Futureworks

## Version Control Statement

| | | | | | |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| ID Number: | | Document Name: | Academic Integrity Policy and Misconduct Procedure V1.2.1 | | |
| Approving Committee: | Academic Board | | | | |
| Last Review: | N/A | Next Review: | Jun-Aug 2027 | | |
| Owner: | Academic Registrar | Review Lead: | Academic Registrar | | |
| Amendments Since Approval: | Detail of Revision: | | | Date of Revision: | Revision Approved by: |
| | Updated in line with feedback from expert reader as part of institutional validation | | | 04/02/2026 | Academic Board |
| | Roles updated in line with changes in management structure | | | 13/08/2026 | Academic Board |

If this document is required in an alternative format, please contact Futureworks on 0161 214 4600 or via email: info@futureworks.ac.uk

Futureworks

# Academic Integrity Policy

## Contents


1 Introduction ..... 4

2 Scope ..... 4

3 Compliance ..... 5

4 Principles ..... 5

5 Student Responsibilities ..... 7

6 Staff Roles and Responsibilities ..... 7

7 Support for Students ..... 8

8 Reasonable Adjustments ..... 9

9 Identifying Academic Misconduct ..... 9

10 Academic Judgment ..... 9

11 Standard of Proof ..... 10

12 Definitions of Academic Misconduct ..... 10

13 Roles and Responsibilities ..... 13

14 Academic Misconduct Panel ..... 13

15 Instigation of Academic Misconduct Procedure ..... 14

16 Informal Stage (Category 1) ..... 14

17 Investigation by the Academic Integrity Lead (Category 2) ..... 15

18 Referral to an Academic Misconduct Panel (Category 3) ..... 17

19 Penalties for Academic Misconduct ..... 20

20 Mitigating Circumstances ..... 21

21 Academic Appeal ..... 21

22 Recording and Disclosure of Information ..... 22

23 Monitoring and Review ..... 22

24 Appendix 1 – AMBeR Tariff ..... 23

## 1 Introduction

1.1 The International Center for Academic Integrity defines academic integrity as a commitment to six fundamental values: honesty, trust, fairness, respect, responsibility and courage.

1.2 Upholding these values is a fundamental principle within Futureworks. strongly linked to good academic practice. The Academic Integrity Policy sets out the Futureworks approach to maintaining the academic integrity of students' work. This is underpinned by the Academic Misconduct Procedure, which sets out the steps Futureworks will take in suspected cases of academic misconduct.

1.3 Futureworks adopts a strategic approach to the prevention and management of academic misconduct. We foster a culture of academic integrity amongst staff and students, based on a coherent set of Academic Regulations and guidelines for implementation by Schools and Services. We recognise that all academic and support staff, holding a variety of roles, have the responsibility to promote a culture of academic integrity, acting as role models for students.

## 2 Scope

2.1 This Policy and Procedure applies to all students enrolled with Futureworks, including apprentices and students enrolled on single registerable modules (SRMs). It applies to the preparation and presentation of all forms of assessed work including without limitation: written and oral examinations and other time-constrained assessments, coursework, essays, assignments, projects, dissertations, presentations, practical work, and the production of artefacts.

2.2 Allegations of research misconduct (e.g. fabrication, falsification or misrepresentation of data or contravention of ethical principles) are also covered by this document.

2.3 Where evidence of academic misconduct becomes apparent after the recommendation of the Assessment Board, the matter will be investigated and the original decision may be set aside if appropriate.

2.4 In cases of suspected or proven academic misconduct, Futureworks reserves the right to investigate previously marked work.

2.5 Where academic misconduct is established after an award has been conferred, and further to investigation, the Assessment Board may recommend to The Open University that the award be rescinded in accordance with the Academic Regulations.

## 3 Compliance

3.1 Higher Education providers must ensure that the qualifications they award meet nationally agreed standards, including the Office for Students Conditions of Registration and the Quality Assurance Agency (QAA) UK Quality Code (2024). Academic misconduct constitutes a breach of these standards

## 4 Principles

4.1 Standards and behaviour expected of students should be made explicit, including standards of proficiency and competencies in a range of verbal communication, written and electronic resources.

4.2 Student support, advice and guidance will be provided within Schools and by Student Services. Education about what constitutes academic misconduct, its consequences and how to achieve sound academic practice should be provided for all students, across all programmes at all levels.

4.3 Importance should be placed on providing training for staff and raising awareness of the value of academic integrity.

4.4 Programme teams should 'design out' (as far as possible) the potential for academic misconduct by implementing robust procedures for curriculum design, student recruitment, programme delivery, assessment and evaluation and through continuous enhancement.

4.5 Where academic misconduct is suspected, an Assessment Board shall not determine the student's assessment result until the facts have been established and the case has been concluded.

4.6 Futureworks aims to deal with suspected cases of academic misconduct within 25 working days from the date when the marks are released. In exceptional cases, where it becomes clear that the investigation is likely to be complex, variation of the timescale and the reasons for this will be notified to the student.

4.7 Confidentiality should be preserved during the investigation of an allegation of academic misconduct to protect the interests of everyone concerned, unless disclosure is necessary to progress the investigation in line with the rules of natural justice. Futureworks expects that all parties will respect the confidentiality of the process.

4.8 The following table summarises the commitments by staff and students to promote academic integrity and eliminate academic misconduct

| Schools will: | Students will: |
|---|---|
| Design assessments which are engaging, relevant and minimise the potential for academic misconduct. | Engage with all assessments in a timely, honest and professional manner. |
| Deliver assessment schedules and information in a timely and effective manner. | Use best efforts to meet assessment deadlines and be familiar with the guidance on referencing, proof-reading and ethics relevant to their discipline area. |
| Support students from all backgrounds to achieve sound academic practice across courses at all levels. | Engage positively with the range of support that is available from Schools and Student Services. |
| Provide information and education about what constitutes academic misconduct and its consequences. | Understand what constitutes academic misconduct and how it can be avoided by using effective referencing and citation practices. |
| Regularly review formative and draft summative student coursework. | Demonstrate the process behind summative submissions as well as the final product. |
| Investigate suspected cases of academic | Engage positively with any investigation, |

| | |
|---|---|
| misconduct in a fair and timely manner. | including retaining and providing copies of drafts of assessed work. |
| Monitor cases of academic misconduct and develop action plans focusing on improvements. | Take steps to secure their work, hardware, software, laptops, data etc from improper use by others. |

## 5 Student Responsibilities

5.1 Material submitted for assessment in any form must be the student's own work. Students must produce work for assessments in a timely, honest and professional manner, without attempting to gain an unfair advantage.

5.2 Students are expected to familiarise themselves with this Policy and Procedure, guidance on referencing and proof-reading provided during their programme, and the ethical policies relevant to their discipline. Students must retain draft copies of work used in the preparation of final submissions to help prove they authored the work if challenged.

5.3 Futureworks takes all cases of academic misconduct seriously and penalties will be imposed where academic misconduct is proven. Students should be aware that a record of academic misconduct may have significant academic and professional consequences. Students can be excluded from Futureworks for very serious or repeat offences.

## 6 Staff Roles and Responsibilities

6.1 Academic Integrity Leads are responsible for investigating suspected cases of academic misconduct and imposing penalties determined by circumstances and evidence presented.

6.2 Tutors have the authority to impose penalties for poor academic practice. Academic Integrity Leads and Academic Misconduct Panels have authority on behalf of the Academic Board to impose penalties for academic misconduct.

6.3 Academic Integrity Leads will monitor the occurrence of academic misconduct and report regularly to the Academic Board. Incidents will be systematically collated and School action plans focusing on improvements will be monitored.

6.4 The Academic Integrity Lead is responsible for ensuring that all cases of academic misconduct are recorded in the Academic Misconduct Log and on the student's record.

## 7 Support for Students

7.1 Students are briefly introduced to the importance of academic integrity in their induction, and this is followed up by academic integrity teaching materials and discussion, which are embedded in specific modules in the first semester of each academic year. The importance of academic integrity, together with permissible uses of AI, are discussed with students in relation to each assessment. Permissible uses of AI may be specific to each assessment brief and are detailed therein. If students require additional support or guidance they can approach their Personal Tutor.

7.2 Students who are suspected of engaging in academic misconduct are strongly encouraged to seek independent advice and support from Student Services.

7.3 At all stages of this Procedure, a student is entitled to be accompanied by a person of their choosing or to be represented by a third party throughout. Any person accompanying the student at any stage in this Procedure is there in a supporting capacity. The student may ask them to speak on their behalf or clarify particular points. The name and designation of any supporting person should be given to the Academic Registry at least 48 hours before any meeting.

7.4 This Procedure is intended to be fair and to comply with the rules of natural justice. It is not a formal court process and, therefore, should not be adversarial or overly legalistic, and there is no need for anyone to have formal legal representation. A student may be accompanied by a person who is legally qualified, providing that person understands and respects the nature of the hearing and does not adopt an overly adversarial or legalistic Stance.

7.5 Futureworks recognises that an allegation of academic misconduct can be a cause of stress for any student. Students are therefore encouraged to engage with central student wellbeing services available from Student Services.

## 8 Reasonable Adjustments

8.1 Reasonable adjustments will be made where students have mobility or communication difficulties in order that they may be informed of the process and have the opportunity to present their case, test the evidence, and offer an explanation.

8.2 Although it is preferable for any meetings relating to suspected academic misconduct be conducted in person, alternative arrangements may be considered as necessary, including the opportunity to participate in an investigation by correspondence or video call.

## 9 Identifying Academic Misconduct

9.1 Academic judgment will be applied based on the evidence that is available when identifying suspected cases of academic misconduct. It is not necessary for intent to be proven in determining whether an offence of academic misconduct has occurred. It is sufficient that a particular act or omission has occurred.

9.2 When students submit summative work on the VLE they are prompted to tick a box confirming that their submission is all their own work. There are two main ways in which we identify possible academic misconduct:

9.2.1 submission of draft work

9.2.2 submission of supporting work

9.3 Students who fail to submit draft work and/or supporting evidence may be asked to undertake a viva voce or presentation in a format appropriate to the subject area.

## 10 Academic Judgment

10.1 Academic judgment will be applied in relation to:

10.1.1 the quantity of copied material;

10.1.2 the type of academic misconduct

10.2 Futureworks employs the AMBer tariff in order to minimise reliance on academic judgement in the application of penalties. The AMBer tariff seeks to quantify elements of academic misconduct and provides a points-based value for them.

## 11 Standard of Proof

11.1 Futureworks will decide whether an allegation of academic misconduct is proven based on the evidence presented during the investigative process. The standard of proof will be the civil standard of proof which means that 'on a balance of probabilities', the facts of the allegation are more likely than not to have happened. The investigative process will determine whether that standard has been met.

## 12 Definitions of Academic Misconduct

12.1 Academic misconduct is defined as any action or attempted action by a student which gives or has the potential to give an unfair advantage in an assessment, or might assist another student to gain an unfair advantage or otherwise undermines the academic integrity of Futureworks. Academic misconduct includes the following without limitation:

12.1.1 Plagiarism: Plagiarism occurs where a student copies words, ideas or images from another person and presents these as their own in an assessment without properly acknowledging and citing the source(s).

12.1.2 Examples of plagiarism include without limitation:

12.1.3 the inclusion in a student's work of another's work whether published or not without proper acknowledgement;

12.1.4 the substantial summarising of another's work without proper acknowledgement;

12.1.5 the substantial and unauthorised use of the ideas of another person without proper acknowledgement.

12.1.6 Re-presentation of work: Re-presentation of work occurs where a student submits the same work in full or in part, that they have previously submitted for academic credit, where this is not expressly permitted by the assessment brief.

12.2 Collusion: Collusion is an attempt to deceive the assessors by disguising the true authorship of an assessed piece of work in full or in part. Examples of collusion include without limitation:

12.2.1 where student A copies, or imitates in close detail, student B's work;

12.2.2 where two or more students divide the elements of an assessment among themselves, and copy, or imitate in close detail, one another's answers.

12.2.3 All students involved will be regarded as jointly liable in cases of collusion. It is also an offence of collusion to allow one's work to be copied or imitated in close detail. Students should take reasonable steps to safeguard their work, data and hardware from improper use by others.

12.2.4 Collusion should not be confused with the normal situation in which students learn from one another, sharing ideas, as they generate the knowledge and understanding necessary for each of them successfully and independently to undertake an assignment or research project. Nor should it be confused with group work on an assignment or research project where this is specifically authorised. Legitimate input from tutors or approved readers or scribes is not considered to be collusion.

12.3 Cheating: Cheating is defined as a form of examination malpractice relating to formal invigilated examinations or other assessments. Examples of cheating include without limitation:

12.3.1 communicating with another candidate during an examination;

12.3.2 communicating with any other person other than an authorised invigilator or other member of staff during an examination;

12.3.3 copying or attempting to copy from another candidate during an examination;

12.3.4 possession of any written or printed materials during an examination, unless expressly permitted by the examination regulations;

12.3.5 possession of any electronically stored information or accessing any information via a network during an examination, unless expressly permitted by the examination regulations;

12.3.6 use of any information, communication, technology device e.g. mobile phone, watch or calculator during an examination, unless expressly permitted by the examination regulations;

12.3.7 substitution of examination materials;

12.3.8 impersonation e.g. where a student arranges for someone else to impersonate them or impersonates another person in an examination, test or hearing;

12.3.9 gaining or attempting to gain access to unauthorised assessment materials in advance of the specified time, unless expressly permitted by the examination regulations;

12.3.10 obtaining a copy of a written examination paper in advance of the date and time for its authorised release.

12.4 Commissioning of Assessed Work: Commissioning occurs where a student commissions a third party to complete all or part of an assessed piece of work and then submits it as their own. Commissioned work may be pre-created or specifically prepared for the student. It might be obtained from a company or an individual and may or may not involve a financial transaction. It includes the use of essay mills, buying work online and the use of a proof-reading service that includes re-writing the original assessed piece of work. Where it is suspected that a student has submitted work that has not been authored by them, the student may be asked questions about the work during an interview with the Academic Integrity Lead or Academic Misconduct Panel to give them the opportunity to demonstrate appropriate knowledge of the subject matter and that they understand the content of the work. Students must keep copies of drafts and other materials used in researching and preparing the work.

12.5 Falsification and Fabrication of Data: Falsification of data occurs where data or evidence are altered or enhanced. Fabrication of data occurs where a student creates data, results or other outputs and presents them as if they were real.

12.6 Ethical Breaches: Ethical breaches may occur where there is a failure to comply with the Futureworks Ethical Practice Policy (Academic), including conducting research and data collection without prior ethical approval from Futureworks. Students should ensure that they are familiar with the Policy.

12.7 Unauthorised Use of Technological Aids: Academic misconduct occurs where a student uses technological aids and/or Artificial Intelligence (AI) to generate all or part of an assessment without specific authorisation, including translation software, paraphrasing tools, text generating software (essay bots) and tools to generate graphics or artworks. Acceptable use of such tools can be found in the Guidance on the Use of AI Tools in Assessments for Students.

12.8 Any Other Attempt to Deceive: Any other deliberate attempt to deceive, including offering a bribe to any member of staff or external person who is connected to Futureworks.

## 13 Roles and Responsibilities

13.1.1 Academic Integrity Lead

13.1.2 The Academic Integrity Lead will ensure a consistent approach to the promotion of academic integrity within Futureworks and the detection and investigation of cases of academic misconduct.

13.2 The role of the Academic Integrity Lead is to:

13.2.1 provide advice and guidance to staff on academic integrity related issues;

13.2.2 decide the level at which each case should be managed and when cases should be referred to the Academic Misconduct Panel;

13.2.3 advise on category 1 and manage category 2 cases;

13.2.4 monitor the occurrence of academic misconduct within Futureworks and report on this to the Academic Registry and Board of Examiners;

13.2.5 create action plans focusing on improvements;

13.2.6 assist with the delivery of staff development on academic integrity related issues.

13.3 One or more Deputy Academic Integrity Leads will support the Academic Integrity Lead in dealing with cases within the School, including any cases where the Academic Integrity Lead has been involved in the teaching, supervision or assessment of the student concerned.

13.4 Training will be provided for all new and continuing Academic Integrity, Deputy Academic Integrity Leads by the Academic Registry.

## 14 Academic Misconduct Panel

14.1 The membership of the Academic Misconduct Panel will normally comprise as a minimum:

- Vice Principal or nominee (Chair)
- Programme Leader from a different School

- Lead Student Partner from a different School
- Secretary (from Academic Registry)

14.2 The Panel may co-opt additional members in complex cases or where specialist expertise is required. No members of the Panel will have been involved in the teaching, supervision or assessment of the student concerned.

14.3 The Academic Misconduct Panel shall:

14.3.1 determine the facts of the case on the basis of the evidence before it;

14.3.2 decide on the balance of probabilities whether academic misconduct has occurred;

14.3.3 consider any explanation given by the student;

14.3.4 confirm the penalty in cases where it is established that academic misconduct has occurred.

14.4 Training will be provided for new and continuing panel members on an annual basis by the Academic Registry.

## 15 Instigation of Academic Misconduct Procedure

15.1 Any member of staff or examiner (internal or external) who has cause to suspect that academic misconduct has occurred at the point of submission or preparation of an assessment should report the case to their Programme Leader.

15.2 Category 1 academic misconduct cases will be dealt with by the Programme Team. The Programme Leader will escalate all suspected Category 2 and 3 academic misconduct cases to their Academic Integrity Lead (or deputy, if the Academic Integrity Lead has previously been involved with the case) for investigation.

15.3 The Academic Integrity Lead (or deputy) will conduct an initial investigation by reviewing the evidence and consulting with relevant staff to decide whether there is a case to answer.

## 16 Informal Stage (Category 1)

16.1 Category 1 covers first-time cases of academic misconduct which accumulate no more than 329 AMBer tariff points (see Appendix 1 – AMBeR Tariff).

16.2 Cases at this Stage usually constitute poor academic practice and are the result of a failure to understand the required protocols. They are most likely to occur at an early stage of a student's programme.

16.3 The student will be invited to a meeting with the tutor or Programme Leader, which will be a formative learning opportunity. The Programme Leader will provide advice and the student will be referred to relevant support and educational opportunities regarding good academic practice.

16.4 The student's work is marked in accordance with the grading criteria and no additional penalty is given.

16.5 The student will be informed that if another such instance occurs in the future, it will be dealt with by a formal meeting with the Academic Integrity Lead and that they may face penalties.

16.6 The member of staff will make a note on the student record system for the purposes of taking appropriate action if further instances occur, although this will not form part of the formal student record.

**17 Investigation by the Academic Integrity Lead (Category 2)**

17.1 The Academic Integrity Lead will manage all category 2 academic misconduct cases. Category 2 cases comprise of those generating up to 329 AMBer tariff points (except for first allegations, which are Category 1) and those generating between 330 and 524 points.

17.2 The Academic Integrity Lead (or their deputy, if the Academic Integrity Lead has previously been involved with the case) will consider the evidence and may consult with relevant staff to decide whether there is a case to answer.

17.3 If the Academic Integrity Lead finds that there is a case to answer they will write to the student stating which academic offence they are suspected of committing and why in the first instance. The student then has 5 working days to either respond to the suspicions in writing or to attend an informal meeting with the Academic Integrity Lead to discuss the issue. If the Academic Integrity Lead is satisfied with their response; for example, if the student admits the offence, no formal process will be pursued, the appropriate penalty will be applied in accordance with the AMBer tariff and the student informed in writing within 5 working days of the meeting. If

the Academic Integrity Lead is not satisfied, the student will be invited to attend a formal interview to discuss the alleged case of academic misconduct. The purpose of the interview will be to give the student the opportunity to establish to Futureworks' satisfaction that the work is their own.

17.4 The student will be given at least 5 working days' notice of the time, date and place of the interview. The following information will be included with the notice:

17.4.1 the grounds on which the alleged academic misconduct is believed to have occurred;

17.4.2 a copy of any evidence to be referred to in the meeting;

17.4.3 the right to seek advice from Student Services;

17.4.4 the right to be accompanied by a person of their choosing.

17.5 The Programme Leader may be present to explain the allegation in detail. A member of staff from the Academic Registry will be in attendance to advise on the process and take a record of the interview using a standard report template.

17.6 If the student does not attend the interview without good cause, a decision may be made in their absence and a penalty may be imposed (see Appendix 1 – AMBeR Tariff).

17.7 In suspected cases of collusion, the Academic Integrity Lead will require individual interviews with all parties involved.

17.8 The Academic Integrity Lead may:

17.8.1 ask the student to provide evidence that shows how they prepared for and wrote the assessed work e.g. copies of drafts or notes; and/or

17.8.2 ask questions about the submitted work during the interview to give the student the opportunity to demonstrate appropriate knowledge of the subject matter and that they understand the content and/or process involved in producing the work.

17.9 Following the meeting the Academic Integrity Lead will:

17.9.1 determine the facts of the case on the basis of the evidence before them;

17.9.2 decide on the balance of probability whether academic misconduct has occurred;

17.9.3 consider any explanation given by the student;

17.9.4 consider any aggravating factors e.g. any previous finding of academic misconduct;

17.9.5 confirm the penalty in cases where it is established that category 2 academic misconduct has occurred; or

17.9.6 refer the case to an Academic Misconduct Panel, where it is believed that category 3 academic misconduct has occurred.

17.10 Written notification of the outcome and the associated reasons will be sent to the student within 5 working days of the meeting, along with the formal record of the meeting. The outcome letter will identify the evidence considered, the regulations applied, the decision on the outcome, the penalty and associated reasons and the student's right of appeal.

17.11 The Academic Integrity Lead will report the outcome to the Assessment Board.

## 18 Referral to an Academic Misconduct Panel (Category 3)

18.1 Category 3 cases comprise of those generating in excess of 524 AMBer tariff points.

18.2 The Academic Integrity Lead (or their deputy, if the Academic Integrity Lead has previously been involved with the case) will consider the evidence and may consult with relevant staff to decide whether there is a case to answer.

18.3 If the Academic Integrity Lead finds that there is a case to answer they will conduct a full investigation in line with sections 17.3-17.10.

18.4 If the case against the student is serious and may lead to their expulsion an Academic Misconduct Panel will be convened in line with section 14.

18.5 The student will be invited to a meeting with the Academic Misconduct Panel. The purpose of the meeting will be to give the student the opportunity to put their case, and to establish to Futureworks' satisfaction, that the work is their own.

18.6 The student will be given at least 10 working days' notice of the time, date and place of the meeting. The following information will be included with the notice:

18.6.1 the grounds on which the alleged academic misconduct is believed to have occurred;

18.6.2 a copy of a report prepared by the Academic Integrity Lead and any supporting evidence;

18.6.3 the right to seek advice from Student Services;

18.6.4 the right to be accompanied by a person of their choosing;

18.6.5 the right to call witnesses and give evidence

18.6.6 the names and roles of panel members

18.7 The student will be asked to submit a written statement in response to the allegation together with any evidence e.g. copies of draft or notes

18.8 The Academic Integrity Lead will prepare a written report explaining the nature of the alleged offence and provide supporting evidence. The report will state why the alleged offence is considered to be Category 3.

18.9 The Academic Integrity Lead and/or the student's Programme Leader may be in attendance to provide clarity if needed.

18.10 If the student or witnesses cannot attend the meeting for good reason they must contact the Academic Registrar as soon as possible to rearrange the meeting.

18.11 If the student does not attend without good cause, a decision may be made in their absence and a penalty may be imposed.

18.12 The Academic Misconduct Panel may:

18.12.1 ask the student to provide evidence that shows how they prepared for and authored the assessed work e.g. copies of drafts or notes; and/or

18.12.2 ask questions about the submitted work during the meeting to give the student the opportunity to demonstrate appropriate knowledge of the subject matter and that they understand the content of the work.

18.13 The order of proceedings at the meeting will normally be as follows:

18.13.1 The Academic Misconduct Panel will convene in a private session to discuss the case and what questions need to be asked;

18.13.2 The student and any support person and the presenting member(s) of staff will attend the meeting at the same time.

18.13.3 The Chair will invite all those present to introduce themselves and their role in the proceedings, and will explain the purpose and structure of the meeting and the possible outcomes;

18.13.4 The Chair will invite the presenting member(s) of staff to present the case;

18.13.5 The Panel and the student (or representative) may ask questions;

18.13.6 The Chair will invite the student (or representative) to explain the circumstances surrounding the alleged academic misconduct from their perspective and respond to the allegation of academic misconduct;

18.13.7 The Panel and the presenting member(s) of staff may ask questions;

18.13.8 Any witnesses called by the presenting member(s) of staff or the student may be called at this point, where previously agreed by the Chair;

18.13.9 The present member(s) of staff will be invited to sum up;

18.13.10 The student (or representative) will be invited to give an explanation and to sum up their case;

18.13.11 Once the Chair is satisfied that all questioning is completed, all parties apart from the Panel members will withdraw.

18.13.12 The Panel will deliberate in order to reach a decision. They may seek further information; and/or adjourn to a later date.

18.14 The Academic Misconduct Panel will:

18.14.1 determine the facts of the case on the basis of the evidence before it;

18.14.2 decide on the balance of probabilities whether academic misconduct has occurred and its severity;

18.14.3 consider any explanation given by the student;

18.14.4 consider any aggravating factors e.g. whether it is a repeat offence;

18.14.5 confirm the penalty where it is established that academic misconduct has occurred.

18.15 Written notification of the outcome and the associated reasons will be sent to the student along with the record of the meeting, within 5 working days of the meeting. The outcome letter will identify the regulations applied, the evidence considered, the decision on the outcome and penalty and the associated reasons and the student's right of appeal.

18.16 The Academic Registry will ensure that all cases are formally recorded using a standard report template and reported to the Assessment Board.

## 19 Penalties for Academic Misconduct

19.1 The penalties for academic misconduct will be determined based on:

19.1.1 the severity of the case;

19.1.2 what stage of the programme the student is at;

19.1.3 whether it was a repeat offence;

19.1.4 whether there was a clear intent to deceive and gain an unfair academic advantage

19.1.5 any explanation given by the student

19.2 Where academic misconduct is detected for the first time on a reassessment for an already failed assessment, no further reassessment will be permitted and the appropriate fail grade will be conferred.

19.3 Futureworks adheres to the AMBer tarriff, in line with the national research consultation exercise conducted on behalf of plagiarismadvice.org. The penalties applied can be found in Appendix 1 – AMBeR Tariff.

19.4 The penalty for a case of Category 3 academic misconduct may be the expulsion of the student from Futureworks. Such action is reserved for the most severe cases; however, students should be aware that expulsion is a possibility should they commit academic misconduct. This is highlighted in the Undergraduate Terms & Conditions. If the student is withdrawn from their course due to academic misconduct they will not be eligible for a refund of fees. If the student is on a student route visa their visa will be withdrawn.

## 20 Mitigating Circumstances

20.1 Students will have the opportunity to provide an explanation for their actions during their interview with the Academic Integrity Lead or Academic Misconduct Panel. Any explanation will not be relevant to deciding whether academic misconduct has occurred but may be taken into account when deciding on the penalty. Where students experience circumstances which affect their performance, there are Futureworks procedures for students to apply for extenuating circumstances, and such cases will be treated in a supportive and appropriate way. Given the existence of these procedures, extenuating circumstances should not be considered in deciding whether academic misconduct has taken place and may only be considered in determining the level of penalty where there is evidence of compelling personal circumstances which impaired the student's judgement.

## 21 Academic Appeal

21.1 The student may, where there are valid grounds, submit an academic appeal within 14 days of the official notification of the outcome of a decision by the Academic Integrity Lead or the Academic Misconduct Panel in line with the Academic Appeals Procedure.

21.2 Appeals against decisions on academic misconduct will only be valid if they are based on the following grounds:

21.2.1 that the original hearing was not conducted fairly and/or in accordance with the published procedure;

21.2.2 that the original decision was unreasonable in all the circumstances.

21.3 If a student is dissatisfied with the outcome of their case at Futureworks and they have exhausted our internal procedures, they have the right to request a review by the Open University (OU). This review process is designed to ensure that their concerns are heard and addressed appropriately. Guidance on how to make an academic appeal the OU can be found in the OU Handbook for Validated Awards

21.4 An appeal against a decision by an Academic Misconduct Panel on a Category 3 case of academic misconduct will proceed directly to Stage 3 of the Academic Appeals Procedure to be

considered by the Open University. Students may seek advice regarding an appeal from Student Services.

21.5 Once the Futureworks and OU Review Stages has been completed, the student will be provided with a Completion of Procedures Letter confirming their right to request a review of The Open University decision by the Office of the Independent Adjudicator for Higher Education (OIA). An OIA Complaint Form must be submitted to the OIA within 12 months of the date of Completion of Procedures Letter. Details may be found at: www.oiahe.org.uk.

## 22 Recording and Disclosure of Information

22.1 Any finding of academic misconduct will be recorded on the student's record and reported to the Assessment Board.

22.2 Offences will be kept on file so that penalties can be applied where a student transfers from one Futureworks programme to another during their period of studies and module credits gained on the former programme are transferred to the current programme. Where an allegation of academic misconduct has been upheld, Futureworks will inform relevant third parties of the nature and outcome of the case as required, including:

22.2.1 placement providers; and/or

22.2.2 potential employers in the event of a reference request.

22.3 The student will be informed in the event of any such disclosures.

## 23 Monitoring and Review

23.1 Academic Integrity Leads will monitor the occurrence of academic misconduct in each School and create action plans focusing on improvements using standard templates, which will be reported to the Academic Registry.

23.2 An annual report on the occurrence of academic misconduct across Schools will be submitted to the Academic Board, paying particular regard to equality issues, for the purposes of assuring the security of Futureworks' academic standards and improving the provision of guidance to students about good academic practice.

## 24 Appendix 1 – AMBeR Tariff

### 1 Assign points based on the following criteria

#### HISTORY

| | |
|---|---|
| 1st Time | **100 points** |
| 2nd Time | **150 points** |
| 3rd/+ Time | **200 points** |

#### AMOUNT / EXTENT

| | |
|---|---|
| Below 5% **AND** less than two sentences | **80 points** |
| As above but with **critical aspects*** plagiarised | **105 points** |
| Between 5% and 20% **OR** more than two sentences but not more than two paragraphs | **105 points** |
| As above but with **critical aspects*** plagiarised | **130 points** |
| Between 20% and 50% **OR** more than two paragraphs but not more than five paragraphs | **130 points** |
| As above but with **critical aspects*** plagiarised | **160 points** |
| Above 50% **OR** more than five paragraphs | **160 points** |
| Submission purchased from essay mill or ghostwriting service † | **225 points** |

** Critical aspects are key ideas central to the assignment*

*† Some institutions may consider this to be a separate form of academic malpractice*

#### LEVEL / STAGE

| | |
|---|---|
| Level 1 | **70 points** |
| Level 2 | **115 points** |
| Level 3/Postgraduate | **140 points** |

#### VALUE OF ASSIGNMENT

| | |
|---|---|
| Standard weighting | **30 points** |
| Large project (e.g. final year dissertation) | **60 points** |

#### ADDITIONAL CHARACTERISTICS

Evidence of deliberate attempt to disguise plagiarism by changing words, sentences or references to avoid detection **40 points**

Futureworks

## 2 Award penalties based on the points

### PENALTIES (Summative Work)

In all cases a formal warning is given and a record made contributing to the student's previous history

| Points | Available Penalties (select one) |
|---|---|
| 280 - 329 | • No further action beyond formal warning<br>• Assignment awarded 0% - resubmission required, with no penalty on mark |
| 330 - 379 | • No further action beyond formal warning<br>• Assignment awarded 0% - resubmission required, with no penalty on mark<br>• Assignment awarded 0% - resubmission required but mark capped or reduced |
| 380 - 479 | • Assignment awarded 0% - resubmission required but mark capped or reduced<br>• Assignment awarded 0% - no opportunity to resubmit |
| 480 - 524 | • Assignment awarded 0% - no opportunity to resubmit<br>• Module awarded 0% - re-sit required, but mark capped or reduced<br>• Module awarded 0% - no opportunity to re-sit, but credit still awarded |
| 525 – 559 | • Module awarded 0% - re-sit required, but mark capped or reduced<br>• Module awarded 0% - no opportunity to re-sit, but credit still awarded<br>• Module awarded 0% - no opportunity to re-sit, and credit lost<br>• Award classification reduced<br>• Qualification reduced (e.g. Honours -> no Honours)<br>• Expelled from institution but credits retained<br>• Expelled from institution with credits withdrawn |
| 560+ | • Module awarded 0% - no opportunity to resit, and credit lost<br>• Award classification reduced<br>• Qualification reduced (e.g. Honours -> no Honours)<br>• Expelled from institution but credits retained<br>• Expelled from institution with credits withdrawn |

### PENALTIES (Formative Work)

| | |
|---|---|
| 280 - 379 | Informal warning |
| 380+ | Formal warning, with record made contributing to the student's previous history |