

Summary of changes to Academic Misconduct Policy

Section (new Policy clause number)	Change	Notes (e.g. no longer applicable / relocated to guidance)
All	Presentation	Re-presented on standard university policy template
1. Overview and Purpose 1.1 Academic Integrity	Precedes policy introduction Set of values and meaning of academic misconduct replace clauses 1 and 2 from previous policy.	Section 1 drawn from existing published Policy and information, e.g. Referencing and academic integrity: Skills Hub Staff and student facing procedures and guidance (with examples) will be provided separately and are not included at policy level.
2. Scope	Precedes policy introduction providing greater clarity on scope, to include credit where students are not registered on an award (e.g. summer school, PGRs taking taught modules) and partner/collaborative provision.	Lifts footnote from previous policy regarding allegations made against former students (refer clause 4.7).
3. Responsibilities	Precedes policy introduction, introducing responsibilities at policy level. Student responsibilities drawn from existing published policy and wording on Student and Skills Hub.	Separate role descriptors will be available within guidance materials
4.2.1 Academic misconduct definition	Use of overarching high-level definition from Office of the Independent Adjudicator for Higher Education (OIAHE) which frames misconduct in terms of 'unfair advantage' rather than intent, which can be subjective and difficult to prove. As per OIAHE definition , there is now clarity that the case will hinge on potential unfair advantage.	Definitions reviewed against those used in the sector by QAA and OIA

	Moves from 'types' of misconduct to 'examples', as more than one example may be found in a submission.	Decouples the example of misconduct from the assessment mode, investigation route and penalty.
4.2.2 Collusion	Rationalisation of current definition.	Text simplified for conciseness.
4.2.3 Plagiarism	Rationalisation of current definition.	Examples of plagiarism shortened, and meaning of 'overlapping material' broadened.
4.2.4 - 4.2.6 Personation	Rationalisation of current definition, with relocation of unauthorised or inappropriate use of digital technologies and impersonation within in-person exams.	Addition of separate examples of misuse of artificial intelligence, drawn from University of Sydney.
4.2.6 Breach of in-person examination or test room protocols	Re-work of existing 'exam misconduct' definition which also covers remote online exams (CEX).	Revision is closer to the original pre-covid definition and relates to in-person assessments only.
4.2.7 Fabrication	Expands current definition to include fabricated quotations and citations, falsification and misrepresentation.	
4.2.8 Breach of Research Ethics	Updated wording to reflect revised Ethics Policy approved by Senate in July 2025.	
4.2.9 Other examples of academic misconduct	New caveat to cover any other type of behaviour which has the potential to undermine the integrity of assessments.	
4.3.1 Assessment submitted in English	Principles on language-based assessments and translation services from previous policy (clause 15) removed.	Moved to underpinning procedures.
4.3.3 Students must work alone on preparation of assessment	Principles on proofreading services from previous policy (policy 16) removed.	Moved to underpinning procedures.

4.3.4 Issue of intent	Removal of the extent of the pre-meditated intention involved in the misconduct as a key factor.	Draws focus on whether the university's academic integrity requirements are met within the submission.
4.3.6 Outcome determined on the balance of probability	Clarity that cases are determined on 'balance of probability' as per OIA Good Practice Framework	
4.4.1 Levels of academic misconduct	New levels (1-limited, 2-significant, 3-severe) replace 'minor/major' to mirror PGR regulations.	Examples provided in guidance.
4.5.1 Investigation procedure and route	Procedures removed from Policy and detailed elsewhere as per Policy Framework.	Moved to underpinning procedures.
4.5.4 First Case	'First Case' process no longer limited to plagiarism and collusion, but clause allows very severe cases to be referred to Panel, which can implement a wider range of penalties.	
4.5.6 Allegations processed without the need to refer to Panel	Provision enables flexibility for cases to be processed under delegated authority where academic judgement is not required, such as where a student admits that misconduct has occurred, or there is other prima facie evidence.	The OIA Good Practice Framework details examples of decisions which do and do not require academic judgement.
4.6 Indicative Penalties	Penalties and their escalation are as per current policy, with the exception of 'disallow resit' and First Case.	
4.7 Academic Misconduct allegations after an award has been made	New policy acknowledges the challenges of investigating a historic case, while providing a clause to allow investigation of former students and enact GCGC Regulations 16 and 22.	
Appendix 1	Terms of reference and composition quoracy moved from clause 63 in previous policy	