



Academic Integrity and Misconduct Policy

1. Overview

- 1.1 The academic activity and reputation of DMU (the University) is founded on the principles of integrity, honesty and trust. All staff and students are expected to uphold these principles in their academic work. We require the work that you submit for assessment to be entirely your own and that you always acknowledge the use of any other sources in referencing conventions relevant to your academic discipline as set out by the University. We also require that you comply with the University's assessment regulations, including those relating to conduct in examination or test conditions.
- 1.2 Academic misconduct occurs where you do not act with academic integrity and honesty. It is an action you take, accidentally or with intent, that has the potential to give you an unfair advantage in your assessment, or which might assist another student to gain unfair advantage. This policy sets out broad definitions of academic misconduct, including those relating to the use of Artificial Intelligence, and the actions that we will take in response to academic misconduct under the provisions of the Academic Integrity and Misconduct Disciplinary Procedure.
- 1.3 Penalties given, if an allegation of academic misconduct is upheld, range from the requirement to engage in extra learning support through to expulsion from the University. The penalties will be dependent on any prior history of academic misconduct, the nature of the misconduct and the level of intent you showed to gain advantage. The type of penalties we apply are provided in Annex 1. If you



2. Support

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

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

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

3. Academic Misconduct Definitions

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

3.2 Poor Academic Practice

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



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

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

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

- Engaging with an 'essay mill' or essay writing service that may or may not involve a financial exchange between you and that third party. The UK Government criminalised 'essay mills' in 2022 and their operations are therefore illegal.
- Asking any other person to contribute, or undertake in full, an assessed piece of work. This includes but is not limited to asking other students, friends, family, private tutors and copyediting services.
- Engaging with AI tools to contribute, or undertake in full, a piece of work to be assessed.

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

- Plagiarise information from AI sources without appropriate referencing
- Engage in a form of contract cheating through using an AI tool to generate your work
- Falsifying information resulting from the AI tool you use
- Use an AI tool to improve your use of the English language in your assessment submission without referencing this in line with referencing guidelines
- Use an AI tool to substantially amend or improve your assessment
- Undertake any other action using AI which constitutes academic misconduct



The only exception to the above would be if the assignment brief itself required the use of AI as part of the process of the



3.6 Cheating in Examination or Test Conditions

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

- Attempting to acquire or acquiring advance knowledge of the content of an examination or test before it is issued to you
- Attempting to communicate or communicating with other student/s or other individual (other than an invigilator) in relation to or during the assessment, including through technology and social media.
- Discussing or sharing, or attempt-1 (r)-4 (sh)16ABDC /C2 ofinginge-1 .02 11 (e)-2

- The inappropriate manipulation and/or selection of data or imagery with the intent to convey a false impression of the information actually used.
- Using information gained from an AI tool that may not provide you with real information
- Creating false references from an AI tool
- Creating or obtaining information illegally

3.9 Re-using previously assessed material

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

- You use short quotations from a previous assignment in the assessment task which are fully referenced
- You are repeating a year or resitting an assessment task that requires you to improve upon your previous submission (including formative/interim submissions) and the Module Leader agrees to the inclusion of parts of your previous work.
- Where a resubmission is being made for the same component in the same module, and the where the assessment brief has not substantially changed' for that component have not changed.

3.10 Ethics

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



4. How DMU Identifies Potential Academic Misconduct



6. Dignity and Respect

- 6.1 All students and staff engaging with the Academic Integrity and Misconduct Procedure must behave with dignity and respect for each other and in accordance with the University's values and the Equality Act 2010. The process will be halted if unreasonable or disrespectful behaviours occur. The University

- 10.2 It will normally be a member of staff who identifies potential or actual misconduct in a student's work. However, as set out in the Academic Integrity and Misconduct Policy, a student may also report the alleged academic misconduct of another student.
- 10.3 It can be distressing and stressful to have an allegation of academic misconduct made against you. Your wellbeing during any such processes remains of paramount importance and you can seek wellbeing support from Student Services or from your own community services. There are also confidential helplines available [Are you in crisis now? \(dmu.ac.uk\)](https://www.dmu.ac.uk/are-you-in-crisis-now). The Students' Union is available to provide you with confidential and independent help and advice.
- 10.4 The Academic Integrity and Misconduct Procedure sets out the normal timescales for each stage. We will let you know if we are unable to meet the published timescale and the reason why.
- 10.5 We will make relevant reasonable adjustments to the operation of this procedure should you require this in relation to a declared disability.
- 10.6 In each Faculty there will be an Academic Practice Officer who is a senior member of staff responsible for overseeing academic integrity and academic misconduct matters.
- 10.7 APOs will meet regularly to discuss and ensure consistency of approach
- 10.8 If the nature of your alleged academic misconduct also indicates an issue of behavioural misconduct (which is addressed in the Student Disciplinary Procedure), we will decide the most appropriate way in which to address both matters proportionately and fairly and will inform you of our decision.
- 10.9 If the nature of your alleged academic misconduct leads us to have concerns about your Fitness to Study or Fitness to Practice, we will decide the most appropriate way to address these matters and will inform you of our decision.

11. Identifying potential academic misconduct

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



11.2 Where a





- 13.3 We strongly advise you to attend the meeting to help support your learning. However, you may choose (i) not to attend the meeting and/or (ii) make written representations, including any mitigation you consider relevant. Where you choose not to attend, the consideration of your case will go ahead in your absence.
- 13.4 Following the meeting or consideration of your case, we will determine:
- Any additional work that you need to undertake or support that is required to help you to avoid poor practice in subsequent assessments
 - For taught programmes, the mark penalty that may be applied to the assessment in which the poor practice was identified
 - For research degrees the mark penalty that may be applied to the assessment in which the poor practice was identified
- 13.5 You will be notified by email of the outcome of the meeting within ten university working days.
- 13.6 Up to two instances of poor academic practice will be addressed through this process. If you submit work with poor academic practice in any further submissions, this will normally be addressed through the process for addressing academic misconduct.

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

- 14.1 Alleged academic misconduct will be addressed through either:
- A Departmental Academic Misconduct Hearing or
 - For the most severe cases, an Academic Misconduct Panel. The University's definition of severe cases is set out in point 42.
- 14.2 The Academic Practice Officer will determine which process will be used dependent on the nature of the case. This task will be taken by the Faculty Head of Research Students for research degree cases. Advice will be taken from the Head of ASO to ensure that this decision aligns with consistency across the University.

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

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

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



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

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

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

16. Academic Misconduct Panel

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

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



- 16.7 You are entitled to be accompanied to the Academic Misconduct Panel meeting by a Student's Companion.
- 16.8 We strongly advise you to attend the meeting to help support your learning and to state your response to the allegation. However, you may (i) choose not to



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

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

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

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

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

- Dismiss the appeal if there are insufficient grounds at which point you may pursue your case with the Office of the Independent Adjudicator (OIA) [Office of the I 3 \(o t15\) J511 f](#)



- 17.4 In allegations of collusion, it is important to note that the University's definition shows intent by both or all parties involved in such an act because the action ultimately results in one or more students gaining advantage.
- 17.5 Where an allegation is upheld and there is evidence to show that both or all students have engaged in misconduct, the Departmental Academic Misconduct Hearing or the Academic Misconduct Panel must ensure broad consistency of approach in the penalties that it applies. Any differentiation will normally be due to differences in individuals' mitigating circumstances or differences in admission of the offence.

Created: June 2018

Originat3 (natm82 9m2(O)3 (r)ec (t)33 (r)-(eat)3(ed:)3 ()T 1 10 0.002 [R(r)2g(d)1(r)svan)2 (e)2 :