


ACADEMIC INTEGRITY POLICY AND PROCEDURES

For students on the MBChB undergraduate medical programme refer to the MBChB Policy on Academic Misconduct, including unfair practice, cheating and plagiarism.

Contents

 THE UNIVERSITY OF BUCKINGHAM	1
Introduction and Scope.....	3
Section A: Definitions, Application and Protocols.....	4
What is Academic Integrity?	4
Promoting and Maintaining Academic Integrity.....	4
Protocols to Maintain Academic Integrity	5
Breaches of Academic Integrity	5
Self-plagiarism	7
Breaching ethical standards	7
Research students	8
Section B: Procedures and Penalties.....	8
Procedures for Breaches of Academic Integrity in Invigilated Examination Rooms.....	8
Investigation into Breaches of Academic Integrity in Summative Assessments	9
Initial Inquiry	9
A The extent of the breach of Academic Integrity.....	9
B Student Profile	9
C Intent.....	9
Penalty Calculator	9
Courses of Action.....	10
Full Investigation	11
Course of Action after Full Investigation	11
Penalties for Breach of Academic Integrity	12
Penalties for Breach of Academic Integrity in PG (Res) Theses	14
Appeals	14
Grounds of Appeal	14
Appeals Procedure.....	14
Figure 1: Academic Integrity	17
Figure 2: Academic Integrity Procedures.....	18

Introduction and Scope

1. This Policy and Procedures document aims to encourage the development of a learning community at the University of Buckingham in which our students and staff learn from one another whilst conducting themselves with courtesy, integrity, honesty and mutual respect.
2. The document is divided into two sections:
 - Section A:** sets out the scope, definitions and application of the Policy and the protocols to be applied in all cases.
 - Section B:** outlines the procedures to be followed in all cases of suspected breaches of Academic Integrity.
3. The document outlines the usual timescales. Please note that when 'working days' are referred to, this excludes weekends, bank holidays and University closure days.
4. Students may obtain advice about Academic Integrity at any point from ASK, the Academic Skills Development team.
5. Additional information and guidance can be found in the University's *Handbook*.
6. All new students are recommended to attend a training workshop "What is Academic Integrity?" run by ASK during the induction period of their first term of study. The workshop will cover aspects of this Policy and will conclude with a short test on understanding Academic Integrity within Moodle.
7. Students will be offered instruction throughout their studies in Academic Integrity. In the interests of fairness and justice, and to protect many students who follow good academic practice, all students must adhere to this Policy and Procedures document regarding Academic Integrity.
8. References within this document to 'invigilated examination' refer to a formally invigilated written or oral test scheduled and supervised by the University Registry. These should be read in conjunction with the **Examination Rules for Candidates** (Section on Academic Rules and Regulations of the University *Handbook*).
9. 'Summative Assessments' refer to all forms of work produced by students individually or in groups and submitted/presented to academic staff for summative assessment, as outlined in approved Module Specifications. This may include in-class tests, examinations, essays, reports, term papers, dissertations, individual or group presentations, websites, recorded material or in other media. For postgraduate research students, this includes project preliminaries and the thesis submitted for examination. In this policy 'thesis' or 'supervised research' refers to all forms of work presented for consideration of a postgraduate award by research.

Section A: Definitions, Application and Protocols

What is Academic Integrity?

10. The University of Buckingham strives to ensure students feel a part of an academic community that shares and develops ideas. Students are encouraged to work with others, interpret and present other people's ideas and produce their own independent academic work.
11. Therefore, the University undertakes to ensure that students are guided on how to distinguish between other people's work and their own, and to correctly acknowledge other people's work. They will be led to understand how to avoid plagiarism and be instilled with good practice for their time at the University.
12. Students will be informed that all work they submit for assessment is expected to be their own independent work. They will be informed that they must fully acknowledge where they have worked with others, or where they present other people's work as part of their assessment or work they have previously submitted for assessment at the University or elsewhere.

Promoting and Maintaining Academic Integrity

13. For the purposes of maintaining academic integrity, the following criteria will be distributed to all students, included in handbooks and posted clearly on web pages and course information.

Situation	What does it mean?
Acknowledging all sources of information	Appropriately acknowledging all sources of information drawn upon in your own academic work according to the citation and referencing practices of your discipline.
Fairness	Never seeking to obtain unfair advantage for yourself or another in any form of academic assessment or examination.
Not to collude	Collaborating with others when appropriate is acceptable BUT knowing when you need to produce your own, independent work is necessary.
Original work	Never obtaining unauthorised external assistance in the creation of work that you submit for assessment including the use of a peer's past submitted assessments.
Accurate data	Always presenting accurate data and information in your academic work.
Acknowledging previous work	Declaring when you have used academic work that you have previously submitted in another academic context and using it only with the University's permission and appropriate citation.

Observing ethical guidelines	Complying with the ethical requirements for the research projects that you undertake, including the University Ethics Policy.
Responsibility	Complying with and undertaking your research responsibly, following all necessary regulatory, legal and professional obligations.

14. Although supporting and maintaining Academic Integrity provides the central focus of this Policy, most of the information relates to failure to maintain (i.e., breaches of) Academic Integrity.

Protocols to Maintain Academic Integrity

15. Except where otherwise clearly indicated, students will be assessed based on their own unassisted and unaided work.

16. In the interests of fairness and justice, students will be made aware that it is University policy to compare all coursework (where feasible) against databanks of existing material to check any similarity that might be in breach of Academic Integrity as defined in paragraph 10.

17. Research students have the opportunity to submit their penultimate draft through Turnitin. Once a student submits a thesis for assessment, a subsequent formal Turnitin report will be used to help identify potential instances of plagiarism or concerns over originality that would then need to be considered under this policy.

18. From the **General Regulations for First Degrees, at 11.2 and 11.3**, coursework submitted for assessment must disclose:

- i All sources of information consulted (which must be distinguished as either primary or secondary); and
- ii Any money paid in respect of proofreading.

19. In the research for and preparation of coursework, students will be informed that they must not receive any assistance other than:

- i The typing of students manuscript (in line with the **General Regulation for First Degrees, at 11.3 a**)
- ii The obtaining of access to a source of information, including obtaining the opportunity to question a person orally or in writing (in line with the **General Regulation for First Degrees, at 11.3 b**)
- iii Proofreading in line with the University's guidance.

Breaches of Academic Integrity

20. Any student suspected of being in breach of the University's regulations relating to examinations, supervised research and coursework will be investigated under this Policy and may be subject to disciplinary proceedings. Such breaches may occur as a result of mistake, negligence or because of intentional misconduct.

21. The following are examples of circumstances recognised as breaches of Academic Integrity that would normally result in formal investigation of a student's performance. The list is not exhaustive and other circumstances may be considered by the University authorities at their discretion. Some breaches may fall into more than one category. Examples are given below.

Circumstance	What does it mean?
Plagiarism	<p>The use of ideas, intellectual property or work of others (including that of another student) without appropriate acknowledgement and/or indication. This action results in presenting someone else's work and/or ideas as your own. It may be considered a form of intellectual theft, e.g., copyright infringement.</p> <p>Examples include:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> i Presenting substantial extracts from books, articles, theses and other published or unpublished works, such as working papers, seminars and conference papers, internal reports, computer software, Internet materials, and lecture notes, slides or recordings or tapes, without clearly indicating their origin with quotation marks and references in footnotes or bibliography. ii Using very close paraphrasing of sentences or whole paragraphs without due acknowledgement in the form of reference to the original work in the text or the footnote. iii Quoting directly from a source and consistently failing to insert quotation marks around the quoted passages. In such cases it is not adequate merely to acknowledge the source.
Cheating	<p>Any action before, during or after an examination or assessment by which a student seeks to gain unfair advantage or assist another student to do so. This includes the possession of unauthorised material or technology during an examination and attempting to access unseen assessment materials in advance of an examination.</p>
Collusion	<p>Working with another student or students in an unauthorised way to create academic work that should be created by a student independently.</p>
External authorship and/or assistance	<p>Where a student present work as their own that has been created using unauthorised external input including ghost-writing or use of commercial essay</p>

	<p>mills* or any other form of contract cheating, whether that input is obtained on a commercial basis or not.</p> <p><i>*Essay mills are companies, which offer to write essays or other student assignments in exchange for money. They typically advertise themselves as academic writing services.</i></p>
Falsification	Any attempt to present fictitious or distorted data, evidence, references, experimental results or other material and/or knowingly to make use of such material.
Copying from another student	Copying from another student, with or without that student's permission.
Disruptive behaviour during examinations or in-class tests	
Personation and Impersonation	<p>Personating by assuming the identity of another or allowing another to assume your identity in order to mislead or deceive.</p> <p>Impersonating by taking the appearance in corporeal form of another.</p>
Submitting work that has been corrected/revised by a third party	Assistance through correcting English or target language where the learning outcomes for a module include a specific requirement to demonstrate facility with written English or a target language.
The inclusion of irrelevant offensive or obscene material in assessments submitted	
The use of translation websites for Modern Foreign Language (MFL) courses	See 'submitting work that has been corrected/revised'.

Self-plagiarism

22. Recycling which is also referred to as 'self-plagiarism' where a piece of work or part thereof which has already been used in one context is used again (without appropriate acknowledgement or authorisation) in another context will result on the recycled material not to be marked. The marking team will remind the student of the need to self-reference.

Breaching ethical standards

23. This covers failing to comply with ethical obligations when carrying out academic work as set out in the **University Ethics Policy** and the applicable ethical requirements for your subject area, such as failing to obtain free and informed consent.

Research students

24. Breaches of Academic Integrity in research includes any of the above breaches in relation to examinations, supervised research and coursework including a failure to comply with regulatory, legal and professional obligations such as a breach of confidentiality, infringement of intellectual property rights, failure to take due care for participants in research or of personal data, and abuse of research subjects or materials (including artefacts).

Section B: Procedures and Penalties

25. This section sets out the procedures and penalties for breaches of Academic Integrity in examinations, coursework and theses.

Procedures for Breaches of Academic Integrity in Invigilated Examination Rooms

The resulting steps are followed

Step 1	<p>Where a student is suspected of a breach of Academic Integrity, the invigilator should quietly inform the student at an appropriate time that this is suspected.</p> <p>If a discussion is necessary, or evidence may be destroyed in the course of the examination the invigilator should ask the student:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none">i To accompany them from the examination room.ii To perform appropriate checks and hand over unauthorised material found at the desk or on their person.iii To be photographed where the unauthorised material is not removable and then, for example, to wash it off. <p>The student will be informed that they are allowed to continue the examination and, must remain seated at the end to complete a statement of their account.</p> <p>If appropriate, additional time to compensate for the time lost as a result of the initial enquiry may be given.</p>
Step 2	<p>If unauthorised material is suspected, this will be confiscated and retained for use in the consequent Academic Integrity investigation. The student's examination script will be flagged to the marking team.</p>
Step 3	<p>A written report of the incident will be prepared by the invigilator(s) and submitted to the Central Academic Integrity Advocate (CAIA) immediately following the examination, together with any suspected unauthorised material, examination script, and the student's statement.</p>
Step 4	<p>In cases brought to the invigilator's attention during the examination, the Central Academic Integrity Advocate (CAIA) will flag the examination script to the marking team and submit the evidence listed in Step 3 to the School Academic Integrity Advocate (SAIA) to initiate an Academic Integrity investigation.</p>

Investigation into Breaches of Academic Integrity

Initial Inquiry

26. Where there are reasonable grounds for suspicion of a breach of Academic Integrity, whether through notification from the University's detection software or by other means, the marking team, or in the case of postgraduate research, the supervisor or examiners, will pass the case to the School Academic Integrity Advocate (SAIA) to conduct an initial inquiry. This is done by completing the Academic Integrity Form, granting access to the Moodle page where the work is submitted and passing any other relevant information to SAIA.
27. The SAIA will conduct the initial inquiry, and either conclude the case or escalate to a full investigation within two term weeks. Any delays in the investigative procedure will be communicated to the student. If the SAIA is also a member of the marking team, the student's work will be passed to a different SAIA.
28. A profile of the case including the following considerations will be prepared by the SAIA in line with the University's procedures:

A The extent of the breach of Academic Integrity

- i the amount of text allegedly plagiarised
- ii the closeness to the original text
- iii the nature of the material allegedly plagiarised, whether purely descriptive or including results, etc.
- iv the weighting of the summative assessment element in which breach of Academic Integrity is alleged, in terms of the overall course assessment

B Student Profile

Due consideration will be given to the following factors, while recognising that they are not necessarily all entirely distinct

- i the stage of the student in their programme
- ii the number of previous offences (if any)
- iii the extent of the student's knowledge of the concept of Academic Integrity e.g. does the student's Department have on file a copy of the University policy, procedures and penalties relating to Academic Integrity, signed by the student and/or has the student attended the 'What is Academic Integrity?' workshop and completed the MOODLE test on Academic Integrity (and if so, score recorded)

C Intent

- i contravention of invigilated examination rules
- ii attempt to deceive
- iii contrition

Penalty Calculator

29. When profiling the case, SAIA uses a Penalty Calculator that is fed with the profiling data. Regardless of the score determined by the Penalty Calculator, in cases where

material has been appropriately referenced a judgement of no breach of Academic Integrity is appropriate. In cases where an investigator deems a student has been careless with referencing, but some attempt has been made, a judgement of Poor Academic Practice may be given at the investigator's discretion.

Courses of Action

30. Following the above profiling exercise, the SAIA will carry out one of the following courses of action:

No Breach of Academic Integrity

31. Where it is decided no breach of Academic Integrity has occurred and all material has been properly presented, no further action will be taken. Work will be marked as normal. Incident is removed from the student's record.

Poor Academic Practice

32. For minor irregularities in presentation of material (e.g. inconsistent referencing, inadequate/excessive paraphrasing, incorrect application of scholarly style), a judgement of **Poor Academic Practice (PAP)** will apply.

33. The investigation will be concluded and the result reported to the student (copying marking team and personal tutor), within a period of two term weeks of the case being referred.

34. **PAP** outcomes will not be recorded on the student's file but will be on the School and Central databases.

35. Work will be marked in the light of this judgement and the student will have an explanatory discussion with their Personal Tutor. It would normally not be appropriate to consider a case as **PAP** where the student has previously received a judgement of **PAP** or breach of Academic Integrity as the student would be expected to have familiarised themselves with appropriate academic practice.

36. Where a judgement of **PAP** is made on a thesis, the work will be assessed in the light of this judgement by requiring appropriate remedial action be taken before the award is recommended and publication of the thesis occurs.

Potential Breach of Academic Integrity

37. Where the SAIA concludes that a potential breach of Academic Integrity may have been committed, they will call for a full investigation.

38. A record of all cases and their outcomes will be submitted by the SAIA to the CAIA to add to the central database, and for collecting management information on breaches of Academic Integrity for subsequent analysis. Cases in which no breaches were found will be anonymised.

Full Investigation

39. At this stage, the SAIA must inform the student in writing (copying marking team, and personal tutor), attaching a copy of the latest approved version of this document. The student will be informed that an investigation is taking place and given an opportunity to offer any explanation or mitigation, either in person or in writing. The student will be given a minimum of 5 days to prepare to make representation in person or provide written representation. If the student makes representations in person, the default position for full investigation will be a video conference and the meeting will be recorded. A student may request a face to face meeting and a note taker will be present. The student may be accompanied at the meeting by a supporter (a person accompanying the student reported or complainant under this policy to a panel and/or hearing, such as a fellow student, member of staff or member of the Students' Union unconnected to the matter).
40. The SAIA shall conduct the full investigation in consultation with other relevant parties as required. The investigation will be concluded and the result reported to the student, within a period of two term weeks of the case being escalated to full investigation. Any delays in the investigative procedure will be communicated to the student.
41. Where the SAIA has reason to suspect that a piece of work submitted by a student was wholly or in part prepared, researched or written by someone other than the student who submitted it and this has not been disclosed by the student, they may call for the student to defend the work in a *viva* or a written comprehension test.
42. The *viva*/comprehension test will be conducted as soon as is reasonably practical by a panel of three examiners selected by the SAIA.
43. The burden of proof in such a *viva* or test will be upon the student to demonstrate to the panel's satisfaction their full comprehension of the work they have submitted.
44. It is the student's responsibility to appear for the *viva*/comprehension test. Failure to appear without satisfactory explanation will result in an immediate failure of that test, with a resulting presumption that the student is in breach of the regulations relating to Academic Integrity and application of penalties will be applied as outlined below. A written record of the outcome of the *viva*/comprehension test will be prepared by the panel and added to the evidence.
45. A record of all cases and their outcomes will be submitted by the SAIA to the CAIA to add to the central database, and for collecting management information on breaches of Academic Integrity for subsequent analysis. Cases in which no breaches were found will be anonymised.

Course of Action after Full Investigation

No Breach of Academic Integrity

46. Where it is judged no breach of Academic Integrity has occurred and all material has been properly presented, no further action will be taken. Work will be marked as normal. Incident is removed from the student's record.

Poor Academic Practice

47. For minor irregularities in presentation of material (e.g. inconsistent referencing, inadequate/excessive paraphrasing, incorrect application of scholarly style), a judgement of **Poor Academic Practice (PAP)** will apply.
48. The investigation will be concluded and the result reported to the student (copying marking team and personal tutor), within a period of two term weeks of the case being referred.
49. **PAP** outcomes will not be recorded on the student's file but will be on the School and Central databases.
50. Work will be marked in the light of this judgement and the student will have an explanatory discussion with their Personal Tutor. It would normally not be appropriate to consider a case as **PAP** where the student has previously received a judgement of **PAP** or breach of Academic Integrity as the student would be expected to have familiarised themselves with appropriate academic practice.
51. Where a judgement of **PAP** is made on a thesis, the work will be assessed in the light of this judgement by requiring appropriate remedial action be taken before the award is recommended and publication of the thesis occurs.

Breach of Academic Integrity

52. Where it is decided that there has been a breach of Academic Integrity, a judgement of **Academic Misconduct** will apply. The SAIA will close the case and then share the case with a second SAIA to confirm the finding. In the event that the second SAIA does not support the finding, the case will be passed to a third SAIA, and the majority decision will be accepted.
53. When applying penalty E or above, the decision must be made by a panel of adjudicators selected by the SAIA. The panel is likely to be formed of the CAIA, the Programme Director or Head of Department and the relevant Module Leader.
54. Penalties A to G will be communicated to the student via the SAIA.
55. When applying penalty H, following the panel decision, SAIA will submit the decision to Registry. Registry will seek approval for penalty H from the Chair of Senate. Registry will communicate the outcome of Penalty H to the student.
56. The investigation will be concluded and the result reported to the student and the penalty that has been applied (copying marking team, and personal tutor), within a period of two term weeks of the case being escalated to full investigation.

Penalties for Breach of Academic Integrity in Summative Assessments

57. Where it is decided that there has been a breach of Academic Integrity, a judgement of **Academic Misconduct** will apply. The student will be penalised as noted below. The

penalty will take into account the extent, gravity and nature of the breach and be in line with similar cases recorded by the University or elsewhere in the sector.

A	The material judged to have been plagiarised will be disregarded, and a grade will be awarded on the remainder of the work. The student will be informed and a record will be entered on the student's file.
B	The items in which plagiarised work was discovered will be required to be resubmitted. The maximum grade that can be awarded for the element(s) of work so resubmitted will be the minimum pass mark. The student will be informed and a record will be entered on the student's file.
C	Award of zero for the individual plagiarised element(s) of the module. There will be no resubmission opportunity. The student will be informed and a record will be entered on the student's file.
D	Award of zero for the entire module. There will be a requirement to retake all elements of the module and the maximum grade that can be awarded for the module will be the minimum pass mark. The student will be informed and a record will be entered on the student's file.
E	Award of zero for the entire module. There will be no retake opportunity. In this scenario a substitute re-sit module would not be permissible. The student will be informed and a record will be entered on the student's file.
F	Failure of all modules taken in the Stage. Students may retake all modules in the Stage at the next available opportunity for a capped pass mark. The student will be informed and a record will be entered on the student's file.
G	Lesser final award (e.g. Pass degree). The student will be informed and a record will be entered on the student's file.
H	Failure of the programme. A recommendation of expulsion from the University. The student will be informed and a record will be entered on the student's file.

58. Any repeat upheld offences can be expected to result in a higher penalty and may result in automatic expulsion.

59. Registry reserves the right to require any student with a record of Academic Misconduct to sit further examinations in an invigilated examination room, where the summative assessment would otherwise take another format.

Penalties for Breach of Academic Integrity in a Postgraduate Research Theses

60. Where it is decided that there has been a breach of Academic Integrity, a judgement of **Academic Misconduct** will apply. The student will be penalised as noted below. The penalty will take into account the extent, gravity and nature of the breach, and be in line with similar cases recorded by the University or elsewhere in the sector.

B	That the thesis be revised and re-submitted for the degree for which it was submitted. At Masters level, the revised thesis would be restricted to a capped passed mark. An oral examination would normally be held. The student will be informed and a record will be entered on the student's file.
G	Lesser exit award The student will be informed and a record will be entered on the student's file.
H	Failure of the programme. A recommendation of expulsion from the University. The student will be informed and a record will be entered on the student's file.

61. Any repeat upheld offences can be expected to result in a higher penalty and may result in automatic expulsion.

Appeals

62. Appeals will be considered where a penalty has been applied for a breach of Academic Integrity occurring in summative assessments, theses and invigilated examinations.

Grounds of Appeal

63. Appeals may be made on one or both of the following grounds:

- i Procedural irregularity in the conduct of the Academic Integrity Policy and Procedure
 - ii New evidence to show that academic misconduct has not taken place is made available with a valid reason as to why it was not disclosed at the time of investigation.
- Mitigating Circumstances are not grounds for appeal under this policy.

Appeals Procedure

64. Students may submit an appeal using the Academic Integrity Appeals Form as soon as possible and not normally later than one week after the notification of the finding. Any relevant evidence in support of the appeal must accompany the student's submission and students must state all of the grounds upon which the appeal is based.

65. The appeal paperwork will be screened by an Academic Services Representative who will check the appeal is fit for consideration, to ensure that:

- i The Academic Integrity Appeals Policy and Procedure is applicable; and
- ii That the Academic Integrity Appeals Form is suitably completed, citing as its basis, any of the grounds as listed above in Paragraph 63; and
- iii That the appeal has been submitted in time.

Ineligible appeals may be directed to a more appropriate procedure or dismissed completely with sign off by the Senior Registry Officer or nominee.

66. Appeal paperwork meeting the screening criteria will be considered by a Review Panel consisting of an Independent Dean from another School and an Academic Services Representative. The Review Panel will check the eligibility of the appeal to ensure that:
 - i Any of the grounds as listed above in Paragraph 63 are met; and
 - ii That appropriate evidence has been provided to support the appeal.
67. Following receipt of the documentation, the Review Panel will assess the documentation and will seek additional information if necessary. The Review Panel will have access to all materials from the case and be able to question the SAIA and other relevant parties in making a decision on the appeal. The function of the Review Panel is to review the decision in a timely manner and, in the interest of fairness to the student, to ensure that appropriate procedures have been followed.
68. You should expect an outcome two weeks after you have submitted your appeal. Any delays in the procedure will be communicated to you.
69. You may be given an opportunity to make representations at any stage of the appeal process either in person or in writing. If you make representations in person, you may be accompanied by a supporter such as a fellow student, member of staff or member of the Students' Union unconnected to the matter.
70. If the decision of the Panel supports the original decision, then no further approval is required and the decision is considered final. The outcome will be communicated to the student (and the student's Head of Department or Programme Director) by the Independent Dean.
71. If the decision of the Panel is to uphold the appeal (and thereby overturns the original decision), the paperwork must be forwarded to the Chair of Examination Senate or nominee for a final decision. The outcome of the appeal will be communicated to the student (and the student's Head of Department or Programme Director) by the Chair of Examination Senate or nominee.
72. Copies of the correspondence must be forwarded immediately to Registry once proceedings have concluded for the purposes of maintaining the student record.
73. A Completion of Procedures letter will be issued by the Registry Officer if the appeal is dismissed, once the student's case has exhausted the University's procedures. The letter will summarise the outcome of the appeal and inform the student of his/her right to request a review of their case by the Office of the Independent Adjudicator. The letter will be issued within 28 days of procedures being completed.
74. The Office of the Independent Adjudicator for Higher Education (OIA) runs an independent scheme to review student appeals and complaints once all internal procedures have been completed. The University is a member of this scheme. If you are unhappy with the outcome you may be able to ask the OIA to review your appeal. You

can find more information about making a complaint to the OIA, what it can and can't look at and what it can do to put things right here: <https://www.oiahe.org.uk/students>.

75. Advice concerning the application of the above procedures either during or after their application may be sought from Registry.

Figure 1: Academic Integrity



All suspected breaches of the **Academic Integrity Policy and Procedure** will be considered. A finding of Academic Misconduct can seriously impact a student’s future study and professional practice.

Investigatory Process into Breaches of Academic Integrity

Classification	Resolution	Investigatory Process
Class 1	No breach of Academic Integrity	No formal investigation. The outcome is determined via standard marking and may be informally consulted with the SAIA
Class 2	Poor Academic Practice	Initial enquiry conducted by the SAIA
Class 3	Academic Misconduct	Investigatory process triggered and conducted by the SAIA
Class 4	Academic Misconduct	Investigatory process triggered and conducted by the SAIA and further up to a panel (paragraph 45 of the Academic Integrity Policy and Procedure)

All classes are carried out at School level.

Figure 2: Academic Integrity Procedures

