Academic Integrity and Misconduct Policy

1. Overview

1.1 The academic activity and reputation of DMU (the University) is founded on the principles of integrity, honesty and trust. All staff and students are expected to uphold these principles in their academic work. We require the work that you submit for assessment to be entirely your own and that you always acknowledge the use of any other sources in referencing conventions relevant to your academic discipline as set out by the University. We also require that you comply with the University's assessment regulations, including those relating to conduct in examination or test conditions.

1.2 Academic misconduct occurs where you do not act with academic integrity and honesty. It is an action you take, accidentally or with intent, that has the potential to give you an unfair advantage in your assessment, or which might assist another student to gain unfair advantage. This policy sets out broad definitions of academic misconduct, including those relating to the use of Artificial Intelligence, and the actions that we will take in response to academic misconduct under the provisions of the Academic Integrity and Misconduct Disciplinary Procedure.

1.3 Penalties given, if an allegation of academic misconduct is upheld, range from the requirement to engage in extra learning support through to expulsion from the University. The penalties will be dependent on any prior history of academic misconduct, the nature of the misconduct and the level of intent you showed to gain advantage. The type of penalties we apply are provided in Annex 1. If you are studying on a programme that leads to a qualification that includes the right to practice in a particular profession (e.g. nursing) and a case of academic misconduct against you is upheld, a penalty may also result in a referral to the relevant Professional Statutory Regulatory Body (PSRB) which may prevent you from practice in that profession.

1.4 This policy applies to all students studying at DMU and to those studying programmes at partner institutions leading to an award from DMU. The specific nature of the Academic Integrity and Misconduct Procedure may vary if you are studying at a partner institution and will be included in your Programme Handbook. Where there is variation, the University is responsible for ensuring that the principles of the partner institution's procedure align with what is required for a DMU award. Where there is ambiguity regarding an aspect of academic misconduct, the University's policy will apply.

2. Support

2.1 The University provides all students with education and support in understanding good academic practice and therefore how to avoid academic misconduct. As a minimum, this includes:

- Referencing
- Skills and Assignments
- Workshops, Drop-ins & Tutorials
- Using Generative Artificial Intelligence
- Good Academic Practice
- BaseCamp
- Introduction to Good Academic Practices

2.2 The University recognises that there will be different reasons why you may resort to actions that would constitute academic misconduct The University has resources and processes in place should you find that you have specific concerns about your assessments, or matters such as your academic success, your wellbeing, or pressure from other people. We strongly advise that you talk to a member of staff or to the Students' Union at the earliest opportunity to gain the support you may need rather than resorting to actions that would constitute academic misconduct.

3. Academic Misconduct Definitions

3.1 The following section sets out DMU's definitions of academic misconduct. These definitions are broadly common across the UK Higher Education sector. Some of these definitions may not be the same as those you experienced at school, college or in countries other than the UK. It is therefore critical that you read the definitions set out below and ask a member of staff if you have any doubts or questions about their meaning. If you are studying in a partner institution located in a country other than the UK, these definitions still apply to you.

3.2 Poor Academic Practice

Poor academic practice is, typically, inappropriate use of a referencing system and *unintentionally* passing off work as your own at a minor scale. Poor academic practice may arise from a lack of understanding of how to produce a piece of work or assessment due to lack of experience or understanding. Examples include but are not limited to:

- where a small part of an assignment appears to convey ideas, data or other information obtained from other sources as if it was your own word for word duplication of up to a few sentences in written work, oral presentations or comparable duplication in non-written forms where the source is not mentioned.

- Unattributed quotations

More than two instances of poor academic practice may be considered as intentional acts of academic misconduct.

3.3 Plagiarism

Plagiarism is your *intentional* action to present work, data or concepts (including drafts and work in progress) as your own when it derives from another source (including from Artificial Intelligence which is not declared as agreed in your project brief), and from which you attempt to gain advantage. Examples of plagiarism include but are not limited to:

- Substantial or continuous duplication of phrases including where word-substitution has been used to disguise the original source' and word-for-word duplication of phrases of sentences in written work or oral presentations

- Substantial duplication of components from another source in creative arts submissions

- Using the views, opinions of another source without acknowledgement

- Copying the style (e.g. parody, pastiche, homage) of another person without referencing the significance of the source

- Paraphrasing work obtained from a published source and passing this off as your own.

3.4 Contract Cheating and the use of Artificial Intelligence (AI) Generated Content

Contract cheating is your intentional action to engage with a third party (for example AI) to undertake some or all your assessment for you which you then submit and pass off as your own and attempt to gain advantage. Contract cheating includes:

- Engaging with an 'essay mill' or essay writing service that may or may not involve a financial exchange between you and that third party. The UK Government criminalised 'essay mills' in 2022 and their operations are therefore illegal.

- Asking any other person to contribute, or undertake in full, an assessed piece of work. This includes but is not limited to asking other students, friends, family, private tutors and copyediting services.

- Engaging with AI tools to contribute, or undertake in full, a piece of work to be assessed.

Use of Artificial Intelligence (AI) tools such as ChatGPT and similar platforms is increasingly commonplace in many parts of education and society and as a tool, and if used wisely, it has many valuable uses. However, the use of AI in assessed pieces of work without prior approval, will constitute intentional academic misconduct where you:

- Plagiarise information from AI sources without appropriate referencing

- Engage in a form of contract cheating through using an AI tool to generate your work

- Falsifying information resulting from the AI tool you use

- Use an AI tool to improve your use of the English language in your assessment submission without referencing this in line with referencing guidelines

- Use an AI tool to substantially amend or improve your assessment

- Undertake any other action using AI which constitutes academic misconduct

The only exception to the above would be if the assignment brief itself required the use of AI as part of the process of the assessment. In this case, the use of AI would be permitted but limited in scope to the exact requirements of the brief, and the use of AI in other parts of the assignment not covered by the brief would be considered to be an academic offence.

3.5 Collusion

Collusion is an intentional action whereby the assessment task requires you to submit your own work, but where you and another student/s liaise to inform one or both submissions. For clarity, any student involved in collusion is taking an intentional act to either advantage another student and/or advantage themselves and are therefore engaging in academic misconduct. Collusion includes, but is not limited to, the following actions:

- Providing another student/s with part or all the material that will form the assessment submission, including any draft work.
- Uploading any part of the work that will form your assessment to a site, including via social media, and external plagiarism checkers, through which another student/s could gain access.
- Using material provided by another student/s within your assessment submission without acknowledging the student/s by appropriate referencing and submitting it as your own.
- Paraphrasing the work of another student and submitting it as your own
- Planning an assessment response together with another individual
- You are responsible for the security of your work. For example, If you leave a device unlocked while away from your desk and another student takes advantage of your absence to copy your assignment from the device - then if there is no clear evidence of theft, this will be treated as collusion.

Collusion should not be confused with collaborative/group learning and peer support where you may share ideas for e.g. books or articles that you may use to inform your assessment/s. However, unless the assessment task requirements instruct you to plan, organise and compile the task in a group, you must plan, organise and compile your assessment without the involvement of another student/s.

3.6 Cheating in Examination or Test Conditions

Examination or test conditions are put in place as a specific tool to uphold academic integrity and maintain fairness. This includes examinations and tests that are delivered on-campus (including partner campuses) or on-line. Cheating in examination or test conditions is your intentional attempt to gain advantage, for you and/or for another student/s, by taking one or more of the following actions:

- Attempting to acquire or acquiring advance knowledge of the content of an examination or test before it is issued to you
- Attempting to communicate or communicating with other student/s or other individual (other than an invigilator) in relation to or during the assessment, including through technology and social media.
- Discussing or sharing, or attempting to discuss or share, assessment content or related information with another student/s or other individual during the examination time period.
- Attempting to copy, or copying from the examination script of another student
- Allowing another student to attempt to copy or copy from your examination script
- Providing information to another student in an examination or attempting to do so
- Obtaining, or attempting to obtain, any other assistance from another student
- Using, or attempting to gain access to, any material not permitted as part of the assessment
- Accessing, or attempting to access, any electronic or technological device during an examination that is not permitted by the University
- Impersonating another student or allowing another student or any other individual to impersonate you

- Refusing to comply with a reasonable request made by a member of University staff where they suspect potential misconduct

- Any other action that you take with the intention of gaining unfair advantage

- Further information can be found in Chapter 6 of the General Regulations.

3.7 Acquiring and submitting work that is not produced by you

Submitting work that has been substantially amended or improved by a third party (to include amendments or improvements made by the use of an AI tool), and submitting it as yours is your intentional action to gain advantage. This includes but is not limited to:

- Submitting work produced in part or in full by someone other than you (including the submission of work produced by AI tools).

- Submitting work that has been substantially amended or improved by someone other than you or by an AI tool

- Submitting work where the English Language (or the language specified for assessment) has been amended by someone other than you, by language generation/enhancement software or websites or by an AI tool.

3.8 Fabrication and/or falsification of information

Falsification or fabrication of information means that you have intentionally used information within your assessment that is not real. This includes but is not limited to:

- Claiming to carry out experiments, observations, interviews, data collection or any other form of research when you have not done so.

- Creating false data

- Referencing work that does not include the information you claim it does

- The inappropriate manipulation and/or selection of data or imagery with the intent to convey a false impression of the information actually used.

- Using information gained from an AI tool that may not provide you with real information

- Creating false references from an AI tool

- Creating or obtaining information illegally

3.9 Re-using previously assessed material

You are not permitted to use all or part of a piece of work for assessment that you have submitted previously for a different assessment, whether this is in your current programme or for submission at any other institution. Doing so would be an intentional action to gain advantage. The only exceptions to this position are where:

- You use short quotations from a previous assignment in the assessment task which are fully referenced

- You are repeating a year or resitting an assessment task that requires you to improve upon your previous submission (including formative/interim submissions) and the Module Leader agrees to the inclusion of parts of your previous work.

- Where a resubmission is being made for the same component in the same module, and the where the assessment brief has not substantially changed' for that component have not changed.

3.10 Ethics

You are required to follow the correct procedures for undertaking research, including for ethical approval. Failure to not comply with the University's research ethics requirements (add link) is an intentional action that constitutes academic misconduct.

4. How DMU Identifies Potential Academic Misconduct

4.1 During the assessment process, your work will be scrutinised for evidence of academic misconduct. For written work, the University will use on-line tools such as Turnitin to provide staff with a level of information about how you have used external sources. The member of staff will then use that information to assess how matches have occurred and to determine if they have any concerns about potential academic misconduct.

4.2 Within an examination or test condition, your paper will be scrutinised for any evidence of academic misconduct. In examination or test conditions any misconduct, including that relating to your behaviour, will be reported and followed up.

4.3 A student can report another student for alleged or actual academic misconduct, however anonymous reports cannot be investigated. You will not be disadvantaged by the University in any way by reporting the alleged or actual misconduct of another student. We strongly encourage you to talk to a member of staff or the Students' Union if, despite this assurance, you have a misconduct allegation that you do not feel you can raise. If you make a misconduct allegation against another student solely on malicious grounds, we will consider taking disciplinary action against you.

4.4 The University uses the Academic Integrity and Misconduct Procedure to investigate and respond to reports of alleged misconduct.

5. Confidentiality

5.1 The University aims to manage academic misconduct allegations confidentially. It will be necessary for a limited number of people to know the details of the allegation for it to be identified/investigated. Depending on the stage of the Academic Misconduct Procedure, these people will include staff who administer, identify or manage the allegation, who undertake the investigation, are named in the allegation, are witnesses to the matters it raises, are part of a panel that considers the allegation or who are asked to review an appeal against a misconduct outcome.

6. Dignity and Respect

6.1 All students and staff engaging with the Academic Integrity and Misconduct Procedure must behave with dignity and respect for each other and in accordance with the University's values and the Equality Act 2010. The process will be halted if unreasonable or disrespectful behaviours occur. The University may make use of the Student Misconduct and Disciplinary Policy if behaviour constitutes misconduct.

7. Graduation

7.1 You will not be permitted to graduate from the University if there is an on-going investigation into your alleged academic misconduct.

8. Revisiting academic misconduct cases

8.1 In upholding the principles of integrity, honesty and trust, we will revisit cases of academic misconduct that have been previously dealt with and completed if substantively new and credible evidence comes to our attention. We will always undertake further investigation where the evidence relates to serious academic misconduct that would be considered by an Academic Misconduct Panel and/or that relates to fitness to practice. We may also undertake further investigation for other forms of academic misconduct.

9. Misconduct identified after graduation

9.1 We will investigate serious academic misconduct after you have graduated if substantively new and credible evidence is brought to our attention. In undertaking that investigation, we will invite you to attend a meeting of the Academic Misconduct Panel which can also meet in your absence. Under the General Regulations, the University can revoke the award of a degree where a case of serious misconduct is upheld. If you have a right to practice within a particular profession, we will also notify the relevant professional body if a serious case of misconduct is upheld.

10. Context

10.1 This Academic Integrity and Misconduct Procedure will be used to investigate and respond to any reports of academic misconduct and is designed to be fair, proportionate and transparent.

10.2 It will normally be a member of staff who identifies potential or actual misconduct in a student's work. However, as set out in the Academic Integrity and Misconduct Policy, a student may also report the alleged academic misconduct of another student.

10.3 It can be distressing and stressful to have an allegation of academic misconduct made against you. Your wellbeing during any such processes remains of paramount importance and you can seek wellbeing support from Student Services or from your own community services. There are also confidential helplines available (inset 'in crisis link). The Students' Union is available to provide you with confidential and independent help and advice.

10.4 The Academic Integrity and Misconduct Procedure sets out the normal timescales for each stage. We will let you know if we are unable to meet the published timescale and the reason why.

10.5 We will make relevant reasonable adjustments to the operation of this procedure should you require this in relation to a declared disability.

10.6 In each Faculty there will be an Academic Practice Officer who is a senior member of staff responsible for overseeing academic integrity and academic misconduct matters.

10.7 APOs will meet regularly to discuss and ensure consistency of approach

10.8 If the nature of your alleged academic misconduct also indicates an issue of behavioural misconduct (which is addressed in the Student Disciplinary Procedure), we will decide the most appropriate way in which to address both matters proportionately and fairly and will inform you of our decision.

10.9 If the nature of your alleged academic misconduct leads us to have concerns about your Fitness to Study or Fitness to Practice, we will decide the most appropriate way to address these matters and will inform you of our decision.

11. Identifying potential academic misconduct

11.1 Where a member of staff suspects that there is academic misconduct in your assessment, they will gather initial evidence to support that position and will inform the Module Leader. For research degree students, the supervisor should inform the Faculty Head of Research Students and the APO.

11.2 Where a member of staff or invigilator suspects or identifies academic misconduct within examination or test conditions, they will compile a report of what they witnessed and provide that to the Module Leader.

11.3 Where a student suspects or identifies the academic misconduct of another student in an examination or test setting, they must inform a member of staff or invigilator. If a student suspects or identifies academic misconduct of another student in any other setting or wishes to make a report outside the examination or test setting, they should inform the Module Leader or the Faculty Head of Research in the case of research degree students.

11.4 For taught programmes, the Module Leader will make an initial assessment of whether the reported potential misconduct is:

- Poor academic practice or
- Academic Misconduct or
- Unclear whether it is poor academic practice or academic misconduct

11.5 A module leader may seek advice from an Academic Practice Officer where it is unclear if a potential case of academic misconduct has taken place.

11.6 If it is not clear as to whether the conduct is poor academic practice or academic misconduct, the Module Leader will refer the matter to the Academic Practice Officer for a decision.

11.7 For research degree programmes, the initial assessment will be made by the Faculty Head of Research Students.

12. Investigation Report

12.1 The Academic Practice Officer will ensure that an appropriate investigation report is completed. This task will be undertaken by the Faculty Head of Research Students for research degree students in collaboration with the APO.

12.2 In compiling the investigation report, a check will be made as to whether you have any declared disabilities or reasonable adjustments agreed with the University so that these can be noted and are relevant to the allegation.

12.3 Once the report has been compiled, we will:

- Notify you that we are investigating possible academic misconduct in your assessment/s.
- Provide you with the evidence that supports the misconduct allegation
- Confirm our initial assessment of the type of misconduct we are investigating
- Confirm the date and time we wish to meet with you, or state when we will be confirming that information.
- Remind you that support is available from the Students' Union in relation to the allegation, and from Student Services should you need support with your wellbeing.
- Provide you with a link to the Academic Integrity and Misconduct Policy and the Academic Misconduct Procedure.

13. Process for addressing poor academic practice

13.1 Where the evidence shows that the misconduct is due to your poor academic practice, you will be invited to a meeting to discuss the allegation and to hear your response. If this is your first instance of poor academic practice, the meeting will be held with the Module Leader. If it is your second or more instance, the meeting will be held with the Academic Practice Officer. In the case of research students, the meeting will be held with the Faculty Head of Research Students and the APO. You will be given five university days' notice of the meeting which can be held in person or online via Microsoft Teams or Zoom.

13.2 You are entitled to be accompanied to the meeting by a Student's Companion The 'Student's Companion' means a member of the academic Staff of the University (if appropriate), or a registered Student of the University, or a member of the Students' Union Advice Team. The role of the companion is to offer support during formal panel meetings. It is not expected that the companion will need to speak during the investigation or the panel meeting, unless by prior agreement. Meetings and hearings held under this procedure are not legal forums, neither the University nor the Student are permitted to be represented by legal practitioners. 'The Student's Companion' can only be a legal adviser in circumstances where the Student's Fitness to Practise is in question (see the Fitness to Practise Policy). In this instance, the University will also have a legal adviser present. Trade Union representation is not permitted at Fitness to Practise panels.

13.3 We strongly advise you to attend the meeting to help support your learning. However, you may choose (i) not to attend the meeting and/or (ii) make written representations, including any mitigation you consider relevant. Where you choose not to attend, the consideration of your case will go ahead in your absence.

13.4 Following the meeting or consideration of your case, we will determine:

- Any additional work that you need to undertake or support that is required to help you to avoid poor practice in subsequent assessments
- For taught programmes, the mark penalty that may be applied to the assessment in which the poor practice was identified
- For research degrees the mark penalty that may be applied to the assessment in which the poor practice was identified

13.5 You will be notified by email of the outcome of the meeting within ten university working days.

13.6 Up to two instances of poor academic practice will be addressed through this process. If you submit work with poor academic practice in any further submissions, this will normally be addressed through the process for addressing academic misconduct.

14. Process for addressing alleged academic misconduct (Departmental Academic misconduct Hearing or Academic Misconduct Panel)

14.1 Alleged academic misconduct will be addressed through either:

- A Departmental Academic Misconduct Hearing or
- For the most severe cases, an Academic Misconduct Panel. The University's definition of severe cases is set out in point 42.

14.2 The Academic Practice Officer will determine which process will be used dependent on the nature of the case. This task will be taken by the Faculty Head of Research Students for research degree cases. Advice will be taken from the Head of ASO to ensure that this decision aligns with consistency across the University.

14.3 Departmental Academic Misconduct Hearings and Academic Misconduct Panel will consider your case on the balance of probability and standard of proof. This means that for the University to uphold an allegation of misconduct, we need to show sufficient evidence that either the misconduct occurred or is likely to have occurred. The balance of probability is the standard of proof required of us by the UK Office of the Independent Adjudicator), the body that sets out expectations of all higher education institutions. Please be aware that these are not legal proceedings, rather they are internal mechanisms for ensuring that the University maintains academic integrity.

14.4 The processes below set out how the University will manage cases that involve one student. Please see points 62 to 66 for information about how we manage cases involving more than one student, for example, in the case of alleged collusion.

15. Departmental Academic Misconduct Hearing

15.1 The Departmental Academic Misconduct Hearing will be led by the Academic Practice Officer, or in the case of research degree students, by the Faculty Head of Research Students.

15.2 You will be given five university days' notice of the meeting which can be held in person or online via Microsoft Teams or Zoom.

15.3 If the academic misconduct allegation questions whether the work you submitted was solely authored by you, you may also be required to attend an oral examination or practical test prior to or as part of the Departmental Academic Misconduct Hearing. The purpose of that examination or test will be to establish your familiarity with the content of the work. If the University decides that this action should form part of the process, you will be given at least five university working days' notice.

15.4 You are entitled to be accompanied to the Departmental Academic Misconduct Hearing meeting by a Student's Companion. The 'Student's Companion' means a member of the academic Staff of the University (if appropriate), or a registered Student of the University, or a member of the Students' Union Advice Team. The role of the companion is to offer support during formal panel meetings. It is not expected that the companion will need to speak during the investigation or the panel meeting, unless by prior agreement. Meetings and hearings held under this procedure are not legal forums, neither the University nor the Student are permitted to be represented by legal practitioners. 'The Student's Companion' can only be a legal adviser in circumstances where the Student's Fitness to Practise is in question (see the Fitness to Practise Policy). In this instance, the University will also have a legal adviser present. Trade Union representation is not permitted at Fitness to Practise panels.

15.5 We strongly advise you to attend the meeting to help support your learning and to state your response to the allegation. However, you may choose (i) not to attend the meeting and/or (ii) make written representations, including any mitigation you consider relevant. Where you choose not to attend, the consideration of your case will go ahead in your absence.

15.6 The Departmental Academic Misconduct Hearing will consider the evidence of alleged academic misconduct and the response you have to the allegation, including any mitigation. A record of the hearing will be made and shared with you for information and correction of matters of fact.

15.7 Within ten university working days of that meeting, the outcome will be confirmed in writing. The outcome of the meeting will be one of the following:

- There is insufficient evidence to show - on the balance of probabilities- that academic misconduct occurred, and no further action will be taken
- You admit misconduct and an associated penalty will be provided
- There is sufficient evidence to show that - on the balance of probabilities - academic misconduct occurred, and, for taught programmes, an associated penalty will be provided.
- Your case will be referred to an Academic Misconduct Panel because there is evidence that the academic misconduct is severe, and a more significant penalty will be required. Where there is any evidence of academic misconduct by a research degree student, this will be referred to the Academic Misconduct Panel.

- Exceptionally, and in response to matters raised in the meeting, if further investigation is required, a follow-up meeting will be held with you once that investigation has concluded. This follow-up process will normally conclude within ten university working days of you being notified and you will receive a further written outcome which will normally be one of the outcomes listed above.

15.8 The penalty awarded from a Departmental Academic Misconduct Hearing will take account of the nature and scale of the academic misconduct, your response to the findings and any mitigating circumstances that are relevant to the case. Appendix 1 provides a guide to the type of penalties that may be given. You will be given a reason for the penalty that has been awarded.

15.9 The Assessment Board for your programme will be informed of the outcome from the Departmental Academic Misconduct Hearing and any associated penalties will be ratified at that Board. If you are a research student, the Research Degrees Committee will be informed and any associated penalties will be ratified at that Committee.

15.10 If you disagree with the outcome or penalty, you may appeal the decision on the following grounds:

- The University procedure has not been followed appropriately, or;
- There is new information/evidence that was not reasonably available before; or
- The process has not operated in accordance with the Equality Act 2010

15.11 You must submit any appeal in writing within 10 days of receiving the written outcome of the Hearing. Your appeal should be sent to the Academic Support Office at acasupportoffice@dmu.ac.uk and its receipt will be acknowledged in writing within five working days.

15.12 Your appeal will be reviewed by the Director of Registry Services who will either:

- Dismiss the appeal if there are insufficient grounds or
- Refer the case to two Academic Practice Officers (not involved in the original case) for review. The Academic Practice Officers will report back to the Director of Registry Services with a recommendation and the decision of the Director of Registry Services will be final.

15.13 You will be notified in writing of the outcome of your appeal within 20 working days of its original submission. If you are dissatisfied with the outcome of your appeal, you may refer your case to the Office of the Independent Adjudicator for Higher Education (OIA). More information about the role of the OIA can be found here (Office of the Independent Adjudicator for Higher Education - OIAHE) and will be provided in your appeal outcome letter.

16. Academic Misconduct Panel

16.1 The Academic Misconduct Panel will consider repeated instance of academic misconduct and severe cases of alleged academic misconduct, penalties for which may lead to expulsion from the University. Severe cases of alleged academic misconduct are classified by your level of intent to deceive the University to gain advantage. This includes but is not limited to:

- Any form of contract cheating including the unreferenced use of AI in assessment
- Impersonating, or allowing someone to impersonate you in any assessment
- Obtaining access to an examination paper or test before it is formally issued to you
- Failing to obtain ethical approval before conducting research
- Extensive collusion between students
- Obtaining information illegally
- Stealing the work or another student or individual.
- Any form of alleged academic misconduct by a research degree student

16.2 A case will always be referred to an Academic Misconduct Panel if there is full or partial evidence that the alleged misconduct is severe.

16.3 The Academic Support Office is responsible for forming an Academic Misconduct Panel. It will be scheduled within 20 working days of you being informed that it will meet, and you will receive the same written information about the case that is received by the Panel at least ten university working days in advance of the meeting. The Panel meeting can be held in person or online via Microsoft Teams or Zoom.

16.4 The role of the Panel is to:

- Review the investigation report and any supporting documentation that both you and the panel have received.
- Hear from the Academic Practice Officer or nominated academic, or Faculty Head of Research Students, who will present the case.
- Meet with you to hear your response to the findings and any mitigating circumstances you wish to present
- Hear from witnesses that may be called by you or by the University
- Ask questions
- Determine the outcome and any penalty which will take place without your presence. The penalty should take account of any mitigating circumstances you present to the Panel.
- You will be informed of the outcome at the end of the panel hearing.

16.5 The Academic Misconduct Panel will comprise the following people who must not have had any prior involvement with your case:

- A Pro Vice-Chancellor, Dean, Deputy Dean or Associate Dean, Academic who will chair the panel.
- A member of the Students' Union Executive Committee
- A member of academic staff who has been trained in the academic misconduct process or who has experience of such cases. For cases involving a research student/s, this member of staff shall be from the University's Research Degrees Committee.
- The Director of Registry Services or their nominee

16.6 If you are studying on a programme that leads to a qualification that includes the right to practice in a particular profession (known as Fitness to Practice e.g. nursing), the Panel will inform the Fitness to Practice lead that you have been referred to an Academic Misconduct Panel. This is because if a case of academic misconduct against you is upheld, you may also lose the right to practice in that profession. The details of the additional requirements under Fitness to Practice panel can be found here Fitness to Practice

16.7 You are entitled to be accompanied to the Academic Misconduct Panel meeting by a Student's Companion.

16.8 We strongly advise you to attend the meeting to help support your learning and to state your response to the allegation. However, you may (i) choose not to attend the meeting and/or (ii) make written representations, including any mitigation you consider relevant. Where you choose not to attend, the consideration of your case will go ahead in your absence. A record of the proceedings will be taken and you will be provided with a copy for information and corrections of matters of fact.

16.9 Within five university working days of that meeting, the outcome will be confirmed in writing. The outcome of the meeting will be one of the following:

- There is insufficient evidence to show - on the balance of probabilities - that academic misconduct occurred, and no further action will be taken
- You admit misconduct and an associated penalty will be provided
- There is sufficient evidence to show that - on the balance of probabilities - academic misconduct occurred, and an associated penalty will be provided.
- Exceptionally, and in response to matters raised in the meeting, if further investigation is required, and a follow-up meeting will be held with you once that investigation has concluded. This follow-up process will normally conclude within ten university working days of you being notified and you will receive a further written outcome which will normally be one of the outcomes listed above.

16.10 The penalty determined by an Academic Misconduct Panel will take account of the nature and scale of the academic misconduct, your response to the findings and any mitigating circumstances that are relevant to the case. Appendix 1 provides a guide to the type of penalties that may be given. You will be given a reason for the penalty that has been awarded.

16.11 You will be notified of the outcome of the Academic Misconduct Panel verbally at the end of the panel hearing, and this will be followed by confirmation in writing, normally within five university working days of the hearing.

16.12 The Assessment Board for your programme will be informed of the outcome from the Departmental Hearing. If you are a research student, the Research Degrees Committee will be informed. Your academic profile will be updated with the outcome of the Academic Misconduct Panel.

16.13 If you disagree with the outcome or penalty, you may appeal the decision on the following grounds:

- The University procedure has not been followed appropriately, or;
- There is new information/evidence that was not reasonably available before or
- The process has not operated in the context of the Equality Act 2010

16.14 You must submit any appeal in writing within ten university days of receiving the written outcome of the Panel. Your appeal should be sent to the Academic Support Office at acasupportoffice@dmu.ac.uk and its receipt will be acknowledged in writing within five university working days.

16.15 Your appeal will be reviewed by the Director of Registry Services who will either:

- Dismiss the appeal if there are insufficient grounds at which point you may pursue your case with the Office of the Independent Adjudicator (OIA) Office of the Independent Adjudicator for Higher Education - OIAHE or,

- Refer the case to an Academic Misconduct Appeals Committee which will be set-up to consider your case and will comprise the following people who must not have been involved in the original Academic Misconduct Panel or been previously consulted about the case. The Committee will comprise, a Pro Vice-Chancellor or a Dean or a Deputy Dean or an Associate Dean, Academic who will act as chair, a member of the Students' Union Executive Committee and a member of the Academic Board.

16.16 Where an appeal proceeds, the Academic Support Office is responsible for setting-up the Academic Misconduct Appeals Committee. It will be scheduled within 20 university working days of you being informed that it will meet, and you will receive the same written information about the case that is received by the Panel at least ten university working days in advance of the meeting.

16.17 You are entitled to be accompanied to the appeal meeting by a Student's Companion.

16.18 The purpose of the appeal hearing is to:

- Review the case that you have put forward in relation to the grounds for appeal
- Meet with you for you to present your case and to answer any questions
- Hear from witnesses that may be called by you or by the University
- Determine the outcome from the hearing
- Verbally confirm the outcome to you

16.19 Within five university working days of that meeting, the outcome will be confirmed in writing. The outcome of the meeting will be one of the following:

- The appeal is dismissed due to insufficient grounds and the original outcome from the Academic Misconduct Panel is confirmed or
- The appeal is upheld and the original outcome from the Academic Misconduct Panel is changed, and a new outcome is confirmed.

16.20 You will be notified in writing of the outcome of your appeal within five university working days of its original submission. If you are dissatisfied with the outcome of your appeal, you may refer your case to the Office of the Independent Adjudicator for Higher Education (OIA). More information about the role of the OIA can be found here Office of the Independent Adjudicator for Higher Education - OIAHE and will be provided in your appeal outcome letter.

17. Cases involving more than one student

17.1 The University will use the same principles set out in this procedure where the alleged academic misconduct involves more than one student.

17.2 The Departmental Hearing or the Academic Misconduct Panel will be used to ensure that there is a fair and equal opportunity for both or all parties to be heard individually before any decisions are reached.

17.3 The University will schedule the Departmental Academic Misconduct Hearing or the Academic Misconduct Panel in fairness to both or all students (e.g. ideally on the same day). The same people should be involved in the consideration of the case for each student involved.

17.4 In allegations of collusion, it is important to note that the University's definition shows intent by both or all parties involved in such an act because the action ultimately results in one or more students gaining advantage.

17.5 Where an allegation is upheld and there is evidence to show that both or all students have engaged in misconduct, the Departmental Academic Misconduct Hearing or the Academic Misconduct Panel must ensure broad consistency of approach in the penalties that it applies. Any differentiation will normally be due to differences in individuals' mitigating circumstances or differences in admission of the offence.

Created: June 2018
Originating Directorate: Registry Services
Updated by: Joseph Parmar
Approved by: Academic Board
Date of approval: June 2023
Effective date: July 2024
Due for review: June 2025