

Academic Integrity & Misconduct Policy

Introduction

1. Queen Mary University of London aims to deliver an outstanding, inclusive, world-class education that aligns with our core values: inclusive, proud, ambitious, collegial and ethical. Our commitment to academic integrity in all areas of education is fundamental to achieving this. This policy sets out the responsibilities and expectations for all members of the Queen Mary community to deliver on this commitment.

Purpose

2. Delivering on our commitment to academic integrity is a shared responsibility for staff and students. This policy sets out Queen Mary's commitment to providing students with the skills, tools and opportunities to demonstrate our core values during the course of their education and student experience. The policy also sets clear expectations for students when engaging with teaching, learning and assessment, and the procedures that will be followed where concerns are raised about student conduct during assessment, teaching and learning activities.

Key Definitions

3. **Academic Integrity** refers to the core values, expectations and standards for excellence in education and research that are upheld by members of a scholarly community. Academic integrity is the way members of the scholarly community (staff and students) actively demonstrate that their academic work is ethical, honest and trustworthy.
4. **Academic Misconduct** refers to actions or working methods that undermine academic integrity during an assessment task or educational activity. Academic misconduct includes actions that undermine the integrity and/or purpose of an assessment, provide a student(s) with undue advantage over others, or undermine the educational standards and reputation of Queen Mary.
5. **Academic Misconduct Chair** refers to staff members appointed by Senate to make decisions about potential academic misconduct by students at the institutional level (that is, concerns which have been referred to the Appeals, Complaints &

Conduct Office).

6. **Academic Misconduct Officer** refers to the academic staff member(s) nominated by the Head of School/Director of Institute to make decisions about potential academic misconduct by students, and to ensure that the Academic Integrity & Misconduct Policy is followed in their School/Institute.
7. **Poor Academic Practice** refers to actions that fall below the expected standards for the completion of an assessment task but do not meet the definitions or threshold to be considered academic misconduct. Poor academic practice occurs when a student has made genuine attempts to comply with the instructions or requirements of the assessment/activity, but an unintentional or minor oversight gives rise to concern about their scholarly practice. For example, where a student has attempted to acknowledge their sources but has not done so in the expected format or standard.

Legislative and Regulatory context

8. The Higher Education and Research Act 2017 makes it clear that all universities and colleges that register with the Office for Students must follow its regulatory framework. This framework requires universities to ensure that assessments undertaken by students are valid and reliable, and that awards issued on completion of studies are credible. The framework also sets out that the quality of education and awards at Queen Mary should meet certain standards that are recognised across the higher education sector. This policy outlines Queen Mary's commitment to developing high standards of academic practice, safeguarding the validity, reliability and credibility of assessments and awards, and ensuring that any actions that undermine this commitment are dealt with appropriately.
9. The Skills and Post-16 Education Act 2022 sets out that it is a criminal offence to provide or arrange cheating services for financial gain to students enrolled at a higher education provider in England. It is also an offence to participate in advertising these services. These activities do not align with our core values or commitment to academic integrity; they may also be considered misconduct when conducted by a student at Queen Mary. Misconduct of this nature which does not relate to a student's own assessment submissions will be referred to the [Student Discipline Policy](#).
10. Queen Mary subscribes to the Office of the Independent Adjudicator for Higher Education (OIA) student complaints scheme, in line with the Higher Education Act 2004. The OIA is an independent review body to which students have recourse should they be dissatisfied with the University's handling of academic misconduct. The OIA's [Good Practice Framework](#) outlines principles and guidance that the University's procedures are expected to comply with.

Scope

11. The Academic Integrity & Misconduct Policy applies to all students at Queen Mary.

12. The Policy may also apply if concerns arise about a former student who has now graduated but is believed to have engaged in academic misconduct during their studies at Queen Mary. Under certain circumstances, this may result in the revocation or reclassification of an award.
13. All staff members are responsible for ensuring that the Policy is implemented and adhered to in the educational activities they deliver, and for reporting any concerns to their Academic Misconduct Officer and/or the Head of the Appeals, Complaints & Conduct Office.
14. Academic Integrity is essential in all areas of academic life. Actions that undermine integrity may be considered misconduct in any assessment or activity, including formative assessment or learning activities. In certain circumstances, the Head of the Appeals, Complaints & Conduct Office may refer concerns about academic integrity or misconduct for consideration under the [Student Discipline Policy](#).
15. Any instance of academic misconduct for students registered on programmes regulated by Professional, Statutory and Regulatory Bodies (PSRBs) will be reported to the Professional Capability Committee and, where it is a stipulated requirement, to other professional bodies that accredit awards.

Principles

16. The education and student experience principles set out in [Queen Mary's Strategy 2030](#), and our Core Values (Inclusive, Proud, Ambitious, Collegial, Ethical) inform the application and implementation of this Policy.
17. The University actively promotes the development of new pedagogical approaches and technologies in assessment, the provision of inclusive support and opportunities for students to engage with learning and assessment, and world-leading quality and standards in education and research.
18. Academic misconduct which shows disregard for the University's core values is likely to result in more serious consequences. The University also recognises that acknowledging and learning from our mistakes demonstrates our core values; where students show contrition and reflection in response to academic misconduct concerns this will be taken into account in decision-making.
19. In line with the [Academic Regulations](#), all marks awarded must be a true reflection of a student's achievement. Where this is called into question, it is normal practice that a student will be required to resubmit work that reflects their own achievement before credit can be awarded.
20. The principles of natural justice, fairness, consistency and proportionality underpin the University's response to any academic misconduct concern.

Roles and responsibilities

21. Academic integrity is the responsibility of all members of the Queen Mary community.

22. The University is responsible for:

- Delivering learning and assessment in line with the [Active Curriculum for Excellence \(ACE\)](#) approach and the Queen Mary Assessment Strategy.
- Providing students with resources and opportunities to develop sound academic skills and practice, and an understanding of the academic conventions for their discipline.
- Ensuring that the expectations and instructions for completion of assessment tasks are clear and accessible.
- Providing students with information about the support available should they face challenges impacting their ability to effectively engage with their studies.
- Ensuring that any concerns about academic integrity are handled fairly and in accordance with this policy.
- Familiarising themselves with information and tools about the detection of academic misconduct, and procedures outlined in this policy for reporting concerns.

23. Students are responsible for:

- A commitment to their own learning, engaging with the resources, opportunities and advice available to support their success. This includes familiarising themselves with the expectations set out in this policy, the academic conventions of their discipline, and the instructions for assessments.
- Ensuring that any work they submit or present is a genuine reflection of their own ability, skills and knowledge, and that it complies with the relevant assessment requirements.
- Ensuring that their actions comply with the requirements of any relevant professional or accreditation body.
- Engaging with the procedures set out in the policy in good faith and respect.

24. Heads of Schools/Directors of Institutes are responsible for the nomination of Academic Misconduct Officer(s) (and Deputies where required) to implement the procedures outlined in this policy. They are also responsible for ensuring that all relevant staff members within their School/Institute act in compliance with this Policy.

25. Module Organisers and staff involved in assessment and marking are responsible for reporting any concerns regarding academic integrity or misconduct to their Academic Misconduct Officer.
26. Academic Misconduct Officers are responsible for ensuring that any academic misconduct concern is investigated and addressed in accordance with this Policy. For matters considered locally by the School/Institute this includes reaching decisions about whether academic misconduct has occurred, and if so the appropriate outcome. For more serious matters, this includes ensuring that a suitable referral is made to the Appeals, Complaints & Conduct Office.
27. Academic Misconduct Chairs are responsible for reaching decisions in cases that have been reported to the Appeals, Complaints & Conduct Office (also referred to as 'institutional level'). This includes reaching decisions about whether academic misconduct has occurred, and the appropriate outcome. It also includes chairing Misconduct Panels convened under paragraph 68 of this Policy.
28. Nominated staff members of the Appeals, Complaints & Conduct Office are responsible for ensuring that referrals made at the institutional level are well-founded and suitably evidenced, before the case may be heard. They are responsible for ensuring that cases are heard in accordance with this Policy, including decisions made by Academic Misconduct Chairs or Panels, and Academic Misconduct Appeals.
29. The Head of the Appeals, Complaints & Conduct Office is responsible for the implementation and interpretation of this Policy. The Appeals, Complaints & Conduct Office provides advice, training and resources that support the implementation of this Policy.
30. The Appeals, Complaints & Conduct Office will present an annual report to the Education & Student Experience Board and Senate with detailed academic misconduct statistics, and any relevant academic integrity activities.

Academic Misconduct Procedures

Types of Academic Misconduct

31. A non-exhaustive list of different actions that are likely to constitute academic misconduct is provided below. This list is non-exhaustive, and any other activity that undermines the integrity of an assessment, attempts to gain undue advantage in an assessment, and/or breaches the Academic Regulations relating to the conduct of assessment may also be considered academic misconduct.
 - a. Plagiarism (including self-plagiarism). Queen Mary defines 'plagiarism' as presenting someone else's work as one's own, irrespective of intention. This includes close paraphrasing, copying from the work of another person, including another student or using the ideas of another person without proper acknowledgement. Self-plagiarism includes repeating work that you

have previously submitted – at Queen Mary or at another institution – without proper acknowledgement. Plagiarism is considered academic misconduct because it undermines the validity and credibility of the work and means that results are not a true reflection of someone's own knowledge and skills.

- b. Collusion. Queen Mary defines ‘collusion’ as any illegitimate cooperation between students in the preparation or production of submitted work, irrespective of intention. Unless such joint work is explicitly permitted by the relevant assessment guidance, students must ensure that any work submitted for individual assessment is entirely their own. Collusion is considered to be academic misconduct because it involves working practices that do not align with the expectations or instructions of the task and undermine the validity of the results as a reflection of individual students’ achievement.
- c. Falsification or fraudulent reporting of any element of an assessment. This includes fraudulent reporting of source material, experimental results, research or other investigative work, and signatures or documentation evidencing completion and/or compliance. These actions are considered academic misconduct because they are unethical, incompatible with our core values, and undermine the credibility of Queen Mary education and research.
- d. Use, or attempted use of a third party for the completion of any part of an assessment. This includes ghost-writing, impersonation or other contract cheating services, and unauthorised and/or unacknowledged contributions from other third parties such as private tutors, family or friends. Queen Mary provides a range of academic support services which foster students’ development and learning. The use of other third parties in the completion of an assessment is misconduct because it undermines the validity of the work as a reflection of the student’s own knowledge and skills.
- e. Unauthorised or unacknowledged text manipulation that undermines the integrity of an assessment, including the use of paraphrasing software, generative artificial intelligence or machine translation such that the work submitted cannot be considered wholly the student’s own. This is considered academic misconduct because it undermines the validity of the work, and provides an undue or unfair advantage over another student who has completed the assessment in line with the requirements.
- f. Examination misconduct, relating to an invigilated examination or in-class test. This includes activities that fall outside the instructions and/or requirements of an invigilated assessment, such as:
 - unauthorised access to an examination paper or venue before an examination.

- forgery of an examination timetable produced by Queen Mary.
 - removal of a question paper, answer script, or other materials from an examination venue.
 - causing a disturbance during an examination, either physically, verbally, or through an electronic device.
 - refusal to cooperate with an invigilator, or to follow an invigilator's instructions.
 - possession of unauthorised material and/or devices while under examination conditions, or leaving unauthorised material in an examination venue (including cloakrooms and toilets).
 - access, possession, or use of unauthorised material via an electronic device during an examination. For the avoidance of doubt, this includes access or use of unauthorised material via an approved device.
 - communication with another candidate while under examination conditions.
 - copying, or attempting to copy, the work of another candidate.
 - having writing on the body in an examination venue.
- g. Misconduct during online examinations, take-home exams, and other time-constrained assessment tasks, including:
- any activity that falls outside the instructions and/or requirements of the assessment
 - communicating with another candidate about the content of the assessment
 - access or use to unauthorised materials, devices or tools
 - unauthorised access to an assessment paper before an examination/assessment
 - communication or collaboration with a third party about the content of the assessment during the assessment
 - unauthorised distribution or publication of the assessment paper or materials.
- h. Breaches of research ethics during the conduct of an assessment. Any research conducted without, or beyond the scope of, ethical approval. This includes research commenced before ethical approval has been granted.

Research ethics breaches are considered to be academic misconduct because they do not align with our core values, and fail to demonstrate the expected standards of scholarship.

Investigation Procedures

32. The University recognises that academic misconduct matters can be challenging or distressing for students. Students have the right to access support, advice and/or reasonable adjustments at all stages of this procedure. It is considered good practice for students to have the opportunity to discuss any concerns being investigated and/or feedback about their scholarly practice.
33. Where an assessment is investigated under these procedures, the student will be informed within the same timeframe stipulated for the return of marking and feedback. The student should be provided with resources to develop their understanding of academic integrity, and information about this Policy.
34. While an investigation is undertaken, the confirmation and publication of official results for the relevant module will normally be withheld.
35. Queen Mary strives to ensure that these procedures are accessible, inclusive, supportive and educational. Students are strongly encouraged to engage with the procedures in good faith. Should a student decline to engage, the process is not invalidated by their absence.
36. The Appeals, Complaints & Conduct Office will review the veracity of any third party report of academic misconduct, which may include requesting further evidence to determine whether an investigation should proceed. In order to protect the privacy of students, no third party will receive any information regarding the student, or any further action taken.
37. An investigation will normally be concluded within 28 calendar days.

Invigilated Examinations

38. Should any concern arise during an invigilated exam or in-class test, the invigilator will gather all available information about the concern, such as photographs or confiscation of any unauthorised material or device, and complete an invigilators' report outlining the nature of the concern and actions taken.
39. Where the Assistant Academic Registrar (Student Enquiry Services) and the Head of the Appeals, Complaints & Conduct Office determine that a minor breach of the examination instructions has occurred, but which does not call into question the integrity of the student's submission, the student will be issued a written warning. No further action will be taken, and the submission will be marked as usual.
40. In other cases, where there is concern about the integrity of the submission, copies of the invigilator's report, any relevant evidence and the examination

documentation will be referred to the Appeals, Complaints & Conduct Office for further investigation.

41. The Appeals, Complaints & Conduct Office will seek advice from relevant academic colleagues about the relevance or interpretation of any discipline-specific materials.
42. The case will then proceed to be heard in line with paragraphs 63-67 of this Policy.

Research Ethics

43. Any concern regarding the ethical conduct of research should be reported to the [Queen Mary Research Ethics Committee \(QMREC\)](#) in the first instance.
44. QMREC will review the concern, and gather any relevant information in line with their procedures, before deciding whether the concern constitutes a research ethics breach.
45. Where QMREC decides that a research ethics breach has occurred during a student assessment, they will refer the matter to the Appeals, Complaints & Conduct Office to determine the appropriate outcome or penalty in line with paragraph 87 of this Policy. The decision of QMREC regarding any research ethics breach is final. Subsequent consideration under the Academic Integrity & Misconduct Policy will be concerned only with the appropriate outcome or penalty (if any).

Postgraduate Research Theses

46. Any report of potential academic misconduct involving a postgraduate research student must be reported to the Appeals, Complaints & Conduct Office.
47. In cases where the subject matter requires expert opinion, the Appeals, Complaints and Conduct Office may consult outside bodies or persons where appropriate.
48. The student will be provided with all relevant evidence and the opportunity to respond.
49. All cases involving a postgraduate research student will be heard by a Misconduct Panel, as outlined in paragraphs 68-85.

Coursework and all other assessments

50. All markers and Module Organisers are responsible for ensuring that any concern about academic integrity is explored, and should they believe that academic misconduct is likely to have occurred that the matter is reported to the Academic Misconduct Officer.
51. The Academic Misconduct Officer will, in consultation with relevant colleagues, gather relevant information, such as: TurnitinUK reports; source materials; notes from any meeting; contextual information about formative tasks, supervisor

meetings or other learning and teaching activities; annotations and commentary from a subject matter expert; guidance, instructions or requirements; document metadata; statements from any witness or other involvement party.

52. The Academic Misconduct Officer may invite the student to a meeting to explore the concerns and/or their understanding where proportionate and appropriate. A meeting is normally required for concerns about the involvement of third parties or the unauthorised use of technology.
53. Once the Academic Misconduct Officer is satisfied that they have sufficient information, they will decide on one of the following outcomes:
 - a. That there is no cause of concern. The assessment will be returned for marking and results released in the normal way.
 - b. That poor academic practice has occurred. The student is encouraged to engage with support and resources to improve their scholarship and academic skills. The assessment will be returned for marking and results released in the normal way.
 - c. That there is evidence of potential academic misconduct, and the case should be heard. The Academic Misconduct Officer will determine whether the case should be referred to the Appeals, Complaints and Conduct Office, or resolved by the School or Institute. A case will normally be referred to the Appeals, Complaints and Conduct Office where:
 - i. the student has a prior instance of academic misconduct on their record.
 - ii. the nature of the allegation suggests a deliberate act (for example, ghost writing, impersonation, fraudulent/falsified elements).
 - iii. the assessment makes a substantial contribution to the student's progression and/or award (taking into account the level of study, assessment weighting and/or programme specifications).
 - iv. the appropriate penalty, in accordance with university guidance, exceeds the scope of the school or institute (as per paragraph 60).

Hearing a case

54. Where there is evidence of potential academic misconduct of any type, the student will be informed of the nature of the allegation and provided with copies of all relevant evidence to be considered gathered during the course of the investigation.
55. The student will be invited to respond, and have the opportunity to provide any additional evidence they wish to be taken into account.
56. The student will have the opportunity to state whether they wish for their case to

be decided by the Academic Misconduct Officer/Misconduct Chair alone (paragraphs 60-67), or whether they wish for the matter to be referred to a full hearing by the Misconduct Panel (paragraphs 68-85).

- 57. If the student does not respond within seven calendar days, it will be assumed that they have no further information to provide, and the case will be decided by the Academic Misconduct Officer/Misconduct Chair.
- 58. All decision makers will apply the balance of probabilities as the standard of proof.
- 59. A decision will normally be reached within 28 calendar days from the conclusion of the investigation.

School/Institute level

- 60. The Academic Misconduct Officer is responsible for decision-making in cases which are heard locally, as defined in paragraph 53 (c).
- 61. The Academic Misconduct Officer will first decide whether or not there is sufficient evidence for academic misconduct to be found. Should they decide that there is insufficient evidence, or that misconduct has not occurred, the matter will be dismissed. The assessment will be returned for marking and the results released in the normal way.
- 62. Where the Academic Misconduct Officer decides that academic misconduct has occurred, they will decide on the appropriate outcome, from those listed in paragraph 87, i-v.

Appeals, Complaints & Conduct Office (Institutional level)

- 63. On receipt of any referral to the institutional level, a nominated staff member of the Appeals, Complaints & Conduct Office will review the case. The nominee has the discretion to decide that the concern relates to poor academic practice, in which case the student will be provided with information about academic integrity and the assessment will be returned for marking and results released in the normal way. Should the nominee consider that further evidence or investigation is required, they will return the case to the Academic Misconduct Officer with advice.
- 64. For cases decided by Academic Misconduct Chair alone, the Chair will be provided with copies of all documentation and evidence collected, including the response and any evidence provided by the student.
- 65. The Academic Misconduct Chair will first decide whether there is sufficient evidence for academic misconduct to be found. Should they decide that there is insufficient evidence, or that misconduct has not occurred, the matter will be dismissed. The assessment will be returned for marking and the results released in the normal way.
- 66. Where the Academic Misconduct Chair decides that academic misconduct has

occurred, they will decide on the appropriate outcome, from those listed in paragraph 87, i-xi.

67. At any stage, an Academic Misconduct Chair has the discretion to refer a case to be heard by the full Academic Misconduct Panel.

Academic Misconduct Panel

Membership

68. An Academic Misconduct Panel will be chaired by any Academic Misconduct Chair approved by Senate.
69. Two further academic members, who are either: members of Senate, Subject Examination Board Chairs (and Deputies), Degree Examination Board Chairs (and Deputies), or Academic Misconduct Officers.
70. A student representative, nominated by QMSU.
71. No member of an Academic Misconduct Panel will be from the same department as the student whose case is to be presented. Normally, at least one academic member will be from a cognate department.
72. A Panel will be considered quorate with at least three members, one of whom must be an approved Academic Misconduct Chair.

Panel Hearings

73. The Appeals, Complaints & Conduct Office will circulate all relevant documentation, including all available evidence, the date/time/location/format of the hearing, and a copy of this Policy, to the student and members of the panel no less than seven calendar days before the date of the hearing.
74. Any additional written response or documentary evidence should be provided at least 2 working days before the hearing, to ensure that panel members have sufficient time to review the material.
75. The hearing will normally be attended by a representative from the Appeals, Complaints & Conduct Office and/or a subject matter expert from the School/Institute, who will provide information about the concerns and evidence but take no part in decision making.
76. A student may be accompanied by any one representative of their choice.
77. The student will have the opportunity to respond to the concerns raised and the evidence provided. The student will also have the opportunity to provide any information about mitigating circumstances that they wish to be taken into account, without prejudice to whether they agree that academic misconduct has occurred.

78. The attendance of other witnesses at the panel hearing is not normally necessary. Should the student or University wish to call witnesses, the Chair has the discretion to decide whether they should attend the hearing or be invited to provide a written statement.
79. The secretary to the panel will take notes during the hearing, and provide clarification on procedural or regulatory matters. A copy of the notes taken will be provided on request.
80. The decision of the Chair on any procedural matter is final.
81. At the conclusion of the hearing, the Panel will deliberate in private.
82. The Panel will first decide whether there is sufficient evidence for academic misconduct to be found. Should they decide that there is insufficient evidence, or that misconduct has not occurred, the matter will be dismissed. The assessment will be returned for marking and the results released in the normal way.
83. Where misconduct has been found, the Panel will decide on the appropriate outcome from any of the options outlined in paragraph 87.
84. If a Panel is divided on a decision to be taken, the Chair will have the casting vote.
85. The student will normally be notified of the outcome within three working days after the hearing.

Outcomes

86. Where academic misconduct has been found to occur, one or more of outcomes listed below may be issued. To ensure proportionality in decision-making, the scope of outcomes available to the decision-maker at different stages of this process is outlined in the relevant paragraphs above.
87. All decisions made under this Policy strive to balance the importance of consistency and clarity, with fair consideration of the individual circumstances. To ensure fairness for all students, decision-makers will have due regard to the guidance on outcomes for common forms of misconduct outlined in Appendix 2, and provide reasons for all decisions. Where a decision-maker decides to vary from this guidance for any good reason they will include an explanation of the factors considered.
- i. a formal reprimand.
 - ii. a requirement that the student undertake a specified educational activity of formative task, within a specified timeframe.
 - iii. a requirement that the element of assessment in which misconduct occurred be resubmitted. This will not count as an additional attempt at the module, and the resulting assessment mark will not be capped.

- iv. failure (a mark of zero) in the element of assessment in which misconduct occurred. Reassessment is permitted where eligible.
- v. failure (a mark of zero) in the element of assessment in which misconduct occurred, with no right to resubmit the assessment.
- vi. capping to the minimum pass mark for the module in which misconduct occurred.
- vii. failure (a mark of zero) in the module of which the assessment forms a part, with the maximum mark on any resit or retake limited to the minimum pass mark.¹
- viii. failure (a mark of zero) in the module of which the assessment forms a part, with no permission to resit or retake the module. 1
- ix. capping to the minimum pass mark for all modules taken (and yet to be taken) in the current academic year. Any module marks below the minimum pass mark will stand.
- x. a requirement that data affected by the misconduct be destroyed, and/or a restriction on the publication or dissemination of the research.
- xi. a requirement that the student rectify any material affected by the misconduct within a specified timeframe.
- xii. a recommendation to the Principal that the student be suspended from the programme for a period of up to one academic year; where it is deemed appropriate, the Chair of the Panel may also recommend that the student receive marks of zero in all modules taken during the academic year in which the misconduct occurred.
- xiii. a recommendation to the Principal that the student be expelled from Queen Mary; where it is deemed appropriate, the Chair of the Panel may also recommend that the student receive marks of zero in all modules taken during the academic year in which the misconduct occurred.

Academic Misconduct Appeals

- 88. Where academic misconduct has been found to occur, a student may appeal this decision and/or any penalty imposed. The appeal will be considered by a nominated member of the Appeals, Complaints & Conduct Office who has had no prior involvement in the case.
- 89. An Academic Misconduct Appeal should be submitted within 14 calendar days from the outcome, and should include reasons and evidence that the appeal meets one of the applicable grounds. The Head of the Appeals, Complaints & Conduct Office has discretion to accept late appeals where there is a good reason for the delay.
- 90. New evidence or issues will not be considered unless the student can demonstrate

good reason why that information was not previously made available.

91. The appeal process will involve a review of the existing casefile by the nominee to determine whether:
- i. the procedures were followed appropriately, and/or,
 - ii. the outcome was reasonable in light of the available evidence.
92. If it is determined that the case was not handled in accordance with the procedures and/or that the outcome was not reasonable in light of the available evidence, the decision-maker may take corrective action where appropriate, refer the case back to the original decision-making body for reconsideration, or refer the case to the Appeals, Complaints and Conduct Office for reconsideration by a Misconduct Chair or Misconduct Panel.
93. The student will be informed of the outcome of an appeal in a Completion of Procedures letter. This is the final stage in Queen Mary's internal Academic Integrity & Misconduct Policy.
94. An Academic Misconduct Appeal will normally be concluded within 28 calendar days of receipt. The student will normally be notified if consideration of their appeal is likely to take longer than this.
95. Queen Mary subscribes to the Office of the Independent Adjudicator for Higher Education student complaint scheme. Where a student remains dissatisfied at the completion of Queen Mary's internal procedures, they may submit a complaint for review by the OIA. Information about the OIA and a student's rights to access this scheme will be provided in any Completion of Procedures letter.

Review

96. This Policy will be reviewed annually by the Education & Student Experience Board and Senate for approval of any minor amendments ahead of the next academic year.
97. The Appeals, Complaints & Conduct Office, in consultation with the Assessment sub-Board of EQSB will normally conduct a detailed review and consultation on more substantive changes to the Policy at five year intervals.

This Policy was approved by Senate on 13 June 2024.

Appendix 1: Academic misconduct involving two (or more) students

1. In all cases involving two or more students, the University strives to balance privacy with procedural fairness.
2. Procedural fairness means that students must have the right to hear and respond to information about them, or which is taken into account in any decision made about their case. This will often include information provided by another student about a misconduct case involving both of them. For example, if two students are believed to have engaged in collusion, an admission by one student is likely to have implications for the other student.
3. To protect students' privacy, only information that is necessary to ensure fairness will be shared. For example, if one student provides information about personal circumstances as mitigation, it is unlikely to be necessary or relevant for other students to know this.
4. To ensure consistency of decision making, cases involving more than one student will normally be considered by a single Misconduct Chair and/or a Misconduct Panel with the same composition.
5. Where one (or more) student(s) requests for their case to be heard by a full Misconduct Panel whereas other student(s) request a decision by Chair alone, the Chair will consider whether it is proportionate and necessary for all students' matters to be referred to the Misconduct Panel. Where this does not occur, the same Chair will normally be involved in all cases.
6. Where a case involving more than one student is heard by a Misconduct Panel, the Appeals, Complaints & Conduct Office and the Chair will decide whether a joint hearing should occur. If a joint hearing is decided, all students will have the opportunity to address the Panel in private to raise any personal circumstances.
7. Decision makers will take the individual circumstances of each student into account. To ensure consistency, where students receive different outcomes in a common case reasons for the variation will be stated, in line with Appendix 2: Outcome Guidance.

Appendix 2: Outcome Guidance

Type of misconduct	Recommendation
Plagiarism/collusion (first instance)	Outcome iv
Examination Misconduct	Outcome vii
Ghost-writing	Outcome vii
Other types of misconduct	Outcome vii
Unauthorised or unacknowledged text manipulation (where text only is affected by the misconduct, not material content. Where content falsification occurs, penalties comparable to “ghost-writing” should be considered).	Outcome iv (as minimum)
A second or subsequent instance of academic misconduct of any kind	Escalating outcomes, relative to previous penalty. Usually Outcome vii or above.

Decisions about the appropriate action and outcome should take into account the following:

1. To ensure quality & standards, all marks awarded must be a true reflection of a student’s achievement. Where the integrity of an assessment has been compromised, it is normally expected that the outcome will require resubmission of the student’s own work to obtain credit. Penalties that do not require resubmission are normally applied where it is clear that a sufficient proportion of the work can be considered the students own achievement, for example, minor instances of plagiarism in a larger body of the student’s own work.
2. No advantage: decision makers will consider whether or not a student who has engaged in academic misconduct will be advantaged over a student who failed an assessment or module honestly, and attempt to ensure this is not the case.
3. Honesty & integrity: instances where a student shows no attempt to produce their own work will be treated with the utmost seriousness. A student’s response may also be taken into account; for example, contrition and reflection may warrant leniency, whereas sustained intention to deceive throughout the case may call for more serious actions.
4. Repeated instances: repeated occurrences of misconduct will normally be treated more seriously. Lack of industry or engagement with learning and support which results in repeated misconduct will normally result in escalating outcomes.
5. Any relevant accompanying behaviour: actions impacting other members of the Queen Mary community, such as coercion, deceit or falsely implicating an innocent student may be taken into account.
6. The effect of the penalty and practical implications for progression or award.
7. The assessment context: this can include expectations about the student’s academic experience, and/or the nature and value of the assessment.

Appendix 3: Transnational Education Programmes

1. The “harmonised penalties” outlined below apply to academic misconduct found to occur in the course of collaborative programmes between Queen Mary and:
 - i. Nanchang University
 - ii. Queen Mary School Hainan
 - iii. Northwestern Polytechnical University
 - iv. Beijing University of Posts and Telecommunications
2. For the avoidance of doubt, the “harmonised penalties” replace those outlined in Paragraph 85 for students on these programmes.
3. Harmonised Penalties:
 - i. A formal warning
 - ii. A requirement that the student resubmit the relevant piece(s) of assessment by a specified deadline with no cap on the mark that may be obtained.
 - iii. A requirement that the student resubmit the relevant piece(s) of assessment by a specified deadline with the resubmission mark capped at the minimum pass mark.
 - iv. A mark of 0 for the relevant piece(s) of assessment, but if the module is failed the student may reattempt at the next opportunity.
 - v. A mark of 0 in the module of which the assessment forms a part, with the module mark capped on any reattempt at the minimum pass mark.
 - vi. The overall classification of Honours to be reduced by one grade with an explanation to be provided as to why the calculated mark does not match the Honours awarded.
 - vii. Recommendation to the Steering Committee¹⁰ that the student be expelled from the two universities. The Steering Committee decision must be ratified by the Principal/President of both universities before the student can be expelled.
4. QM penalties where the mark is capped mean that for the UK transcript and Honours calculation the mark is limited to 40% on the UK scale (60% on the CN scale) but the mark recorded by BUPT will be the uncapped mark as BUPT does not use capping of marks.
5. Where the penalty involves failure in the module the student may reattempt but, unless specified in the harmonised penalties, must miss the next opportunity, if the next opportunity is held in less than six months, and except for students spending the final year in London where examinations are held annually.
6. Penalty vii. will only be applied for exam misconduct cases where the QMUL standard penalty of failure of all modules would mean dismissal by BUPT as the students cannot fail more than 30 credits under BUPT regulations.