

Academic Integrity Policy

Version number	Date approved (and committee)	Reason for production/revision	Author	Proposed next review date
V. 3.1	July 2023 Exceptional AcBo	Updated for currency, including AI developments	Quality Manager / Quality Officer (casework)	Annually
V3.0	June 2022 AcBo	Updated for ICMP awards	Quality Manager / Quality Officer	Biannually and as required
V2.0	Sept 2020 AcBo	Annual Review	Quality Officer	Biennially and as required
V1.0	26/06/19 Academic Board	Annual review	Deputy Registrar	Annually and as required
Related policies				
<i>General Regulations</i>				
External Reference				
<p>UK Quality Code for Higher Education, Advice and Guidance: enabling student achievement. ICMP seeks to provide a safe and secure environment which is conducive to work and study for all students and staff.</p> <p>QAA Academic Integrity Charter for UK Higher Education, Principles of managing cases of Academic Integrity</p> <p>OIA Good Practice Framework</p>				

1. Introduction

- 1.1. The purpose of this document is to detail the key principles and processes concerning student academic misconduct. In doing so, it seeks to establish academic integrity as central to ICMP learning, teaching, and scholarship.
- 1.2. ICMP is committed to ensuring that students and staff have the required understanding of what constitutes both academic integrity and academic misconduct, and that they are supported as necessary by the institution.
- 1.3. The process is as follows. (See Section 5 for detail):
 - 1.3.1. Report alleged misconduct
 - 1.3.2. Initial investigation
 - 1.3.3. Academic Misconduct Programme Meeting (for first offence)
 - 1.3.4. Academic Misconduct Hearing (for cases of contract cheating and subsequent offence(s) of misconduct)
 - 1.3.5. Review stage (as required)
- 1.4. The Academic Integrity Procedure applies to all students enrolled or previously enrolled on award or credit bearing programmes at ICMP. They do not apply to students on non-credit bearing (short) programmes.

2. Definitions

- 2.1. Any activity likely to undermine the integrity that is essential to scholarship and research constitutes academic misconduct. Academic misconduct can thus be defined as any action by a student which gives (or which has the potential to give) unfair advantage in an examination or assessment. Misconduct may also take the form of assisting someone else to gain an unfair advantage.
- 2.2. Examples of academic misconduct may include, but are not limited to:
 - 2.2.1. **Plagiarism**
Presenting someone else's work or ideas as one's own;
 - 2.2.2. **Self-Plagiarism**
Submitting the same assessment (in part or full) already submitted to ICMP or another institution;
 - 2.2.3. **Collusion**
Unauthorised collaboration on an assessment. All parties involved will be dealt with through the Academic Integrity Regulations;
 - 2.2.4. **Contract Cheating**
Submitting work that has been completed by a third party as one's own. This includes the use of "essay mills," where an individual or organisation is paid to complete an assessment; it also includes the unauthorised use of Artificial Intelligence (AI), as defined by ICMP in its guidance to staff and students.
 - 2.2.5. **Submission of fraudulent evidence for academic purposes**

This includes making false Extenuating Circumstances claims or submitting false evidence for such claims;

3. General Principles

- 3.1. If it is suspected that a student has committed academic misconduct, as detailed above, the case will be investigated.
- 3.2. All investigations of alleged misconduct are dealt with in a timely manner and through processes which are clear, straightforward and transparent.
- 3.3. Confidentiality will be respected in conducting all aspects of the misconduct investigation. Details of cases under investigation are only disclosed to those immediately involved and/or those whose participation is necessary for the investigation.
- 3.4. Cases are dealt with in strategic alignment with ICMP's Equality, Diversity, and Inclusion policies, free from bias. Where a student has declared a disability, ICMP will endeavour where appropriate to ensure that information is available to them in appropriate formats, with reasonable adjustments made to proceedings within the procedure as required.
- 3.5. Group or connected academic misconduct cases will be considered and managed individually by the Quality Office. Hearings may consider joint or group allegations at a single hearing with all students in attendance. Students will however be given an opportunity to speak to the panel privately so that they can raise confidential or sensitive matters relating to mitigation.
- 3.6. Students have the right to be accompanied to any discussions, or meetings by a friend or student representative. Legal representation is not permitted at any discussion or meeting. The student should advise the meeting organiser of the name and relationship of the person accompanying them at least 48 hours prior to the meeting.
- 3.7. The standard of proof to be adopted during the investigation of alleged cases of misconduct will be the balance of probabilities. This means that the panel is satisfied, based on the evidence provided, that the occurrence was more likely to have occurred than not.
- 3.8. The burden of proof is on ICMP, meaning that it is ICMP's responsibility to prove that academic misconduct occurred.
- 3.9. Communication with students will be via the student's ICMP email address. It is the student's responsibility to check their emails regularly during the process.
- 3.10. Students may typically continue with their studies while an academic misconduct investigation is ongoing but will be made aware of consequences should the case against them be upheld. Where the outcome of an investigation into academic misconduct could prevent a student progressing or lead to their expulsion, this will be made clear to them.
- 3.11. In exceptional circumstances, it may be appropriate to refer a student to the disciplinary procedure following the conclusion of the academic misconduct investigation.

- 3.12. ICMP's final position on a misconduct investigation is confirmed in writing by a member of senior management in order to provide assurance that this is the definitive response of the provider and that the case has been managed according to these regulations.
- 3.13. Any student subject to misconduct proceedings in accordance with these regulations may obtain advice and guidance from the Quality Office by emailing Complaints@icmp.ac.uk. Support can also be obtained from Student Services and the Student Voice system.
- 3.14. In cases of suspected contract cheating, or in other cases at the Programme Leader's discretion, a viva will be initiated by the Programme Leader to identify the probability of misconduct. The outcome of the viva will be sent by the Programme Leader to the Quality Office for use as evidence at the Academic Misconduct Hearing (section 7).

4. Roles

- 4.1 The **Quality Office** has oversight of all processes and documents relating to academic misconduct in order to carry out reporting requirements of the Academic Board. The Quality Office also oversees all individual cases of academic misconduct, ensuring that the process is followed correctly, that all paperwork is completed, that the necessary communication occurs, and that each stage is monitored and recorded.
- 4.2 The **Programme Leader** receives the report of suspected misconduct from the marker, notifies the Quality Office, and works with them to investigate the allegation. The Programme Leader chairs the Academic Programme Misconduct Meeting (section 6.2) and is a member of the Academic Misconduct Panel (section 7).
- 4.3 **Programme Administration** liaises as necessary with the Programme Leader about the reporting of the case and decisions concerning the release of the grade. The team arrange reassessment opportunities as required and record the outcome on the student record system.
- 4.4 The **Academic Misconduct Panel** meets with the student to investigate where there have been one or more previous allegations of academic misconduct (section 7).
- 4.5 **The Reviewer** is a senior member of ICMP staff assigned when required to review a case should a request to review the outcome be received. The Reviewer will not have been involved with the investigation or hearing. (Section 8).

Process

5. Reporting a suspected case of academic misconduct

- 5.1. Where a suspected case of academic misconduct is identified, the marker will notify the Programme Leader.
- 5.2. The Programme Leader will review the evidence provided and reach one of the following judgements within 10 working days of receipt of the allegation:
- i. There is no case to answer and misconduct did not occur. The assessment will be marked as normal

- ii. That this is a case of poor academic practice, meaning that the academic misconduct was unintentional. The Quality Office will consult with Programme Administration to determine whether there have been previous allegations of academic misconduct or poor academic practice against the student. The work will be returned for marking on its merits; a resit may be required, with a cap at pass. The Programme Leader will refer the student to academic integrity resources and/or training. The Programme Leader will notify the Quality Office and Programme Administration to make an entry on the student's record for consideration if a future allegation of academic misconduct is made against the student.
- iii. That academic misconduct has probably occurred, in which case the Programme Leader will submit the [Academic Misconduct Reporting Form](#) to qualityassurance@icmp.ac.uk. The Quality Office will determine whether there have been previous allegations of academic misconduct or poor academic practice against the student before notifying the student of the allegation.

6. Academic Misconduct: First Offence

6.1. If there have been no previous allegations of academic misconduct or poor academic practice against the student, the Quality Office will write, normally within 10 working days of receipt of the Academic Misconduct Report Form, to the student:

- i. to present the allegation;
- ii. to confirm the judgement of the Programme Leader that the student has breached the Academic Integrity Regulations;
- iii. to provide the student with details of the allegation and evidence;
- iv. to refer the student to academic integrity resources and training provided by ICMP;
- v. to inform the student of the penalty, as determined by the Table of Penalties (Appendix);
- vi. to invite the student to either:
 - a. Admit the allegation and accept the penalty, in which case the penalty will be applied with no further right of appeal and the case will be closed.
 - b. Deny the allegation, in which case the matter will be referred to an Academic Misconduct Programme Meeting (section 6.2).

6.1 Academic Misconduct Programme Meeting

- i. Where a student contests the allegation or penalty, the student will be required to attend an Academic Misconduct Programme Meeting (or in the case of contract cheating the Academic Misconduct Hearing described in section 7).
- ii. The Quality Office will notify the student of the meeting date and advise the student of their right to be accompanied by a friend or student representative.
- iii. If the student does not attend the meeting, it will proceed in their absence and an outcome and/or penalty decided.
- iv. The Academic Misconduct Programme Meeting will be chaired by a Programme Leader who is not known to, or has not taught, the student. A representative of the Quality Office will attend as advisor and servicing officer.

6.2 The Programme Leader will make one of the following judgements:

- i. There is no case to answer and misconduct did not occur. The assessment will be marked as normal;
- ii. That this is a case of poor academic practice, meaning that the student did not intend to cheat. The work will be returned for marking on its merits; a resit may be required, with a cap at pass. The Programme Leader will refer the student to academic integrity resources and/or training.
- iii. That the student has committed academic misconduct, and the penalty imposed within the notification letter stands.

6.3 The Quality Office will notify the student in writing of the outcome within 10 working days. It will also notify Programme Administration to make an entry on the student's record for consideration if a future allegation of academic misconduct is made against the student.

7 Academic Misconduct Hearing: Second Offence or Contract Cheating

7.1 If there has been a previous allegation of poor academic practice or academic misconduct against the student, and in all cases of contract cheating, the Quality Office will convene an Academic Misconduct Hearing.

7.2 Previous academic misconduct will not normally be relevant to determining whether the student committed the misconduct under investigation. However, it may be relevant if the student has previously committed the same, or very similar, misconduct. The timing of revealing any previous record of academic misconduct will be such as to not prejudice the outcome.

7.3 In the case of suspected contract cheating, a viva will be held prior to the hearing. In most cases the following points will apply:

- i. The student must attend the viva in person. If a valid reason makes this impossible, this must be submitted to the Quality Office in writing; only with written permission from the Quality Office may the student then attend online. In such cases, the microphone and camera must be on for the duration of the hearing.
- ii. The viva will be attended by the student, the Programme Leader, and the Programme Administrator.
- iii. The student will be offered the opportunity to present the original files of their submissions (e.g. Word documents, PowerPoint documents, video files etc) and should be able to produce a range of resources and evidence used in the completion of the work (e.g. pdf reports, journals, books, links etc).
- iv. If the student does not attend the viva, the viva may be conducted during the hearing. In this case, the above points will apply.
- v. Following the viva, the Programme Leader will send to the Quality Office the outcome and details, which will be used as evidence at the hearing.

7.4 The panel will include the following members, each of whom will be properly trained and supported:

- i. The Principal or Nominee (normally a member of the Senior Academic Team) (Chair);
- ii. An impartial member of the Academic Team (this could be a Programme Leader or Teaching Fellow, who is not known to, or has not taught, the student);
- iii. A student representative;

iv. A representative of the Quality Office will attend as advisor and servicing officer.

7.5 The Programme Leader of the student's programme has the right to attend, particularly if the student has missed the viva meeting.

7.6 The Quality Office will write, normally within 5 working days of receipt of the Academic Misconduct Form, to the student:

- i. to present the allegation;
- ii. to advise the student that the case will be heard by the Academic Misconduct Panel;
- iii. to provide the student with all available evidence;
- iv. to advise the student of their right to be accompanied by a friend or student representative;
- v. to advise the student of their right to provide a written statement.

7.6 The student must attend the hearing in person. If a valid reason makes this impossible, this must be submitted to the Quality Office in writing; only with written permission from the Quality Office may the student then attend online. In such cases, the microphone and camera must be on for the duration of the hearing.

7.7 Once the date of the hearing has been confirmed and all evidence received, the Quality Office will write to the student to:

- i. confirm the date / time / location of the meeting;
- ii. confirm the name of the panel members;
- iii. invite the student to provide a written statement;
- iv. remind the student of their right to be accompanied by a friend or student representative, who can provide pastoral support;
- v. advise the student that if they fail to attend, the Hearing will proceed in their absence.
- vi. To inform the student of the possible penalties that may be applied.

7.8 As a result of an Academic Misconduct Hearing, the panel will determine that:

- i. There is no case to answer, and misconduct did not occur. The assessment will be marked as normal;
- ii. This is a case of poor academic practice, meaning that the student did not intend to cheat. The work will be returned for marking on its merits; a resit may be required, with a cap at pass. The Programme Leader will refer the student to academic integrity resources and/or training.
- iii. That the student has committed academic misconduct, in which case the panel will refer to the Table of Penalties (Appendix) to determine the penalty.

7.9 In determining the penalty, the Academic Misconduct Hearing will consider the nature and severity of the offence, the apparent intention to deceive, and any previous allegations.

7.10 In exceptional circumstances, it may be appropriate to refer a student to the disciplinary procedure following the conclusion of the academic misconduct investigation.

7.11 The Quality Office will notify the student in writing, normally within 5 working days, of

the outcome. It will also notify Programme Administration to record the outcome on the student's record for consideration if a future allegation of academic misconduct is made against the student.

- 7.12. If the outcome is expulsion, the student may receive an interim award if they have obtained the necessary credits; the Assessment Board will recommend the relevant award. The student will not be permitted to attend the graduation ceremony.

8 Review Stage

- 8.1 Where a student is dissatisfied with the outcome of an Academic Misconduct Hearing, they may submit a request for review to be considered by the Reviewer (who will be appointed following the request to review). Grounds for requesting a review for a decision are limited to the following:
- i. There is evidence that there has been a material procedural irregularity in the conduct of the disciplinary process;
 - ii. There is additional evidence that has not previously been considered and could not reasonably have been made available at an earlier stage;
 - iii. There is bias or reasonable perception of bias during the procedure;
 - iv. The penalty applied was perceived as disproportionate to the offence.
- 8.2 Any student wishing to request a review must email Complaints@icmp.ac.uk stating the ground(s) of the request. This must happen within 10 working days of the date that the student was informed of the hearing outcome.
- 8.3 The Quality Office will forward the request to the Reviewer, a senior member of ICMP staff appointed by the Quality Office who was not previously involved in the case. The Reviewer will consider the case and make a recommendation to the Chair of the Academic Misconduct Hearing (as relevant). If the recommendation is that the appeal is upheld, a new meeting/hearing will be scheduled by the Quality Office, with a different Chair and panel, as appropriate. If the request for review is denied, the case will be closed.
- 8.4 A decision will be made within 20 working days of receipt of the request.
- 8.5 The decision of the Reviewer / rehearing is final. This is considered the end of ICMP's internal procedures.

9. Completion of Procedures

- 9.1 Following the outcome of the request for review, the student will be issued with a Completion of Procedures letter. Information about Completion of Procedures (COP) letters is accessible from the OIA [website](#).

10. The Office of the Independent Adjudicator (OIA)

- 10.1 If a student continues to be dissatisfied with the outcome, the student may lodge a complaint with the Office of the Independent Adjudicator (OIA) for Higher Education following receipt of their COP letter. Details of the OIA and how to submit a complete can be found on the OIA [website](#).

Appendix: Indicative Table of Penalties

The appropriate penalty will be determined by the relevant staff member(s) investigating the case, based on the specifics of the situation.
Poor Academic Practice: first instance
<ul style="list-style-type: none">• The work will be marked on its merits• A capped resit may be required• The student will be required to receive academic integrity guidance/training• A note will be made on the student's record• A repeat allegation of poor academic practice will be progressed to Level A
Level A: First instance of plagiarism, self-plagiarism, falsification, or collusion
<ul style="list-style-type: none">• The work will receive a grade of 0• A capped resit is required• The student will be required to receive academic integrity guidance/training• A note will be made on the student's record• Where a Level A Penalty is issued at a reassessment opportunity, the Progression Board will determine the appropriate progression outcome
Level B: Subsequent instance of plagiarism, self-plagiarism, falsification, or collusion (or first instance at Level 6 or Level 7)
<ul style="list-style-type: none">• The work will receive a grade of 0• A capped resit is required• The module is capped at pass• In an instance of collusion with an ICMP alumnus, their award may be revoked• The student will be required to receive academic integrity guidance/training• A note will be made on the student's record• Where a Level B Penalty is issued at a reassessment opportunity, the Progression Board will determine the appropriate progression outcome• The student may face expulsion
Level C: Contract cheating (use of essay mill) at Level 4, 5, 6, or 7.
Note: Expulsion is a more likely outcome than for Level B.
<ul style="list-style-type: none">• The work will receive a grade of 0• A capped resit is required, with viva• The module is capped at pass• The student will be required to receive academic integrity guidance/training• A note will be made on the student's record• Where a Level C Penalty is issued at a reassessment opportunity, the Progression Board will determine the appropriate progression outcome• The student may face expulsion