons for the outcome selected and (where this applies) the reasons for not having selected a lesser outcome.
- 7.33 If the AI Panel determines that the appropriate outcome is a reduction in a student's degree classification or termination from the programme, this decision will be recommended to the Dean of Faculty for ratification and reported to Senate.
- 7.34 If the AI Panel determines that the appropriate outcome is Withdrawal of Award, this decision will be recommended to the Dean, and once endorsed by the Dean or nominee, approved by Senate
- 7.35 The CQA team in the Host Faculty will inform the student in writing of the decision of the AI Panel and the reasons for it, normally within five (5) working days of the decision. The letter will also identify the appeals procedures set out in Section A.
- 7.36 The decision of the AI Panel to impose a penalty will be reported to, and recorded by, the Board of Examiners or Faculty Graduate School of the student's Home Faculty.

8. Reconsideration of Evidence

- 8.1 Where significant new evidence is identified by the University, which could not reasonably have been obtained at the time of its original investigation, it may be appropriate for the University to re-open an Academic Integrity investigation.
- 8.2 The investigation should initially follow the process outlined in section B 2.1 to B 2.3.
- 8.3 In deciding whether it is appropriate to re-open an Academic Integrity investigation, the following aspects should be considered:

- a) The severity of the suspected breach (it is only expected that investigations will be re-opened for suspected breaches of a serious nature);
 - b) The potential impact of the new evidence on the outcome and/or penalty from the initial investigation;
 - c) The reliability and strength of the new evidence, including a consideration of the elapsed time since the suspected breach was believed to have been committed;
 - d) The potential impact on the student of re-opening an investigation;
 - e) Any other implications, such as the requirements of professional/regulatory bodies.
- 8.4 The decision on whether to re-open an Academic Integrity investigation is for the Faculty Academic Integrity Officer (or nominee).
- 8.5 If a decision is made to re-open an Academic Integrity investigation, the student should be invited to attend an AI Meeting, following the procedure outlined in B 6 and any relevant subsequent procedures.

These Regulations Governing Academic Integrity were approved by Senate on the 16 June 2021. They shall come into force at the start of the 2021/22 academic year. Any breaches of academic integrity received before the 2021/22 academic year will continue to be dealt with in accordance with the Regulations in force at the time the notification of breach was received. Breaches of academic integrity may only be dealt with under regulations in force at the start of a student's programme if it is proven that substantial disadvantage would result otherwise.

Reviewed in June 2016; no changes made.

Reviewed in June 2017; changes approved by Senate on 21 June 2017.

Reviewed in May 2018; changes approved by Senate on 20 June 2018.

Reviewed in May 2019; changes approved by Senate on 19 June 2019.

Reviewed in May 2020; changes in response to COVID-19 approved by Senate on 26 May 2020.

Reviewed in May 2021; changes approved by Senate on 16 June 2021.

Reviewed in May 2022; changes approved by Senate on 15 June 2022.