

Academic Integrity and Academic Misconduct Policy

2025-26

Owner:	Registrar & Head of Academic Quality
Author:	Head of Academic Quality
Version Number:	2.0
Approval Date:	
Approved By:	Academic Board
Date of Commencement:	01 September 2025
Date of Last Review:	01 December 2025
Date for Next Review:	01 September 2026

Contents

1.	Purpose	3
2.	Scope	3
3.	Equality impact	3
4.	Policy Statement and Principles	3
5.	Penalties for Academic Misconduct	12
6.	Academic Misconduct Procedure	5
7.	Appeals	12
8.	Independent Review - Office of the Independent Adjudicator (OIA)	15
9.	Enforcement	15
10.	Behaviour during the academic misconduct investigation process	15
11.	Related Policies and Procedures	16
	Annex 1	17
	Annex 2	22

1. Purpose

- 1.1 This policy provides information on Academic Integrity and Academic Misconduct.
- 1.2 The policy and procedures outlined within set out how Academic Integrity is safeguarded and how Academic Misconduct is managed at GIS, to ensure that all decisions are taken in an honest, transparent, and respectful manner.
- 1.3 As a learning community, GIS recognise 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. GIS are committed to ensuring that every member of the institution is made aware of the responsibilities in maintaining the highest standards of academic integrity and of the steps necessary to protect those standards.
- 1.4 GIS are determined that students should know and understand good academic practice, and this is matched by our resolve that academic misconduct should not prosper. Accordingly, GIS have adopted a balanced approach, providing support to enable students to acquire knowledge and skills to maintain academic integrity. GIS and the University of East London are 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 for following regulations for the proper conduct of assessments. No credit will be awarded for work found to have breached these Academic Misconduct Regulations.

2. Scope

- 2.1 This policy applies to all GIS students registered on undergraduate and taught postgraduate courses awarded by the University of East London (UEL).
- 2.2 The policy and reflects the [UEL Academic and General Regulations 2025-26](#).
- 2.3 A student cannot initiate an academic misconduct action against another student; this can only be done by an academic member of staff.
- 2.4 This policy may be applied retrospectively in cases where a graduate is found to have committed academic misconduct while enrolled at GIS and the University of East London. However, the Institution will take into account the specific circumstances of the case and the seriousness of the alleged misconduct when determining whether to proceed.

3. Equality impact

- 3.1 This policy is neutral in terms of equality-related issues.

4. Policy Statement and Principles

4.1 Statement

- 4.2 All GIS students are expected to meet the standards of behaviour required of them as a member of the GIS community. The Institution, in alignment with UEL, has a range of policies and procedures to manage breaches of student codes of conduct, student contracts or other codes of practice with fairness and consideration of individual circumstances.

Principles

The approach taken by GIS relating to Academic Integrity is based upon the values of honesty, integrity, responsibility, trust, respect, and fairness and guided by the following principles:

- Each of us takes responsibility for our own work.
- We treat the work of others with respect and in accordance with good academic practice.
- We understand that some students may need guidance and compassionate support in developing good academic practices, and we are dedicated to offering support in various ways to help them build the skills needed for academic success. Our teaching and support staff will reinforce these learning opportunities by exhibiting and promoting academic integrity in all areas of their professional practice.
- Teaching staff will be encouraged to design assessments that minimise the opportunity to breach academic integrity.
- No credit will be awarded to any work that breaches our regulations.
- All proven instances of academic misconduct will be penalised.

5. Academic Poor Practice

- 5.1 Academic Poor Practice is defined as the result of limited academic skills or understanding, typically arising from a student's lack of familiarity with the expectations and conventions of academic work in higher education. Examples include (but are not 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:
 - 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.
 - 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.
- 5.2 Academic poor practice will also be considered against the following factors:
- a) Students in their first term of higher education (typically at levels 3 and 4), or Level 7 students without recent experience of study in UK higher education and may not yet have acquired the necessary knowledge and understanding to demonstrate good academic practice.
 - b) Instances of unintended plagiarism, self-plagiarism or collusion which occur during the early stages of a student's studies (as above), will be regarded as academic poor practice. Providing there is no premeditated dishonesty involved
- 5.3 Work that is identified as academic poor practice should be dealt with through the marking and feedback process (not through the academic misconduct process). Students who wish to appeal against their confirmed results may appeal in accordance with the procedure for [Appeals against Assessment Board decisions - Part 6 of the Manual of General Regulations](#).
- 5.4 Academic misconduct includes but is not limited to the following definitions. For the purposes of this policy, please note the definitions in [Annex 1](#).
- [Academic Integrity](#)

- Academic Misconduct
- Academic Poor Practice
- Collusion
- Contract Cheating
- Coursework Submitted for Assessment
- Examinations
- Generative AI (GenAI)
- Plagiarism
- Research Ethics misconduct
- Self-Plagiarism

5.5 Decisions relating to whether academic integrity has been breached require evidence based on a **Balance of Probabilities**.

6. Academic Misconduct Procedure

6.1 Reporting

- Where an assessing staff member suspects academic misconduct, they must complete the following actions and report their finding to the Resolutions Officer via resolutions@gis.sport **within 5 working days of detection**:
 - Clarify the nature of the action suspected of being academic misconduct,
 - Identify and collate relevant evidence,
 - Complete sections 1 and 2(a) of a formal academic misconduct allegations and record (AMAR) form on the student's action,
 - The assessment is annotated with the following comment: *"No grade can currently be provided due to potential breach of academic integrity being identified in this assignment. The student will be notified of the allegation(s) and invited to discuss these concerns with a member of the academic team in due course,"*
 - No further feedback is provided on the assessment until the case is closed.
- An assessing staff member that suspects academic misconduct is known as the "Identifier."
- The Identifier, in consultation with the Resolutions Officer, will determine whether it appears academic misconduct has occurred, by reviewing the reported circumstances and any relevant materials, including suspected source materials, and notifying the student of a potential breach **within 10 working days**.
- If, within the stipulated time period noted in 6.1.3, the Identifier and Resolutions Officer have not found evidence that misconduct may have occurred, the work will be marked as normal, and no further action will be taken.

6.2 Initial Meeting between Identifier and Student

- Where it is deemed that academic misconduct may have occurred, the Resolutions Officer will inform a student of any academic misconduct allegation. The student will be invited to an initial exploratory meeting with the Identifier to take place **within 5 working days** of the notification email.
- If academic misconduct has been alleged because an assessor 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, have been taken), then a viva voce interview may be incorporated within the meeting with the Identifier. The student will be informed in advance that a viva voce interview will be taking place in accordance with UEL's guidance in conducting viva voce interviews in relation to academic misconduct.
- In cases such as collusion, where two or more students have an allegation of academic misconduct, the students may be invited to a group meeting.
- The Identifier will be accompanied by an independent colleague.
- Academic Misconduct Regulations do not apply in an instance where an assessment has been submitted outside of a stipulated deadline and is therefore not eligible for marking. This does not include instances where:
 - An auto-extension has been granted for registered learning support students;
OR
 - A mitigating circumstances (Self-Certification and/or Evidenced) claim has been granted.
- The student will be entitled to be accompanied to the meeting by one person, who may be a relative, friend, colleague, or a member of Student Support. 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.
- The initial meeting may take place via MS Teams. For viva voce interviews, all parties will be expected to enable their webcam.
- At that meeting, the student will be reminded of the Academic Integrity and Misconduct Policy (including the tariff of penalties at [Annex 2](#)), shown 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 method used to detect similarity to a published source.
- If the student does not appear at the date and time scheduled for the exploratory meeting or refuses to take part, the Resolutions Officer will consider whether any reasons offered are valid and, if so, judges whether to adjourn proceedings to a later date. One adjournment alone will be permitted where there is valid reason. Further adjournment(s) will only be agreed by exception and at the discretion of the Resolutions Officer and the Identifier.

- If the student does not attend the meeting, without giving notice or supplying a reason, they will be deemed to have accepted the proposed allegation and notified of the penalty or next steps in writing.
- Students are required to confirm that they understand how the assessment in question is considered to have breached the Academic Integrity and Academic Misconduct Policy. Further instances of academic misconduct are likely to lead to a serious penalty, in addition to undertaking all necessary steps to ensure that Academic Regulations are not breached moving forwards. Where a student may not admit to academic misconduct, please refer to clause 6.3.
- Following the initial exploratory meeting, the Identifier will update the AMAR form with details from the meeting in Section 2(b) and return to the Resolutions Officer **within 5 working days**.
- If a viva voce interview is conducted, the Identifier must complete the viva voce reporting form and return to the Resolutions Officer **within 5 working days**.
- Following receipt of the exploratory meeting, or if the stipulated time period noted in 6.2.13 is surpassed, the investigation may result in one of the following outcomes:

Outcome	Action	Action Detail
No Case	No further action required	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> a) The assessment will be marked and released with feedback provided. b) they achieved grade released with no penalty. c) AMAR form completed and submitted to Resolutions Officer for recording.
Poor Academic Practice	Handled via marking process	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> a) The assessment will be marked and released with feedback provided. b) The grade discounted sufficiently to reflect the degree of poor academic practice. c) AMAR form completed and submitted to Resolutions Officer for recording.

Academic Integrity Breached	Offence made and further action required	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> a) The assessment annotation (6.1.1) remains. b) AMAR form completed, with all relevant evidence and submitted to Resolutions Officer for processing. c) AMAR case file is then reviewed by the Resolutions Officer in collaboration with the Identifier. d) The level of penalty the student is given depends on the severity of the academic misconduct with the potential for an Academic Misconduct Panel to be convened (see following clauses).
-----------------------------	--	--

- The Resolutions Officer will formally communicate the outcome of the investigation to the student, along with the completed AMAR form and any penalties to apply, subject to UEL Assessment/Progression Board.

No Case

- Where the student has produced work, which is not deemed to have breached academic regulations, an outcome of no offence will be issued by the Resolutions Officer.

Poor Academic Practice

- Where the student has produced work which is poorly referenced or incorrectly referenced resulting from misunderstanding or lack of confidence using academic conventions, an outcome of poor academic practice will be issued by the Resolutions Officer.

Academic Integrity Breached – First instance of minor offence

- Where breaches of academic integrity occur for the first time, providing that there is no evidence of pre-meditated dishonesty (see section 7), a Level A penalty will be issued by the Resolutions Officer. The assessment concerned will be issued with the penalty as stipulated in [Annex 2](#).

Academic Integrity Breached – Serious Offence

- Where a first instance of serious academic misconduct and/or any academic misconduct following a Level A penalty has occurred, a Level B1 penalty will be issued. In more serious cases, an Academic Misconduct Panel may be convened prior to issuance of an outcome. The assessment concerned will be issued the penalty as stipulated in [Annex 2](#).

6.3 Post-Outcome Procedure

- Where a student admits to academic misconduct but does not accept the proposed penalty, the student must submit a written statement outlining their reasons for not accepting the penalty **within 5 working days from receipt of the outcome**. The Resolutions Officer will forward the statement to the Responsible Officer for consideration.

- If the Responsible Officer rejects the student's statement, the Resolutions Officer will notify the student **within 5 working days** that they can submit their statement for proceeding to an Academic Misconduct Panel. This will be considered by a Responsible Officer external to that of the student's course.
- Where the student attends the meeting and:
 - Does not admit academic misconduct because they have suitable grounds to challenge the decision and/or;
 - Feels that there are unique and particular circumstances that mitigate or explain the allegation(s)

The student must submit an evidence-based proposal for proceeding to an Academic Misconduct Panel **within 5 working days from receipt of the outcome**. The Resolutions Officer will forward the proposal to the Responsible Officer separate to that of the student's course.

- Where a proposal or statement to proceed to an Academic Misconduct Panel is **not** received within the stipulated time period, the request will be rejected, and the proposed outcome and penalty will stand.
- Where a proposal or statement to proceed to an Academic Misconduct Panel is received within the stipulated time period, the Responsible Officer will review the proposal or statement and decide whether there are sufficient grounds for the case to be considered by an Academic Misconduct Panel. This decision must be made **within 10 working days** of receipt of the proposal by the Responsible Officer from the Resolutions Officer.
- 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 will consider the full range of issues relating to the student's proposal or statement along with the details of the alleged breach.
- Where the student's proposal or statement does not provide sufficient grounds to allow the student's case to proceed to an Academic Misconduct Panel, the reviewing Responsible Officer will complete a written report **within 10 working days** of receiving the proposal or statement, providing their decision and explanation for this. This will be forwarded to the Resolutions Officer for review and, if accepted, will inform the student **within 5 working days of receipt** that the proposed penalty will be applied.
- The decision of the reviewing Responsible Officer is final and there shall be no right of appeal.
- If the proposal or statement is deemed valid by the reviewing Responsible Officer, the matter will be considered by an Academic Misconduct Panel. This student will be informed of this, in writing, by the Resolutions Officer **within 5 working days of receipt of decision**.
- The written notification must also inform the student that any case heard by an Academic Misconduct Panel may result in being awarded a more severe penalty than that originally proposed.

6.4 Referrals to an Academic Misconduct Panel

- An Academic Misconduct Panel will take place if:

- The student admits to academic misconduct but does not accept the proposed Level A or Level B1 penalty AND has a written statement approved by the Responsible Officer.
- The student does not accept the proposed Level A or Level B1 penalty because they have suitable grounds to challenge the decision AND has an evidence-based proposal approved by the Responsible Officer.
- The student feels that there are unique and particular circumstances that mitigate or explain the allegation(s) AND has an evidence-based proposal approved by the Responsible Officer.
- If the offence occurred in an exam.
- If misconduct has occurred in a previous assessment which received a Level B1 penalty.
- For any other serious offence attracting a high penalty (Level B2 and above).
- For any other case as deemed necessary by the Responsible Officer.

6.5 **Academic Misconduct Panels**

- Following a referral, an Academic Misconduct Panel should be convened by the Resolutions Officer, to investigate the facts of a case and/or to determine the appropriate penalty.
- The constitution of the Academic Misconduct Panel should be:
 - Two members of GIS academic staff. At least one of the Panel will be a neutral member of academic staff (Programme Leader or above), with appropriate expertise of academic misconduct procedures.
 - Where possible, a student representative nominated by the Student's Union.
 - Where appropriate, the Programme Leader will act as the Chair.
 - The Resolutions Officer (or nominee) will officer the panel.
 - Cases considering allegations that may warrant Level C or D penalties would expect to have a Head of Service or Department as Chair e.g., Head of Academics, Head of Academic Quality etc.
 - The Resolutions Officer will also consider UEL representation at such panels.
 - Where possible we will seek to ensure that the composition of the panel reflects the character of our institution.
 - 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.
- In cases such as collusion, where two or more students have an allegation of academic misconduct, GIS may decide to deal with these cases together.
- At the discretion of the Chair, an Academic Misconduct Panel may take place via MS Teams.
- Proceedings of an Academic Misconduct Panel shall be as follows:

- 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 Officer **7 working days** prior to the Panel date.
- All relevant records of the exploratory meeting shall be made available to the Academic Misconduct Panel, together with all relevant correspondence from the Resolutions Officer.
- The student will be entitled to be accompanied to the meeting by one person, who may be a relative, friend, colleague, or a member of Student Support. 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.
- The student must inform the Resolutions Officer of any person accompanying them at least **5 working days prior to the Panel date**. If details of the accompanying person are not provided by this time, the Panel can reserve the right to refuse admission to the accompanying person. If the accompanying person's behaviour within the Panel is deemed inappropriate, the Chair has the right to demand that they be removed from the Panel.
- The student shall have the right to call and to question witnesses. 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 member of Student Support if present).
- If the student does not appear at the date and time scheduled for the hearing, the Academic Misconduct Panel shall consider whether any reasons provided for non-attendance are valid, and:
 - If no reasons are provided, or if they are judged invalid, proceed in the respondent's absence, regarding the student (subject to any written account) as having admitted none of the allegations.
 - If members so judge, adjourn proceedings to a later meeting.
- If the Identifier (or nominee) does not appear at the date and time scheduled for the Academic Misconduct Panel, the case will be permanently withdrawn, with no grounds for appeal.
- In determining whether the allegation(s) has/have been proven, the Panel must be satisfied that the allegation(s) is/are proven **on the balance of probability**.
- In reaching its conclusions on whether the allegation(s) has/have been proven, the Academic Misconduct Panel shall consider fully any relevant input from staff familiar with the student's circumstances and/or previous performance.
- Should an Academic Misconduct Panel be unable to reach an agreed decision, the Chair will determine a final decision.
- The Academic Misconduct Panel shall submit a written report, detailing the outcome of the case, to the Resolutions Officer **within 10 working days**. The Resolutions Officer will

issue the outcome to the student and the Identifier **within 2 working days** of receipt of the report.

- If the student is found to have breached these regulations, the Panel will impose a penalty in accordance with the tariff at [Annex 2](#) below and a record of the outcome shall be kept on the student's file.
- Students will be given **20 working days** after the meeting to review the panel outcome and decide whether they wish to appeal or accept the outcome.
- If the student accepts the penalty, the Resolutions Officer (or nominee) will notify the tutor, administrator, etc. and the penalty will be applied and detailed on the student record. The student is sent a decision outcome notice via email from the Resolutions Officer (or nominee).
- If the student decides to contest the allegation, the Resolutions Officer (or nominee) will explain the process for rejecting the penalty and the student will be asked to present a written response for consideration by the Director of Student and Academic Services (or nominee) within **20 working days** from the date of notification of the Academic Misconduct Panel decision to contest the allegation, stating the ground(s) of appeal (see section 7).
- Students are recommended to speak to a Students' Union adviser at this point in the process if they have not already.
- 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 Student Conduct Team, with the recommendation that any student concerned be expelled under the general disciplinary powers of the Vice-Chancellor & President.

7. Penalties for Academic Misconduct

7.1 Criteria for determining the penalty for academic misconduct

When determining the appropriate penalty, a rising tariff and an indicative penalty tariff approach will be applied when determining sanctions for academic misconduct, ensuring consistency while taking individual circumstances into account. Where an allegation is referred to an Academic Misconduct Panel Hearing, the Panel will carefully consider the nature of the misconduct using the criteria outlined below, considering the student's prior academic conduct and the specific context of the current case:

- **Pre-Meditated Dishonesty:** Deliberate and intentional academic misconduct that is planned in advance, rather than occurring spontaneously or due to misunderstanding will normally be considered more serious than that which has arisen inadvertently.
- **Previous history:** A previous history of academic misconduct will normally be considered as being more serious than a first instance of academic misconduct.
- **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 there involves human

agency or generated by Artificial Intelligence, will normally be considered more serious than that involving the authorised, but unattributed, use of another person's work.

- **Other:** Any other relevant factors pertinent to individual cases may be considered in the penalty.

7.2 **Tariff of Penalties for Academic Misconduct**

In determining the penalty, the Resolutions Officer and Academic Misconduct Panel shall have due regard of the need to:

- maintain the academic standards of the institution.
- deal equitably with the students of the institution.
- apply proportional penalties in all circumstances.

The tariff of penalties for academic misconduct is set on in [Annex 2](#).

8. Appeals

7.1 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.

7.2 There shall be no appeal against the decision of the Academic Misconduct Panel except on the grounds that:

- There is new and material evidence which the student was, for exceptional reasons, unable to present to the Academic Misconduct Panel.
- 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.
- There is documented evidence of bias on the part of the members of the Academic Misconduct Panel or its Officer.
- The penalty imposed exceeded that available to the Academic Misconduct Panel.

7.3 An appeal can only be made against the decision of the Academic Misconduct Panel and not of any outcomes issued earlier in the process.

7.4 Any student wishing to appeal must submit to the Registrar (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. If accepted, an Appeal Panel may take place.

7.5 The Appeal Panel shall have power to:

- adjourn the hearing to a future date;
- confirm the penalty imposed;
- moderate the penalty imposed to a lesser penalty, the panel may not impose a greater penalty;

- uphold the appeal and overturn a decision to impose a penalty, refer any case to a disciplinary or Fitness to Study proceeding.

7.6 No new evidence may be given at an appeal panel, 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.

7.7 Should the request for an appeal be successful, an Appeal Panel shall be convened by the Registrar (or nominee).

7.8 The panel will be made up of three academic staff members not previously involved with the case, one of whom will be a Deputy Dean, who will Chair the meeting. The Resolutions Officer (or nominee) will officiate the meeting.

7.9 Notice for the Appeal Panel should be no less than **10 working days**.

7.10 **Appeal Panel Proceedings**

- In the event of an appeal of the Academic Misconduct Panel's decision, the following procedure should be followed.
- The Resolutions Officer will invite the student and the Chair of the Academic Misconduct Panel to attend the Appeal Panel, informing them of the date, time, and venue. There shall be no other persons invited to attend the hearing, save that the student may be accompanied.
- The student will be entitled to be accompanied to the meeting by a relative, friend, colleague, or a member of Student Support. 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.
- The Resolutions Officer will circulate the case papers to the members of the Appeal Panel, the appellant, and the Chair of the relevant Academic Panel at least 10 working days prior to the hearing.
- The Chair of the relevant Academic Misconduct Panel shall be invited to submit a response to the appeal, which should be received at least 5 working days prior to the hearing. The Resolutions Officer shall circulate the response to the members of the Appeal Panel and the appellant (and relative, friend, colleague, or a member of Student Support) at least 3 working days prior to the hearing.
- In the event of late papers being received by the Resolutions 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.
- The student may elect not to appear in person before the Appeal Panel. In such cases, the Appeal Panel will consider the appeal based on written submissions. If, however, a written submission is not clear, the Panel will arrive at a decision based on the evidence available to it.

- Should the student fail to appear at the hearing without reasonable cause or explanation, the Appeal Panel will hear the appeal in absentia and arrive at a decision on the basis of the evidence available to it.
- The Appeal Panel, having regard to all the written and verbal evidence provided, will decide whether the decision being appealed was fair, reasonable, and proportionate.
- In the event of the Appeal Panel not being able to reach a unanimous decision, there will be a majority conclusion.
- **Within 10 working days** of the Appeal Panel, the Resolutions Officer (or nominee) will formally notify the student of the outcome which will set out its reasons for either dismissing or upholding the appeal. No further correspondence shall be entered into.
- The decision of the Panel will be final and there shall be no further right of appeal.

9. Independent Review - Office of the Independent Adjudicator (OIA)

- 9.1 If the student is not satisfied with the outcome, they may request that the case is reviewed by the Office of the Independent Adjudicator which is a body independent of our University.
- 9.2 The grounds and eligibility for review shall be determined by the Office of the Independent Adjudicator (OIA). The OIA provides an independent scheme for the review of student grievances under the Higher Education Act 2021.

10. Enforcement

- 10.1 If any student of GIS refuses to comply with a request or decision made to enforce this policy, their refusal will be reported to the Registrar (or nominee), who will take such action to enforce this policy, as necessary.
- 10.2 Each academic year GIS Academic Board will receive a report that enables it to monitor, identify and act on any shortfalls in how these regulations are interpreted and applied.
- 10.3 The annual report will include statistical data on the number of allegations that are raised by the type of misconduct; the outcomes; programme clusters from which they originate; the length of the process; the protected characteristics (including sex, disability, and ethnicity) of those involved; penalties applied, and cases dismissed.

11. Behaviour during the academic misconduct investigation process

- 11.1 GIS has zero tolerance towards those whose behaviour is considered to be unacceptable and will take action in this respect. Unacceptable behaviour includes communicating with GIS 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
 - Making claims that are knowingly false or unfounded.
- 11.2 If the behaviour of a student is unacceptable, GIS will usually tell the student why their behaviour is considered as such and will allow an opportunity to amend it. If the behaviour continues, GIS will enact the UEL Non-Academic Misconduct policy.

12. Related Policies and Procedures

12.1 [GIS Policies](#)

12.2 [UEL Policies](#)

- Generative AI [Policy](#) and [Principles](#)
- [UEL Manual of General Regulations 2025-26](#)
- Student Code of Conduct
- Non-Academic Misconduct Policy

Annex 1

Definitions

Phrase	Definition
Academic Integrity	The honour code of academia, meaning you are committed to honesty in your work, respecting the ideas of others through proper referencing, taking responsibility for your own learning, and acting fairly in all academic activities.
Academic Misconduct	<p>is defined as practice which leads to unfair advantage in an assessment for the purposes of achieving personal gain.</p> <p>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.</p> <p>Academic Misconduct includes, but is not limited to the following:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none">a) Obtaining information from any other person or source during a viva examination, except those materials explicitly permitted.b) Importation into an examination room of materials or devices.c) Other than those which are specifically permitted under the regulations applying to the examination in question.d) Reference to such materials (whether written or electronically recorded) during the period of the examination, whether or not such reference is made within the examination room.e) Refusing, when asked, to surrender any materials requested by an invigilator.f) The application of an electronic device unless this has been expressly permitted for that examination.g) Copying the work of another candidate.h) Disruptive behaviour during examination or assessment.i) Obtaining or seeking to obtain access to unseen examination questions prior to the examination.j) Failure to observe the instructions of a person invigilating an examination or seeking to intimidate such a person.k) Impersonating or attempting to impersonate another candidate or being knowingly impersonated.l) Offering an inducement to invigilators and/or staff and/or other persons connected with assessment.m) Communicating with other students during a timed assessment, unless clearly stated as collaborative or groupwork.

	<ul style="list-style-type: none">n) Participating in collusion during an examination, this includes actioning dishonestly in any way, whether before, during or after an assessment, to obtain an unfair advantage.o) Using generative artificial intelligence software or applications including large Language models to generate answers.
--	--

<p>Poor Academic Practice</p>	<p>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 not limited to):</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • 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: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> 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. <p>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 through the academic misconduct process).</p> <p>Students who wish to appeal against their confirmed results may appeal in accordance with the procedure for Appeals against Assessment Board decisions - Part 7 of Manual of General regulations.</p>
<p>Collusion</p>	<p>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 submits part or all as their own work.</p>
<p>Contract Cheating</p>	<p>Occurs when work commissioned or produced by third parties i.e., essay mills, ghost-writing companies, and other sources.</p>
<p>Coursework Submitted for Assessment</p>	<p>For coursework submissions, academic misconduct includes, but is not limited to the following:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> a) Including in your own work material whether written, visual, or oral without giving suitable acknowledgement to its creator and/or author, including in your own work material whether written, visual or oral without giving suitable acknowledgement to its creator and/or author.

This includes the use of Generative Artificial Intelligence (GenAI) tools beyond what is allowed in the assessment brief.

- 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 in your own work concepts, ideas or theories paraphrased from a source(s) without the use of citing it/ or them.
- d) Submitting sections whether it is electronic or hard copy, without acknowledging the source.
- e) The submission of work that the student, as the author, has previously submitted, without suitable acknowledgement of the source of their previous work. Unless permitted to do so as part of the in-course retrieval process.
- f) Including or quoting the work of other students in one's work, except for published work, or outputs held in the library as a learning resource, which should be cited and acknowledged appropriately.
- g) Being party to any arrangement whereby the work of one candidate is represented as that of another.
- h) The submission, as your own work, of any work that 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 whether there is human agency or AI generative.
- i) Practices such as 'cutting and pasting' or otherwise copying segments of text into your work, without clearly indicating that the text is a quotation.
- j) For work not intended to be submitted as a collaborative assignment: producing work with one or more other students, using study practices that mean the submitted work is nearly identical, overall or in part, to that of other students.
- k) Attempts to circumvent the similarity checking programmes that the University uses (including the use of spinning websites to rephrase text).
- l) The submission of AI-generated content as your own work, without adequate referencing or acknowledgment.

Other forms of Unfair Practice:

- m) Offering an inducement to staff and/or other persons connected with Assessment.
- n) Falsifying data and references in any assessment.
- o) Work placement fraud.

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.
Self-Plagiarism	When work that has already been submitted for assessment either to GIS, or another institution, and is then used again in another assessment.
The Balance of Probability	means deciding if something is more likely than not to have happened, based on the evidence.
Generative AI (GenAI)	refers to artificial intelligence systems capable of creating new content, typically in the form of images, text, audio or video, that is original and not directly copied from existing examples. Popular and widely available Gen AI products include Microsoft Co-pilot and ChatGPT. Content that is then submitted as your own original work
Research Ethics Misconduct	A breach of ethical approval occurs when a student submits assessed work, such as a dissertation, research project, or other coursework, that includes research requiring ethical approval, where such approval has not been sought, granted or confirmed prior to the commencement of the research activities, or where the student makes a major deviation from any approved research without gaining additional ethical approval through the Institutions ethical approval processes.
Work Placement fraud:	Work placement fraud is a type of fraudulent activity that typically involves individuals and organisations misrepresenting or exploiting opportunities related to work placements. An example of this is when a student provides falsify information to exploit or secure work placement opportunities.
Viva Voce	is a meeting held to assess a student's subject knowledge and to gain a clearer understanding of how they completed a particular piece of work. It is not a disciplinary hearing, but rather an opportunity for the student to explain their approach, demonstrate ownership of their work, and clarify any uncertainties or concerns that may have arisen during marking or review

Annex 2

Tariff of penalties for academic misconduct

Academic Misconduct Penalties – UG and PG Programmes	
<p>Level A1: First instance of minor academic misconduct</p> <p>A student who plagiarises for the first time will be issued with a Level A1 Penalty, providing that there is no evidence of pre-meditated dishonesty.</p>	<p>Level A2: First instance of minor academic misconduct</p> <p>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.</p>
<p>Penalty Outcome:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The student will be issued with a capped pass mark for the relevant component. <p>Or</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • If the extent of the academic misconduct means that the work is a fail, the student will be issued with a mark of 0 for 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. <p>If a mark of zero is issued during a reassessment opportunity, this may impact the students ability to continue on their course, as per the Academic Regulations. The Assessment Board will determine the appropriate consequence.</p> <p>A Level A1 Penalty is neither recorded on a transcript, nor reported to a professional body.</p>	<p>Penalty Outcome:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • 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. <p>If a mark of zero is issued during a reassessment opportunity, this may impact the students ability to continue on their course, as per the Academic Regulations. The Assessment Board will determine the appropriate consequence.</p> <p>A Level A2 Penalty is neither recorded on a transcript, nor reported to a professional body.</p>

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 (to be reviewed by an Academic Misconduct Panel)
---	---

<p>Penalty Outcome:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • 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. <p>Where a Level B1 penalty is issued at the reassessment point, this may impact the students ability to continue on their course, as per the Academic Regulations. The Assessment Board will determine the appropriate consequence.</p> <p>NB – For undergraduate awards, this penalty will be recorded on a transcript, and the allegation may be reported to a professional body.</p> <p>For Postgraduate awards, a Level B1 Penalty is neither recorded on a transcript, nor reported to a professional body.</p> <p>Indicative Misconduct:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • 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 inappropriate use of artificial intelligence or work commissioned by third parties. 	<p>Penalty Outcome:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • 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. <p>Where a Level B2 penalty is issued at the reassessment point, this may impact the students ability to continue on their course, as per the Academic Regulations. The Assessment Board will determine the appropriate consequence.</p> <p>NB – For undergraduate awards, this penalty will be recorded on a transcript, and the allegation may be reported to a professional body.</p> <p>For Postgraduate awards, a Level B2 Penalty is neither recorded on a transcript, nor reported to a professional body.</p> <p>Indicative Misconduct:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • 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 B1 penalty. • Any further instances where there is evidence of pre-meditated dishonesty. This may include the inappropriate use of artificial intelligence or work commissioned by third parties.
--	--

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)

<p>Penalty Outcome:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • 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. <p>Where a Level C penalty is issued at the reassessment point, this may impact the students ability to continue on their course, as per the Academic Regulations. The Assessment Board will determine the appropriate consequence.</p>	<p>Indicative Misconduct:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • 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 apply to academic misconduct involving theft, the falsification of work, impersonation, bribery, reference to prohibited materials in an examination and/or the attempted intimidation of an invigilator).
--	--

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

<p>Penalty Outcome:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The student will be issued with a mark of 0 for the relevant assessment component. • Expulsion with immediate effect. 	<p>Misconduct:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • 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 warning in the first instance or a Penalty if repeated, 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 has previously received a Level A 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.

Upheld allegations of academic misconduct at Undergraduate level resulting in a Level B, C and D penalty will be recorded on the transcript and may also result in any relevant professional body being notified.

Upheld allegations of academic misconduct at Postgraduate level resulting in a Level C and D penalty will be recorded on the transcript and may also result in any relevant professional body being notified.

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 B, Level C or Level D recorded breach, on any previous assessment attempt, cannot be pass compensated.

Any module with a Level A1 or Level A2 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.