

# Registry and Student Administration **Policy: Academic Integrity**



## Version Control

Policy Name:	Academic Integrity
Owner:	Anne Miller, Interim Academic Registrar
Author:	Tori McKay, Associate Director (Academic Experience)
Approved by:	Senate
Date of Approval of this Version:	03.07.2024
Next Review Date:	June 2025
Version Number:	1.0
Applicable Statutory, Legal or National Best Practice Requirements:	OIA – Good Practice Framework: Disciplinary Procedures (Oct 2018) OIA – Good Practice Framework: Handling Complaints and Appeals (Dec 2022) OIA – Good Practice Framework: Bias and the Perception of Bias (Dec 2022) The Equality Act (2010) UK Higher Education Providers – Advice on Consumer Protection Law (May 2023)
Equality Impact Assessment Completion Date:	29.05.2024
Data Protection Impact Assessment Completion Date:	28.05.2024

This document can only be considered valid when viewed via the University website and/or intranet. If this document is printed into hard copy or saved to another location, you must check that the version number on your copy matches that of the one on the University website. Approved documents are valid for use after their approval date and remain in force beyond any expiry of their review date until a new version is available.

Any supporting documents listed in this policy can be found on the Student Casework [Academic Misconduct site](#).

## Contents

1. Introduction and Aims.....	1
2. Purpose and Scope.....	1
3. Academic Integrity and Good Academic Practice .....	1
4. Poor Academic Practice versus Academic Misconduct.....	2
5. Concerns about Academic Practice/Integrity.....	3
6. Academic Concern Meetings.....	3
7. Academic Integrity Investigations .....	4
8. Outcomes for Academic Misconduct Cases.....	8
9. Appealing a Misconduct Outcome and/or Penalty .....	8
10. Consideration of Extenuating/Personal Circumstances .....	9
11. Roles and Responsibilities .....	10
12. Accessibility and Inclusivity .....	11
13. Oversight, Implementation and Support.....	11

## 1. Introduction and Aims

- 1.1 The University of Bradford is committed to upholding the highest standards of academic quality and integrity. Academic integrity involves both individual responsibility and collective commitment and is essential, not only for maintaining the credibility of our awards and programmes of study, but also for ensuring fairness, respect, and trust within our academic community.
- 1.2 While it is accepted that a key part of a student's academic journey at the University will involve the development and refinement of their academic practice, all students are expected to take responsibility for their own learning and agree to adhere to the fundamental expectations regarding academic integrity and good academic practice.
- 1.3 This policy aims to outline the University's expectations with regards to good academic practice and provides a robust, yet supportive, framework for considering academic integrity concerns. The policy aims to ensure that all such concerns are investigated fairly, consistently and in a timely manner, and that all parties are clear on their roles and responsibilities regarding the process.

## 2. Purpose and Scope

- 2.1 This policy applies to all students participating in taught programmes and/or modules at the University of Bradford, regardless of qualification level or subject discipline.
- 2.2 The basic principle of this policy is that if a student attends an examination or submits a piece of coursework, they are confirming that they intend to participate in the assessment process and that they understand and agree to comply with the University's expectations in relation to academic integrity.
- 2.3 The Academic Integrity policy and process is not intended to manage the consideration of misconduct as it relates to student behaviour outside the parameters of academic assessment. Such scenarios are considered and managed through the [Student Disciplinary Procedure](#).
- 2.4 Issues of academic integrity and ethical practice as they relate to postgraduate research students and/or members of staff at the University are considered via [a separate policy within Research and Innovation Services](#).

## 3. Academic Integrity and Good Academic Practice

- 3.1 Academic integrity means acting in an honest and ethical way, both in the pursuit of knowledge (e.g. in learning and research activity) and in the demonstration of knowledge (e.g. through assessment activity). It describes a set of overarching values and principles that should guide students in upholding the standards of their own academic work and those of the University.
- 3.2 Good academic practice is a term closely related to academic integrity and is a fundamental expectation when undertaking a programme of study at the University. Good academic practice involves adhering to institutional policies, complying with assessment requirements, following ethical guidelines, and demonstrating proficiency in academic skills, including:
  - Producing and presenting original work.

- Respecting the intellectual property of others, by attributing ideas and/or the work of others through accurate citations and referencing.
- Ensuring accuracy and precision in research methods, data collection, analysis, and reporting to maintain the integrity of academic research and scholarship.

3.3 Students are supported to understand the University's expectations relating to academic integrity, as well as to develop good academic practice, through resources such as:

- 'Step up to HE' pre-arrival and induction resources.
- Academic Integrity Induction online module.
- Programme and module induction sessions, formative assessment activities and summative assessment briefs.

## 4. Poor Academic Practice versus Academic Misconduct

4.1 When a student fails to adhere to the principles of academic integrity and/or good academic practice, their work/conduct falls into one of three categories:

- Poor Academic Practice
- Academic Misconduct
- Gross Academic Misconduct

### Poor Academic Practice

4.2 For the purposes of this policy 'poor academic practice' refers to instances where a student has failed to adhere fully to the academic conventions of a particular assessment, despite them demonstrating attempts to do so.

4.3 Examples of poor academic practice include, but are not limited to:

- Not adhering to all assessment brief requirements - e.g. not writing in an appropriate style, not using an appropriate submission format.
- Using sources, materials and/or equipment inappropriate for the assessment in question.
- Poor paraphrasing and/or over-use of direct quotation.
- Errors or gaps in citation or acknowledgement of sources.
- Errors or gaps in reference lists.

### Academic Misconduct

4.4 For the purposes of this policy, 'academic misconduct' describes more serious breaches of academic integrity and/or expected academic practice.

4.5 Examples of academic misconduct include, but are not limited to:

- Plagiarism, whereby a student presents someone else's work or ideas as their own without acknowledgement/citation.
- Accessing unauthorised materials or assistance during exams.

- Using generative AI tools outside the given parameters of the assessment brief without acknowledgement or attribution.
- Falsifying or inventing data, information, sources, citations and/or experiences (e.g. in reflective assignments).
- Colluding on an assignment without permission as part of the assessment brief.

## Gross Academic Misconduct

4.6 For the purposes of this policy ‘gross academic misconduct’ describes severe violations of academic integrity and/or flagrant breaches of expected academic standards. Gross academic misconduct is considered particularly serious due to the potential impact on the integrity and credibility of the University’s assessment processes, programmes of study and awards/qualifications.

4.7 Examples of gross academic misconduct include, but are not limited to:

- Contract cheating, whereby a student commissions a person or organisation to complete assessments (including exams) on their behalf, e.g. in exchange for some kind of financial payment or other reward.
- Obtaining unauthorized access to exams papers, assessment briefs/answers and/or another student’s work to gain an advantage in assessment.
- Submitting forged and/or counterfeited elements of assessed work to gain an advantage (e.g. forging signature of placement supervisor to bolster hours completed).

## 5. Concerns about Academic Practice/Integrity

5.1 Concerns about academic integrity and/or poor academic practice may arise at any point during a student’s journey. As a University community, it is everyone’s responsibility to raise a concern where they believe a student is not adhering to the expectations of academic integrity. This is particularly the case where there are suspicions of academic misconduct or gross academic misconduct.

5.2 In most instances, concerns will be raised by academic members of staff teaching the student in question, but they also may come from individuals connected to the student, programme or University (e.g. fellow students, external markers, members of student support services). Where this occurs, the person in question should raise a concern either via the ‘Academic Misconduct Referral Form’ or by contacting the Student Casework Team. The student’s Programme Leader will be notified that a concern has been raised.

5.3 In response to concerns regarding poor academic practice/academic integrity, the Programme Leader, the student’s module tutor, or other member of the programme team may arrange an Academic Concern Meeting.

## 6. Academic Concern Meetings

6.1 The need for an academic concern meeting might arise for a number of reasons:

- A student has not engaged during key assessment/supervision activity but unexpectedly submits a complete draft submission.

- There appears to be a significant discrepancy between the student's writing (i.e. in emails or formative tasks) and the quality of submitted work for review.
- Areas of poor academic practice (e.g. inauthentic referencing) or potential plagiarism have been identified in formative/draft summative work.
- A student has not responded at all to module activity, communications and/or the supervision process (e.g. for dissertations).
- A student has been observed engaging in inappropriate behaviour during a formative class test or practical examination.
- There is a concern about a piece of summative work, but not enough information to determine the most appropriate course of action with regards to the academic misconduct investigation process.
- An academic integrity concern has arisen from a source other than the module tutor.

6.2 The purpose of a meeting might vary slightly depending on the above, but is primarily to:

- Establish whether there are legitimate grounds for concern regarding academic integrity/authorship/expected standards.
- Signpost any support services/resources relevant to the student and their work.
- Communicate to the student any concerns regarding academic integrity or poor academic practice and explain the process and potential consequences if a case for academic misconduct is submitted in relation to their work.
- If needed, generate valid evidence that can be used to support formal academic integrity/misconduct investigations.

6.3 While an academic concern meeting may inform elements of an Academic Integrity Investigation, it does not constitute an investigation in its own right and is not accompanied by any formal warnings and/or penalties.

6.4 Wherever possible, academic concern meetings will be scheduled at a time mutually agreed by the student and academic member of staff, taking into consideration any prior commitments (e.g. childcare or other caring obligations or religious observances). Students will also be offered the choice of meeting online or in-person. Further information is available in the Guide to Academic Concern Meetings.

## 7. Academic Integrity Investigations

### Step 1: Initial Concerns and Categorisation

7.1 Following the completion of a piece of summative assessment, the first marker will flag any pieces of work that require further discussion in relation to poor academic practice and/or academic integrity concerns. In instances where provisional marks for the assessment are due to be released for other students, markers will be asked to add a statement to the work notifying students that it is under review.

7.2 For any pieces of assessment flagged as having potential academic integrity concerns, the first marker will liaise with either a second marker or the Module Leader to make an

initial judgement as to the most appropriate course of action:

- If there is no evidence to substantiate concerns of poor academic practice, the marker will mark the piece of assessment as normal.
- If there is evidence of poor academic practice, the marker will mark the piece of assessment as normal, using the standard marking criteria/rubric to acknowledge instances where the work did not adhere to the expected academic conventions/standard. This may result in a failed mark for the assignment. The marker will also add a statement to the work acknowledging poor academic practice and signposting students to appropriate support.
- If there is believed to be sufficient evidence to pursue an academic misconduct investigation, the marking team will submit a case to the next step in the process via the 'Academic Misconduct Referral Form'

7.3 If there is uncertainty in relation to the initial concerns and categorisation of the work, the first marker and/or module tutor may wish to arrange an Academic Concern Meeting to help make an appropriate judgement.

### **Step 2: Submitting Case for Academic Misconduct Investigation**

7.4 Upon determining that there is sufficient cause to pursue an academic misconduct investigation, the first marker, or other member of the marking team, will submit a case via the 'Academic Misconduct Referral Form' which outlines the source and elements of the suspicion, along with any evidence which supports the suspicion/allegation.

7.5 Upon submission of a case, the student in question will be notified that there is an allegation of academic misconduct against their work. They will be presented with the allegation, any supporting evidence submitted by the marking team, and will be given the opportunity to respond to the details outlined in the case.

### **Step 3: Opportunity for Student to Respond**

7.6 While there is no obligation for a student to respond to an allegation of academic misconduct relating to their work, they will be given 7 days from the date of notification to respond if they wish to do so.

7.7 The notification to the student regarding their academic misconduct investigation will contain guidance on their options - for example if they wish to accept or contest the allegation - and on how to structure their response. Students will also be able to upload supporting evidence if they wish to.

7.8 Students can access advice and support with their response to an allegation from the Guide to Academic Misconduct Investigations, as well as from the [UBU Advice Centre](#).

7.9 While the University acknowledges that receiving an allegation of academic misconduct can be concerning and/or upsetting for a student, it is important that academic integrity concerns are investigated thoroughly, effectively and fairly, to safeguard the standards of the University's awards and qualifications for all students. At all stages of an academic integrity investigation, students will be signposted to relevant resources and services to ensure they are being appropriately supported through the process.



## Step 4: Scrutiny of Case

- 7.10 Once the 7-day window for a student's response has passed, the academic misconduct investigation case will be assigned to an investigator who is independent of the module and programme area. The investigator will review the allegation, supporting evidence and any response received from the student. They will then make a judgement as to whether, on the balance of probabilities, academic misconduct has occurred.
- 7.11 Using the Academic Misconduct Outcome and Penalties Framework, the investigator will then make one of the following judgements:
- **Case Dismissed/Not Proven** - there is insufficient evidence to substantiate concerns of either academic misconduct or poor academic practice, so the marking team will mark the piece of assessment as normal.
  - **Poor Academic Practice** - there is insufficient evidence to substantiate concerns of academic misconduct, but there is evidence of poor academic practice. The marker will mark the piece of assessment as normal, using the standard marking criteria/rubric to acknowledge instances where the work did not adhere to the expected academic conventions/standard. The marker will also add the standard statement (from Step 1) to the work, acknowledging poor academic practice and signposting students to appropriate support.
  - **Academic Misconduct Upheld** - there is sufficient evidence to conclude, on the balance of probabilities, that the student's work constitutes a breach of academic integrity and/or expected academic practice. The student will receive notification of this outcome and any corresponding penalty.
  - **Further Scrutiny Required** - there are additional/complicating factors or exceptional circumstances relating to a particular student's case which require further scrutiny by an Academic Integrity Panel.
  - **Suspected Gross Academic Misconduct** - there is evidence of gross academic misconduct which requires further scrutiny at an Academic Integrity Panel.

## Step 5 (where required): Academic Integrity Panel

- 7.12 Where there is suspected gross academic misconduct, a student's academic misconduct investigation is particularly complex and/or the student has submitted an appeal against a gross academic misconduct outcome/penalty, an Academic Integrity Panel will be convened to review the case and agree an appropriate course of action.
- 7.13 An Academic Integrity Panel is made up of members who have had no previous involvement with the case in question:
- A member of academic staff, from outside the Faculty and/or School to which the allegation relates, will chair the panel. In the case of appeals, this will be an Associate Dean for Learning and Teaching.
  - A second member of academic staff, from outside the Faculty and/or School to which the allegation relates, will be a member of the panel.
  - The UBU Education Officer, or another nominated member of UBU, will be a member of the panel.

- 7.14 The following individuals may also be in attendance at the Academic Integrity Panel to support the discussion and deliberations of the panel members:
- The University's Student Casework Manager, or another nominated member of the Student Casework Team, to advise on elements of regulation/policy/procedure.
  - The independent investigator assigned to the case, to provide clarity on points of detail relating to the investigation.
  - Either the tutor involved in the original suspicion or another nominated member of the Programme Team, to provide clarity on points of detail relating to the assignment and/or the student's submitted work.
- 7.15 The student, about whose work the Academic Misconduct Investigation relates, will be invited to attend the Academic Integrity Panel. The scheduling of panels will, wherever possible, take into consideration any prior commitments the student might have (e.g. childcare or other caring obligations or religious observances).
- 7.16 While there is no obligation for the student to attend, the invitation allows them the opportunity to discuss their work with the Panel. The student is able to bring someone to the Panel to support them. Normally panels will be scheduled online, but students will be given the opportunity of requesting an in-person panel if they wish.
- 7.17 Regardless of whether the student is able, or wishes to, attend the scheduled meeting, they may provide a written statement to be submitted to the panel. Further guidance on the purpose and conduct of the panel are available in the Guide to Academic Integrity Panels.
- 7.18 Following the Academic Integrity Panel event, one of the following judgements will be made in relation to the student's case:
- **Case Dismissed/Not Proven** - there is insufficient evidence to substantiate concerns of either academic misconduct or poor academic practice, so the piece of assessment will be marked as normal.
  - **Poor Academic Practice** - there is insufficient evidence to substantiate concerns of academic misconduct, but there is evidence of poor academic practice. The marker will mark the piece of assessment as normal, using the standard marking criteria/rubric to acknowledge instances where the work did not adhere to the expected academic conventions/standard. The marker will also add the standard statement (see Step 1) to the work, acknowledging poor academic practice and signposting students to appropriate support.
  - **Academic Misconduct Upheld** - there is sufficient evidence to conclude, on the balance of probabilities, that the student's work constitutes a breach of academic integrity and/or expected academic practice. The student will receive notification of this outcome and any corresponding penalty.
  - **Gross Academic Misconduct Upheld** - there is sufficient evidence to conclude, on the balance of probabilities, that the student's work constitutes a severe breach of academic integrity and/or expected academic practice. The student will receive notification of this outcome and any corresponding penalty.

## 8. Outcomes for Academic Misconduct Cases

- 8.1 Following the conclusion of an investigation, all cases will be subject to an official outcome and any cases of academic misconduct or gross academic misconduct that are upheld will also be subject to a penalty, as detailed in the Academic Misconduct Outcome and Penalties Framework.
- 8.2 This Framework provides investigators with options for outcomes and penalties that are proportionate and that, wherever possible, offer the student the ability to learn from their academic misconduct/poor academic practice through reassessment. One example of this is the University's Plagiarism Awareness Programme which is designed and delivered by Library staff to ensure that students understand the concept of plagiarism, how to avoid it and how to use the appropriate referencing techniques and academic conventions expected on their programme.

## 9. Appealing a Misconduct Outcome and/or Penalty

- 9.1 Students can appeal directly against the outcome and/or penalty of an academic misconduct investigation within 14 days of their outcome notification. For clarity, the deadline to appeal will be detailed in the notification email to the student.
- 9.2 There are two grounds for appeal:
  - 9.2.1 There is evidence to demonstrate that the outcome and/or penalty was disproportionate to the nature of the allegation or was not permitted within the scope of the Academic Integrity Policy.
  - 9.2.2 There is new evidence which, for good reason, was not available at the time of the academic misconduct investigation and which could have affected the outcome and/or penalty.
- 9.3 The Student Casework Team will review the evidence on which an appeal is based and will determine whether it is sufficient to warrant consideration of the appeal. If there appears to be sufficient evidence to warrant consideration of the appeal, the student's academic misconduct case will be reviewed.

### Appeal against an Academic Misconduct outcome/penalty

- 9.4 Appeals against an academic misconduct outcome/penalty will be assigned to a new investigator who is independent of the module/programme area, and who has had no involvement with the original academic misconduct investigation. The investigator, with support from a member of the Student Casework Team, will review details of the original investigation, the appeal and any supporting evidence.
- 9.5 The student, about whose work the academic misconduct appeal relates, will normally be invited to attend a meeting with the investigator. While there is no obligation for the student to attend, the invitation allows them the opportunity to discuss their appeal. Wherever possible, meetings will be scheduled at a time mutually agreed by the student and the investigator. Meetings will normally be conducted online, but students may request an in-person meeting if they wish. The student is able to bring someone to the meeting to support them through the process.
- 9.6 Upon review of all the evidence, the investigator will then make a judgement as to whether the appeal should be upheld, partially upheld or not upheld.

## Appeal against a Gross Academic Misconduct outcome/penalty

- 9.7 Appeals against a gross academic misconduct outcome/penalty will be referred to a new Academic Integrity Panel who is independent of the module/programme area, and who has had no involvement with the original gross academic misconduct investigation. The Panel will review details of the original investigation, the appeal and any supporting evidence.
- 9.8 The student, about whose case the appeal relates, will be invited to attend the Academic Integrity Panel and may also provide a written statement for the panel, whether they choose to attend or not. While there is no obligation for the student to attend, the invitation allows them the opportunity to discuss their appeal with the Panel. The student is able to bring someone to the Panel to support them through the process.
- 9.9 Upon review of all the evidence, the Panel will then make a judgement as to whether the appeal should be upheld, partially upheld or not upheld.

### Completion of Procedures

- 9.10 Upon review of the appeal, the student will receive a completion of procedures letter informing them whether their appeal has been rejected, upheld, partially upheld or not upheld.
- 9.11 If the appeal is upheld or partially upheld, the original decision may be changed, or it may remain the same, but the penalty may be altered. If the appeal is not upheld, the original decision will stand.

### Options Post-Appeal

- 9.12 If students are dissatisfied with the outcome of their appeal, they may be able to apply for a review of the appeal, to the Office of the Independent Adjudicator for Higher Education (OIA), provided the appeal is eligible under their rules.
- 9.13 Normally, students can only escalate their case to the OIA if they have exhausted the stages in this procedure and received a completion of procedures letter.
- 9.14 Students must raise a complaint with the OIA within 12 months of receiving the completion of procedures letter.
- 9.15 Students can complete an OIA Complaint Form online or download a copy from the [OIA website](#). Alternatively, students can telephone or write to the OIA for a form.

## 10. Consideration of Extenuating/Personal Circumstances

- 10.1 If students feel they are unable to engage with, and complete, their assessments to the expected standard, they should submit a claim for extenuation through the agreed Consideration of Personal Circumstances Policy, rather than submitting work which breaches expectations of academic standards and integrity.
- 10.2 Claims of extenuating or personal circumstances will not influence decisions relating to the outcomes of poor academic practice and/or academic misconduct investigations. There may be very exceptional occasions whereby a student's circumstances are taken into consideration when determining the penalty applied as a result of an academic

misconduct investigation, but such consideration will not change the outcome of the investigation itself.

## 11. Roles and Responsibilities

- 11.1 The Academic Integrity Policy is intended to provide a clear framework for making decisions relating to poor academic practice and academic misconduct. It aims to facilitate consistent and timely decision-making, allow for appropriate consideration in relation to serious or complex cases, and ensure that both the academic standards of the University are upheld and students are appropriately supported through the process.
- 11.2 All participants in the processes relating to this policy are expected to act in a supportive and respectful manner, in line with staff and student contracts and codes of conduct.
- 11.3 All participants in the processes are also expected to adhere to any legal, regulatory and policy requirements with regards to [confidentiality and data protection](#).

### Students

- 11.4 Students are expected to take responsibility for their own learning, to be proactive in seeking support when they need it, and to ensure they submit work which is their own and which complies with the expectations of academic integrity, academic standards, and the conventions of the assessment in question.

### Staff - Programme and Module Teams

- 11.5 Programme and module teams are expected to communicate expectations relating to academic integrity to students at the beginning of their programme and at key points thereafter (e.g. in summative assessment briefs)
- 11.6 Programme and module teams are also expected to maintain open and supportive communication with students facing academic misconduct allegations, ensuring that students are signposted or referred to appropriate sources of advice, guidance and support.

### Staff - Independent Investigators

- 11.7 Investigators are members of academic staff who are independent of both the student and the programme and module area to which the piece of work under investigation relates.
- 11.8 Investigators are expected to act in accordance with the process and corresponding decision-making frameworks as outlined in this policy. Investigators are also expected to engage with initial training and read any guidance available relating to the role prior to undertaking an investigation.
- 11.9 Other than in formal contexts, such as an Academic Integrity Panel, investigators should not communicate directly with students regarding their academic misconduct investigation.

### Staff - Student Casework Team

- 11.10 The Student Casework Team is responsible for implementing and managing the day-to-day operations of the academic misconduct investigation processes. This includes

supporting investigators and coordinating Academic Integrity Panels.

- 11.11 The Student Casework Team is expected to maintain accurate records of all academic misconduct investigations and to report on cases, both for the purposes of programme/module team enhancement planning as well as for institutional oversight/ongoing policy review.

### **University of Bradford Union of Students (UBU)**

- 11.12 UBU is expected to play a key role in championing academic integrity and good academic practice among students, as well as highlighting to students the potential consequences of not adhering to the expected standards.
- 11.13 The UBU Advice Centre is expected to help students navigate this policy and related procedures, to ensure students are aware of their rights, roles and responsibilities.
- 11.14 UBU colleagues are also expected to maintain open and supportive communication with students and members of UoB staff, as part of this process, to ensure that students are signposted or referred to appropriate sources of advice, guidance and support in a joined up and timely manner.
- 11.15 UBU also plays an important role in providing ongoing feedback to the University about students' experiences with the academic misconduct investigation process, to inform policy review and continuous improvement activities.

## **12. Accessibility and Inclusivity**

- 12.1 The Equality Act 2010 places a legal obligation on the University to make reasonable adjustments to its services and meet the requirements of staff with a disability and/or other specific needs. An Equality Impact Assessment of this policy has been provided in the appendices for reference.
- 12.2 Where a student feels they may require additional support to navigate and/or participate in the processes outlined in this policy, they should contact either their module tutor or the UBU Advice Centre in the first instance. Measures to support participation may include, for example, support to navigate systems, complete forms or upload evidence.
- 12.3 Where a member of staff feels they may require additional support to navigate and/or participate in the processes outlined in this policy, they should contact their line manager in the first instance. Measures to support participation may include, for example, distribution of individual roles and responsibilities across a module/programme team.

## **13. Oversight, Implementation and Support**

- 13.1 This policy and its implementation are owned and overseen by the University of Bradford's Learning and Teaching Committee.
- 13.2 Registry and Student Administration (RSA) are responsible for the operation of the policy and corresponding processes, as well as the ongoing schedule of policy/process review and continuous improvement.
- 13.3 The policy and accompanying appendices shall be reviewed annually.

# Academic Misconduct: Outcomes and Penalties Framework

NB: The below is not an exhaustive list and will be reviewed and expanded upon on a continual basis as new categories emerge. Examples of each category and guidance regarding severity of penalty are available in the Academic Integrity Scenarios. If any queries on a category or evidence submitted in relation to an allegation, please contact [academicmisconduct@bradford.ac.uk](mailto:academicmisconduct@bradford.ac.uk) initially.

Outcome	Evidence of...	Penalty
<b>Poor Academic Practice</b>	Not adhering to all assessment brief requirements.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▪ Standard statement on impacted submission.</li> <li>▪ Penalise poor academic practice within scope of the assessment rubric.</li> <li>▪ Signposting to support/developmental resources.</li> </ul>
	Poor paraphrasing and/or over-use of direct quotation.	
	Using sources, materials and/or equipment inappropriate for the assessment.	
	Errors or gaps in reference lists and/or in-text citations.	
<b>Academic Misconduct</b>	Presenting someone else's work or ideas as their own without attempt at acknowledgement/citation.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▪ Upheld misconduct outcome on record.</li> <li>▪ Undertake reassessment and pass the compromised component.</li> </ul> <p>Penalty dependent on the nature and extent of the misconduct, but could include:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▪ Component capped at zero.</li> <li>▪ Module capped at pass mark.</li> <li>▪ Module capped at zero (i.e. for credit only).</li> </ul> <p><i>And, where applicable:</i></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▪ Attend the Plagiarism Awareness Programme (PAP).</li> <li>▪ Attend an Academic Concern Meeting/Tutorial.</li> <li>▪ Pass the module in full, if failed.</li> </ul>
	Using generative AI tools outside the given parameters of the assessment brief without acknowledgement or attribution.	
	Falsifying or inventing data, information, sources, citations and/or experiences (e.g. in reflective assignments).	
	Colluding on an assignment without permission as part of the assessment brief.	
	Being in possession of, and/or using, unauthorised materials during an exam.	
<b>Gross Academic Misconduct</b>	<p>Allegations within the 'academic misconduct' category, but with any of the following additional characteristics:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▪ A student has had two or more upheld academic misconduct outcomes in any previous academic stage/level of their studies.</li> <li>▪ The nature of the allegation means that a conversation with the student about their work is necessary to determine genuine authorship (e.g. in the case of generative AI use on a dissertation-type assignment).</li> <li>▪ There are complexities relating to a student's personal circumstances which require further scrutiny/discussion to determine an appropriate penalty.</li> </ul>	<p>Penalty dependent on the nature and extent of the misconduct, but could include:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▪ Upheld misconduct outcome on record and transcript.</li> <li>▪ Reassessment for capped mark or credit only.</li> <li>▪ Repeat elements of programme (e.g. modules or stage).</li> <li>▪ Suspension from studies.</li> <li>▪ Withdrawal from programme with or without award of credit.</li> </ul>

	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▪ The misconduct relates to a student who has already qualified and/or has withdrawn and received an intermediate award.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▪ Rescinding of credit/award.</li> </ul>
	Contract cheating, whereby a student commissions a person or organisation to complete assessments/exams on their behalf (e.g. in exchange for some kind of financial payment or other reward.)	
	Obtaining unauthorised access to exams papers, assessment briefs/answers and/or another student's work to gain an advantage in assessment.	
	Submitting forged and/or counterfeited elements of assessed work to gain an advantage (e.g. forging signature of placement supervisor to bolster hours).	
<b>Issue beyond Academic Misconduct</b>	If misconduct is broader in scope than solely academic integrity issues – e.g. relating to disciplinary policy, fitness to practice/study, and/or criminal proceedings.	Dependent on outcome from other process(es), but any penalty relating to a student's academic record will be processed via the examination board processes as normal.