



Division of Student Experience

Procedural Information to support the Academic Misconduct Policy

Contents

1. OVERVIEW AND PURPOSE.....	2
2. SCOPE	2
3. RESPONSIBILITIES	2
4. PROCEDURES.....	3
4.1 Definitions (relevant procedural information).....	3
4.2 General principles.....	4
4.3 Levels of Academic Misconduct	5
4.4 Procedure for determining a case of academic misconduct.....	6
4.5 Indicative penalties.....	11
4.6 Academic Misconduct Panels	13
5. ACADEMIC MISCONDUCT AFTER AN AWARD HAS BEEN MADE.....	15

1. OVERVIEW AND PURPOSE

1.1 This document provides the procedural information that underpins the University's Misconduct Policy [*hereafter 'the Policy'*]. It must be read in conjunction with the Policy.

1.2 It is designed to provide further information to all staff members responsible for operationalising the Policy.

2. SCOPE

2.1 The procedural information mirrors the Policy and has sections relating to definitions and levels of academic misconduct, indicative penalties, and procedures for determining a case of academic misconduct, including referral to an academic misconduct panel.

2.2 As per 4.1 of the University's [Policy on the Creation and Management of University Policies](#), procedural or process documents like this one outline the required way of working, and processes which must be followed. They are official documents to which staff must adhere. Guidance holds a different designation; it provides related advice or details of best practice. It will be made clear within the document where a section/clause is guidance rather than a procedure.

2.3 This is a University level document. Whilst it is recognised that subject areas have different characteristics it is nonetheless necessary to have a consistent baseline informing local actions. This will ensure parity, transparency, and consistency whilst still allowing for local flexibility where appropriate.

2.4 It is also recognised that the Policy is new for 2025-26 and, whilst Faculty structures are becoming established some flexibility and pragmatism will be required in order to operationalise the Policy. It is therefore expected that this accompanying document will be updated throughout the year.

3. RESPONSIBILITIES

3.1 Responsibility for the administration of these procedures, and any local processes designed to further operationalise work associated with academic misconduct, lies in the main with Faculties and Schools. The owner of this document, from a governance perspective is the Division of Student Experience.

3.2 Updated role descriptors are being prepared and will be published here, once finalised: <http://www.sussex.ac.uk/adqe/standards/academicmisconduct/integrity>

4. PROCEDURES

4.1 Definitions (relevant procedural information)

4.1.1 A piece of assessment may contain more than one type of academic misconduct (e.g. there may be evidence of both plagiarism and fabrication, or a breach of research ethics and collusion). These procedures relate to summative assessment where the mark contributes towards credit. Where academic misconduct is suspected in formative (non-contributory) work or modules which are audited by PGRs, the misconduct should normally be addressed by specific feedback on the issue that has raised concern.

4.1.2 Plagiarism

The use of the same material submitted for credit, without appropriate acknowledgement, (either at Sussex or another institution) is not permitted. For cases where work has been re-used within summative assessments see clauses 23 and 24 relating to 'Overlapping material 'Procedures for Marking, Moderation and Feedback'.

4.1.3 Collusion

Students should be advised not share their work, their ideas or approaches to summative assessment (where these are individually assessed rather than by group). They should also be discouraged from sharing devices during the period that they are working on their own assessments (up to and including any late submission period) as this could lead to situations where work is accessed by other students. This is because the definition of collusion states "...an act of collusion includes those who...allow others to access their work prior to submission for assessment".

This information is noted on the Student Hub pages relating to Academic Misconduct and should be provided in assessment briefs and guidance on Canvas sites

4.1.4 Breach of in-person examination or test room protocols

The advent of "smart" technology has increased the risk to the integrity of in-person examinations and test rooms. In addition to mobile phones, the use of wrist watches, ear buds, and eyewear, any of which may have built in Bluetooth and AI technology, may form part of an allegation of academic misconduct.

4.1.5 Unauthorised or inappropriate use of digital technologies, including artificial intelligence

- i. Where AI usage is permitted by an assessment brief, the student remains responsible for verifying the accuracy. Where the AI tool has provided false sources or quotations, and the student has not checked them, this will be treated as academic misconduct.
- ii. Per 5.2.1 of the Academic Misconduct Policy, all work submitted for assessment should be written or presented by the student in English, unless otherwise specified by the assessment

brief. This means that work, or sections of work, cannot be written in a language other than that required for the assessment and then translated by a third party (person or electronic service/tool). Such action could result in a case of unauthorised use of digital technologies, which (per 5.1.4 of the Policy) includes in its definition “use of AI or other digital tools, such as translation tools, in an assessment where their use has been prohibited.”

- iii. Where a translation service is required for source used in the assessment that is not available in English, or the language required for the assessment, the student must confirm the section/s of the assessment that has been translated and whether this has been translated by themselves or a third party.
- iv. Unauthorised or inappropriate use of digital technologies in the former Academic Misconduct definitions was folded into the fabrication or personation definitions. The intention now is to provide a clearer type of misconduct for cases where unauthorised use of AI is suspected. Fabrication and personation definitions remain for cases where the root cause is suspected to be something other than misuse of AI. The Investigating Officer should use their academic judgement to determine which type of misconduct to cite.

4.2 General principles

4.2.1 The assessment brief is a critical element in the investigation of any potential academic misconduct. The detail, clarity, and strength of the brief will help to make outcomes easier to determine. Standardised assessment briefs can help to provide clarity for both staff and students. Where useful, module convenors are advised to work closely with their Academic Developers to ensure their assessment brief is robust.

4.2.3 Where a proofreading service (whether human or technology based) is used the student must ensure that no substantive changes are made to the content of the assessment prior to submission. It is the student's responsibility to ensure that any changes made comply with the University Proofreading Protocols, and to retain a copy of edits made by the proofreader. Proofreading will not be permitted on some assessments. Where there are concerns that proofreading has led to substantive changes, a case of personation or unauthorised use of digital technologies may be taken forward, based on the authorship of the assessment.

4.2.4 Students should retain research data that underpins dissertations or projects until after graduation.

4.2.5 Schools must agree and provide students with information on discipline specific referencing norms at the start of their studies. These norms must be notified to students at the start of their studies, through course/module handbooks and/or Canvas sites, module teaching sessions and assessment briefings, as appropriate. Markers must ensure that appropriate referencing norms have been adhered to.

4.2.6 All sources of information used in preparing the work being submitted must be fully acknowledged, in an approved format. This includes acknowledging all written and electronic

sources. Where work is produced in an examination context it will be sufficient to acknowledge the source without providing a full reference.

4.2.7 Students must not take notes or other unauthorised materials/devices into an examination, unless the instructions explicitly state that this is allowed. Guidance for students can be found on the Student Hub: [During your exam : University of Sussex](#).

4.2.8 Per 4.3.5 of the Academic Misconduct Policy, the issue of intent or exceptional circumstances is excluded from determining whether misconduct had occurred or not. Consideration must focus on potential for unfair advantage.

4.2.9 The University does not use AI-based detection tools, due to concerns around data protection, potential bias, and the reliability and accuracy of such tools. Given this position, markers should not use these tools when putting forward an allegation of misconduct. More information on the University's position regarding AI in relation to teaching and assessments can be found [here](#).

4.3 Levels of Academic Misconduct

4.3.1 Per 5.3.1 of the Academic Misconduct Policy, misconduct is categorised by levels of severity, depending on the scope of the breach, any previous cases, and the impact on the assessment; specifically, whether the breach fundamentally undermines the integrity of the work, confers an unfair advantage or otherwise presents a risk to the institution. The stage of study, and/or weighting of the assessment should not determine the level of potential academic misconduct.

4.3.2 The indicative level is determined, in the first instance, by the Investigating Officer who should use the examples below as a guide. If the Investigating Officer is not confident in their determination, they can note this and provide a commentary as to why they are not certain, but they cannot defer the determination entirely to the panel.

4.3.3 Where a case has been referred to an Academic Misconduct Panel, the Panel can amend the level if this is indicated by the evidence and /or what emerges during the course of the Panel meeting.

4.3.4 Level 1 – Limited

Examples of Limited misconduct may include, indicatively:

- Where a small proportion of the assessed work contains misconduct, i.e. less than 10% of the work, or 1-2 examples of any form of misconduct;
- Where a minority of references are incorrect, potentially due to errors in use of digital technologies such as AI;

4.3.5 Level 2 – Significant

Examples of Significant misconduct may include:

- Where the assessment contains repeated instances of limited misconduct;

- Where a large proportion of the assessed work contains the misconduct;
- Where the extent of the misconduct is small (e.g. a small number of fabricated sources), but is substantive to the argument or analysis;
- A piece of work which appears to have been produced wholesale by an unauthorised use of AI tools;
- Where ideas and content that are of fundamental importance to the argument or findings of an assessment contain misconduct.

4.3.6 Level 3 - Severe

Examples of Severe misconduct may include:

- A piece of work which appears to have been commissioned (e.g. via an essay mill) such that it is felt that there is none of the student's own work present;
- Impersonating, or allowing someone to impersonate you in any assessment;
- In cases of breach of research ethics involving human participants and highly sensitive subjects;
- An act which presents serious reputational or legal risks to the institution;
- Other severe breaches which undermine the integrity of assessments such as obtaining and/or sharing an assessment task or model answers in advance, or attempting to bribe, coerce or otherwise influence a member of staff to be assessed more favourably than the work merits.

4.3.7 No case

If the Investigating Officer believes that the evidence presented is not sufficient to determine whether or not misconduct has occurred at all, they will return the material to the marker/module convenor with a request for more information. If this is not forthcoming, the Investigating Officer will not proceed with the case.

4.3.8 Concurrent cases

If a First Case is identified and followed by another, or multiple, instances of potential academic misconduct in the same assessment period then all cases will receive the fixed penalty for a First Case. The Investigating Officer will be responsible for liaising with the different module convenors to ensure cases are processed correctly, seeking advice from the Academic Misconduct Office as necessary.

If a case is identified, and is followed by another, or multiple instances of potential misconduct in the same assessment period, but the student already has an upheld First Case then all cases should be referred to an Academic Misconduct Panel. The Panel will have the discretion to scale and apply penalties as necessary. Where practicably possible, all cases will be considered by the same Panel.

4.4 Procedure for determining a case of academic misconduct

4.4.1 Initial identification

Where a concern has been raised, during the marking or moderation process, the marker, under the oversight of the module convenor, should take prepare an initial mark-up with reference to the Turnitin report (where relevant) and submit to the Investigating Officer as a potential first case.

Where a registered doctoral tutor is involved in the marking process, the module convenor should undertake this work to avoid a situation where a student would be reviewed by another student.

4.4.2 The initial mark-up can consist of light touch notes against some of the concerns, mainly serving to prompt the module convenor during the student meeting. This should be submitted to the Investigating Officer for confirmation of how to proceed.

4.4.3 First cases

The Investigating Officer should first confirm with relevant colleagues that this is a first incident of level 1 or level 2 academic misconduct (i.e. that there are no previously upheld allegations of academic misconduct on record).

If it is not a first case, or where the Investigating Officer feels this needs to be treated as level 3 even when a first case, then the Panel case process will apply.

Where a first case is confirmed, the Investigating Officer will ask the module convenor to meet with the student to discuss the assessment and the concerns that potential academic misconduct has occurred. Students should be invited to this meeting no later than 10 days after the provisional marks have been published. Exceptionally, a meeting with the MC may take place after this date, but should be held as soon as practicable. Any student can request adjustments to the meeting, e.g. for the meeting format to be amended to online or to be accompanied by someone to support them, if they would find this beneficial.

This should be treated as a learning opportunity rather than being punitive in tone. The convenor should note the type/definition of the potential misconduct and ask the student what happened during the preparation of the assessment. This should be done as neutrally as possible to avoid students potentially feeling pressurised into agreeing that misconduct has occurred in order to avoid any further processes or a more severe penalty.

If the student acknowledges the issues with the work and accepts that misconduct did occur then the convenor will complete the process via the following actions:

- If limited (level 1) – reduce assessment mark by 10 percentage points.
- If significant (level 2) - apply the fixed outcome of a mark of 0 for the assessment and require a sit with a 10 percentage point penalty.
- Refer the student to the Academic Practice Workshop. Enrolment on and satisfactory completion of the online Academic Practice Workshop will be recorded by the University. This record will be checked in all cases where a new allegation of academic misconduct is raised. Any further case of misconduct will be recorded on the student's assessment record as a misconduct case, regardless of whether or not the student enrolled on and completed the online Academic Practice Workshop.
- Refer the student to their Academic Personal Tutor (APT) for pastoral support, if necessary.

- Notify the Curriculum and Assessment Officer (CAO) who will formerly communicate the outcome to the student in writing and make the associated updates to the assessment record.

If the student reasonably accounts for the suspected misconduct in their explanation, and the convenor is prepared to accept this, then they will complete the process via the following actions:

- Allocate a face value mark that reflects the overall quality of the work and process this mark and feedback in the usual way.
- Refer the student to the Academic Practice Workshop. Enrolment on and satisfactory completion of the online Academic Practice Workshop will be recorded by the University. This record will be checked in all cases where a new allegation of academic misconduct is raised.
- Refer the student to their APT for pastoral support, if necessary.
- Notify the CAO who will formerly communicate the outcome to the student in writing and make the associated updates to the assessment record.

If the student fails to attend or respond, or attends and denies academic misconduct without a reasonable explanation, and the convenor feels a full investigation is therefore required, then they will complete the process via the following actions:

- Confirm to the student that they (the convenor) still have concerns about the piece of work and that the student's explanation does not fully account for those concerns. Advise that the assessment will be put forward for further investigation by an academic misconduct panel.
- Reassure the student that this means no outcome has yet been determined and the student will have a further opportunity to put forward their explanation.
- Notify the CAO that the mark is held pending a full investigation. The CAO will formerly communicate the outcome to the student in writing and notify the Academic Misconduct Office of a potential panel case.
- Prepare the evidence pack. This should include a fully marked up copy of the assessment with examples of the misconduct and a commentary to elaborate on their concerns (where necessary), as well as any source material/references. The assessment brief, and the Canvas information on Academic Misconduct for the module should also be included. The Turnitin Similarity Report can be provided as part of the evidence base, if relevant. However, academic judgement and the interpretation of the Similarity Report should be used to determine a case, rather than any numeric threshold of text matches.
- Note that the mark-up process is essential to the ability of the Investigating Officer, and the Academic Misconduct Panel, to determine the level of academic misconduct and the appropriate penalty to apply. The markup must be sufficient to clearly illustrate the level and type of misconduct being alleged.
- As part of the evidence pack, allocate a face value mark which reflects the marker's opinion of the work against the marking criteria, as far as possible with the suspicion of misconduct discounted so that the mark reflects the quality of the work as it stands.
- Submit the evidence pack to the Investigating Officer.

4.4.4 Allegations after a First Case

Should an allegation of misconduct occur for a student who has already had a case upheld via the first case process, the marker/module convenor should submit a full evidence pack straight to the Investigating Officer who will need to refer the case to the Academic Misconduct Office. If the allegation is one of collusion, this will result in all the students involved being referred to the Academic Misconduct Office, even where it is a first case for one or more of the students. The Panel will determine whether it is appropriate to confirm a first case penalty for those students or not.

4.4.5 Investigating Officer review

Per 4.3.2 of these procedures, the Investigating Officer should now review the evidence pack, consult with colleagues as necessary (e.g. the module convenor, the exam invigilator/exams office) and determine what level of misconduct is present in the work. The Investigating Officer will add any additional comments to the evidence pack and notify the Academic Misconduct Office who will log the allegation.

Where the Investigating Officer feels that the initial mark-up does not contain sufficient evidence of academic misconduct, they can either refer it back to the marker/module convenor to add to the mark-up or dismiss this as “no case”. Where the Investigating Officer determines “no case” the work should be returned to the marker and the usual marking, moderation and feedback procedures followed. Feedback should comment on the opinion of the work against the marking criteria, not the suspected actions or intentions of the student.

4.4.6 Notification to the Academic Misconduct Office

Upon receipt of a referral to panel, the Academic Misconduct Office will review the evidence pack and ensure all relevant documentation is included and ready to go forward to a Panel. They will then organise a panel which will proceed in accordance with the governance and conduct arrangements noted in section 4.7 below.

4.4.7 Where the evidence pack is incomplete, the Academic Misconduct Office reserves the right to return the case to the Investigating Officer and hold the case until sufficient documentation is available. The complete evidence pack must be provided to the Academic Misconduct Office no later than 10 working days after marks publication, after which the case may be withdrawn by the Academic Misconduct Office in consultation with a Panel Chair.

4.4.8 Where a very complex or serious case takes longer to collate, discretion to extend the timeframe to submit the evidence pack may be exceptionally given by the Deputy Pro Vice Chancellor or the Director of Student Experience (or their nominee). Due consideration should be given to the risk of delaying progression or award decisions for the student/s concerned.

4.4.9 Right of appeal after First Case outcomes

Outcomes of First Cases, whilst not determined by an officially constituted decision making body of the University, are a formal outcome made under the aegis of the approved governance for Academic Misconduct. Penalties are applied and an upheld outcome will be recorded on the

student's record. However, an upheld outcome will only be issued where the student has acknowledged that academic misconduct has occurred and therefore they would only be withdrawing/ retracting their own acceptance of the circumstances, rather than a decision that has been imposed by the University.

As such, there is no right of appeal, under the Academic Appeal Regulations, of a First Case outcome. Nevertheless, students will be entitled to a 5 working day 'cooling off' window to change their minds, following the meeting with the module convenor. The meeting should be conducted in a neutral manner without accusation of misconduct, instead seeking to understand what happened during the production of the work and to determine whether concerns can be reasonably explained. If there is not agreement then the case should be referred to panel, where the student will have the formal right of appeal. If the student, subsequent to the meeting, feels they were pressurised into admitting academic misconduct or that any prejudice or bias informed the conversation, then they can utilise the 5 day window and request that the outcome be set aside and the case referred up to a panel.

4.5 Indicative penalties

4.5.1 Section 5.5 of the Academic Misconduct Policy provides the indicative penalties available in determining the outcome of an allegation of academic misconduct. For ease of reference, the penalties are copied below:

Level	Description	Indicative penalty if no previous cases	Indicative penalty if previous case/s (expectation that each subsequent case will escalate penalty)
First Case procedure	A first incident of level 1 or level 2 academic misconduct will receive a fixed outcome and referral to the Academic Practice Workshop where there have been no previous instances of academic misconduct. A level 3 breach may be referred to Panel.	L1 – reduce assessment mark by 10 percentage points L2 - reduce assessment mark to 0 and require a sit with 10 percentage point penalty	-
1	Limited amount of academic misconduct within the assessment.	Reduce assessment mark by 10 percentage points	Reduce assessment mark to 0, OR Reduce module mark to 0
2	Significant amount of academic misconduct within the assessment.	Reduce assessment mark to 0	Reduce assessment mark to 0, OR Reduce module mark to 0, OR Reduce classification by one band, OR Reduce module mark to 0 and disallow resit, OR Expulsion from the University for a period of at least 3 years
3	Severe academic misconduct	Reduce module mark to 0, OR Reduce classification by one band, OR Reduce module mark to 0 and disallow resit, OR Expulsion from the University for a minimum of 3 years	Reduce module mark to 0, OR Reduce classification by one band, OR Reduce module mark to 0 and disallow resit, OR Expulsion from the University for a minimum of 3 years

4.5.2 Per 5.5.3 of the Policy, penalties may be used singularly or in combination. Penalties are applied to the face value mark, i.e. the mark which reflects the marker's opinion of the work against the marking criteria, taking the totality of the work into consideration as far as possible with the suspicion of misconduct set aside. The face value mark may be a pass or fail, based on quality of the work as it stands.

4.5.3 For consistent and equitable treatment, the Panel is expected to apply penalties according to level of academic misconduct and any previous upheld cases. The Panel has discretion to treat more than one case submitted in the same assessment period as 'concurrent' and therefore not escalate the penalty. Exceptionally, a Panel may determine that there is no penalty, despite finding that academic misconduct has taken place.

4.5.4 First Case penalties can be applied by the Faculty as an outcome of the student meeting. All other penalties will be applied by an Academic Misconduct Panel. In practice, in either case, the CAO team, the Academic Misconduct Office, and the Exams & Assessment team will liaise as necessary to ensure the student's assessment record correctly reflects the final outcome. The full marks processing mechanisms are set out in an internal process guide available from the Academic Misconduct Office.

4.5.5 The First Case penalty for L1 limited misconduct will be a 10 percentage point deduction:

- Where the face value mark is already a fail, the penalty is still applied, and the assessment will require a resit not a sit. Depending on the weight of the assessment component and other assessment component marks, the student may or may not achieve a conflated pass mark for the module. The student benefits from the learning opportunity of being taken through the First Case process, and the penalty (via the application of the misconduct flag) precludes future condonement/compensation.
- Where the application of the L1 penalty takes the face value mark below a pass mark, that new fail mark will stand but the student will be given a sit (without any further deduction, which distinguishes it from the L2 penalty which does carry a deduction for the sit).
- Where the 10 percentage point deduction for the L2 sit takes the module mark below a pass mark, the module will be capped at the pass mark rather than requiring a 2nd resit for an assessment which has been academically passed.
- If the L2 sit is an outright fail then a discretionary 2nd resit can be offered, as per the Progression and Award Regulations.

Further information to support PS teams with the processing of the face value marks and penalties can be found in the Processing Guide to Processing Academic Misconduct Penalties, published here: <https://www.sussex.ac.uk/adqe/standards/academicmisconduct>

4.5.6 The Academic Misconduct Panel has the discretion to apply the penalty it feels most appropriate, having conducted the full investigation. This can be a different penalty than that put forward by the Investigating Officer, for example where the level is determined to be 'significant' rather than 'limited'.

4.5.7 Any penalty imposed via a First Case meeting or Panel decision will be confirmed by the next appropriate Progression and Award Board. The PAB may determine an alternate outcome when reviewing the full set of marks at the end of the year.

4.6 Academic Misconduct Panels

4.6.1 Delegated Panels

Where cases are clearcut and do not require further investigation or academic judgement (e.g. an invigilator's report states that the student has breached the in person examination or test room protocols), the Academic Misconduct Office will utilise the Delegated Panel process.

The Misconduct Panel Secretary, under the delegated authority of an Academic Misconduct Panel Chair, will process the case and issue the outcome to the student. In these circumstances the student will not be invited to a Panel meeting, but may submit a written statement for consideration.

The delegated Panel process should not be used for a First Case, and upheld cases will receive a standard penalty of reducing the assessment mark to 0. If the student has multiple previous cases, the Academic Misconduct Office should refer the case to the Panel, where a greater range of penalties may be issued.

4.6.2 Governance arrangements

The Education and Students Regulations Sub-Committee, on behalf of the University Education Committee, must approve the membership pool for academic misconduct panels; staff who have not been approved cannot sit on panels. This should include appropriate academic and professional service staff, and staff should either have, or wish to gain, experience of working with policies and regulations and handling complex issues. The pool can be as large as required.

4.6.3 A panel consists of a minimum of the Chair and two members from the pool. The Chair has the final authority to confirm an outcome if the panel membership does not agree a majority decision. All panels will take place online and role descriptors for the misconduct panel Chair and member are provided at: <http://www.sussex.ac.uk/adqe/standards/academicmisconduct/integrity>.

4.6.4 If a panel is not properly constituted or acts outside of its Terms of Reference (provided in Appendix 1 of the Academic Misconduct Policy), any decision could be appealed on grounds of procedural irregularity. Chairs must ensure the correct governance is adhered to at all times.

4.6.5 Students that have been referred to a panel will receive a minimum of 5 calendar days' (i.e., to include a weekend) notice. They will be provided with information on the allegation made against them, stated in broad terms, and will be directed to the relevant University regulations/policies. The evidence file will be made available on request for the student to review in advance of the panel meeting. The student will be asked to confirm their attendance in advance and informed that they are entitled to attend and are strongly encouraged to do so but that it is not a requirement. The

student can elect to submit written evidence instead of, or as well as, attending. In cases of non-response, the panel can proceed without the student or any written response.

4.6.7 Students have a right to be accompanied by a member of the University of Sussex faculty or the University of Sussex Students' Union Advice team.

4.6.8 An academic representative should be in attendance at every panel to present the allegation. This can be the marker, a member of the marking team, the module convenor, the Investigating Officer, or a subject matter expert with knowledge of the assessment. In extremis, the panel can proceed without the academic representative with the authorisation of the panel Chair, who will review the available evidence to determine whether they can present in place of the academic representative.

4.6.9 The outcome should be communicated to the student, in writing, within 10 working days of the Panel meeting. The outcome should also provide signposting to relevant staff or support services as required, as well as to the academic appeals process. The relevant Faculty professional services team should receive a copy of the outcome for onward administrative actions. At this stage, the marker should review the original face value mark and confirm, based on the outcome of the panel what the final mark for the assessment should be.

4.6.10 The Academic Misconduct Office is required to submit a retrospective annual report to the Education and Students Regulations Sub Committee. The report should provide data on both First Cases and those referred to panel, recording outcomes and cross-referencing course and demographic data in order to identify any trends.

4.6.11 Conduct of the Panel

The Chair will open the meeting with introductions, and an explanation of how the panel will proceed. This will include the definition of the example(s) of academic misconduct alleged to be present in the assessment, the presentation of the evidence, an opportunity for the student to speak to the allegation and an opportunity for the panel to ask questions of the presenter and the student. After this, the presenter and the student will be moved to a virtual waiting room whilst the panel has a private meeting to consider the outcome. All parties will rejoin the meeting for the confirmation of the outcome, which as per 4.6.9, will also be provided in writing within 10 working days.

4.6.12 Where the student agrees that academic misconduct has occurred in the assessment in question, the outcome will be an upheld instance of academic misconduct, with the panel ensuring an appropriate penalty is set from the options available with the Academic Misconduct Policy.

4.6.13 Where the student denies that academic misconduct has occurred in the assessment in question, the outcome will be determined on the balance of probability, using the evidence presented to the panel.

4.6.14 Where the outcome is “no case to answer” i.e., a dismissal of the allegation where the panel agrees that academic misconduct has not occurred or has not be satisfactorily determined, then no penalty will be applied. The work should be returned to the marker and the usual marking, moderation and feedback procedures followed. Feedback should comment on the opinion of the work against the marking criteria, not the suspected actions or intentions of the student. The face value mark (which may or may not be a pass mark) will be used for progression and classification purposes.,

4.6.15 The student will normally be told the outcome and the penalty at the end of the meeting. However, the outcome can include adjourning the panel to a new date to be established, where issues emerge that make this a more appropriate decision. The outcome can also include a deferral of the decision for consultation regarding the regulations. In either instance, the student will be kept updated and a decision must be made in a timely manner.

5. ACADEMIC MISCONDUCT AFTER AN AWARD HAS BEEN MADE

5.1 On occasion, the University receives a communication raising a concern, or making an allegation, relating to academic misconduct from a former student. In all such cases, the communication should be passed to the Academic Misconduct Office for a response. The Academic Misconduct Office will send an acknowledgement to the third party.

5.2 The Academic Misconduct Office will conduct preliminary enquiries and refer the matter to the PVC (Education & Students), or nominee for a decision as to whether to pursue the matter further.

END.

Review / Contacts / References	
Document title:	Procedural Information to support the Academic Misconduct Policy
Date published:	October 2025
Approving body:	N/A - procedural documents do not require formal committee approval
Last review date:	N/A - procedural documents will be reviewed and updated in-year when required, and annually otherwise.
Revision history:	October 2025 – first iteration February 2026 – in year clarifications
Next review date:	September 2026 (annual review to ensure operational processes keep pace with BAU changes)
Related internal policies, procedures, guidance:	https://www.sussex.ac.uk/adqe/standards/academicmisconduct
Division / School:	Division of Student Experience
Policy owner:	Director of Student Experience
Point of Contact:	Deputy Pro Vice-Chancellor (Education & Students) Head of Student Administration