



Senate

<b>Paper Title</b>	Academic Integrity: principles and plans for 2023-2024
<b>Outcome requested</b>	<p>At the meeting held on 8 June 2023, Senate agreed that it would discuss academic integrity in more detail at the meeting of 19 October.</p> <p>The Appeals, Complaints and Conduct Office has compiled some draft principles to support Queen Mary’s approach to academic integrity, and has also provided details of work that will be undertaken to support more significant amendments to the Academic Misconduct Policy for 2024-25.</p> <p>Senate is invited to consider the draft principles and to note the work that is currently underway to improve our approach to handling cases of academic misconduct.</p>
<b>Points for Senate members to note and further information</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• A task and finish group will be established to review the Academic Misconduct Policy for 2024-25. The group’s recommendations will be considered in detail by the Education Quality and Standards Board before consideration by Senate in June 2024.</li> <li>• The draft principles for responding to academic misconduct are for discussion, with a view to informing the task and finish group and the Appeals, Complaints and Conduct Office.</li> </ul>
<b>Questions for Senate to consider</b>	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Does Senate agree with the proposed actions to support the changes to the Academic Misconduct Policy 2023-24 with a view to developing this approach further for 2024-25.</li> <li>2. Does Senate have any additions or amendments to the draft principles to support Queen Mary’s approach to academic integrity?</li> </ol>
<b>Regulatory/statutory reference points</b>	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Office for Students: Conditions of Registration</li> <li>2. <a href="#">Office of the Independent Adjudicator: The Good Practice Framework</a></li> <li>3. <a href="#">QAA UK Quality Code for Higher Education</a></li> </ol>
<b>Strategy and risk</b>	<p>Aligns with the Queen Mary Strategy 2030</p> <p>Excellence in Education</p> <p>Excellence in Student Engagement</p> <p>Excellence in Student Employability</p>

	Excellence in Learning Environment
<b>Reporting/ consideration route for the paper</b>	Senate – for discussion
<b>Authors</b>	Haylee Fuller, Head of the Appeals, Complaints and Conduct Office
<b>Sponsor</b>	Jonathan Morgan, Chief Governance Officer and University Secretary

## Draft Principles for Academic Integrity & Misconduct at Queen Mary

Queen Mary is committed to embedding academic integrity across all areas of the curriculum. The University promotes effective assessment design and ensures that students are supported in developing a sound understanding of expectations in relation to academic integrity. Our approach aligns with Condition B2 of the Office for Students' Conditions of Registration in the provision of *'support relating to understanding, avoiding and reporting academic misconduct'*, and this commitment is reflected in the revised process for considering first incidents of academic misconduct within a student's home school or institute.

Queen Mary strives for proportionality in addressing issues of academic integrity and misconduct, and considers that the review of initial integrity issues at a local level provides a focus on learning and promotes the development of good scholarship. Such local conversations or processes can allow students to gain valuable feedback and improve their academic skills when minor issues arise, and reserves the central misconduct process for dealing with significant concerns. These principles are designed to help ensure that educational and remedial actions are paramount, without compromising academic quality and community expectations.

Procedural fairness is central to any consideration of misconduct. Procedural fairness includes making sure that the process is accessible, inclusive and clear for students to understand and engage with. In practice, this means they should always have adequate information about what evidence or concerns are being considered and a fair opportunity to respond. It also means that decisions should be independent, reasoned, and confidential. Decisions about the appropriate action and outcome will strive to take into account the following:

- It is recognised that assessment and misconduct matters can be stressful for students. A supportive, educational approach with opportunities for early remediation should be explored wherever appropriate.
- To ensure quality & standards, all marks awarded must be a true reflection of a student's achievement. Where the integrity of an assessment has been compromised, it is normally expected that the outcome will require resubmission of the student's own work to obtain credit. Penalties which do not require resubmission are normally applied where it is clear that a sufficient proportion of the work can be considered the student's own achievement, for example, minor instances of plagiarism in a larger body of the student's own work.
- Outcomes and actions recognise the importance of consistency and clarity, while striving to give due consideration to individual circumstances. To ensure fairness and consistency for all students, decision-makers will provide reasons for any outcome. Where they have decided to vary from the university guidance on outcomes/penalties for any good reason they will include an explanation of the factors considered. Good reasons might include the considerations outlined below.
- Responses should be proportional to the extent and severity of the misconduct.
- Honesty & integrity – the use of paid services or where a student shows no attempt to produce their own work will be treated with the utmost seriousness. A student's response to concerns raised may also be taken into account; for example contrition and reflection may warrant leniency, whereas sustained intention to deceive throughout the case may call for more serious actions.
- Repeated instances – repeated occurrences of misconduct will normally be treated more seriously. Lack of industry or engagement with learning and support which results in repeated misconduct will normally result in escalating outcomes.

- The assessment context – this can include expectations about the student’s academic experience (eg level of study), and/or the nature and value of the assessment (eg. is it a significant piece of work or milestone, or accounting for a considerable amount of the module or classification).
- Any relevant accompanying behaviour – actions impacting other members of the Queen Mary community, such as coercion, deceit or falsely implicating an innocent student may be taken into account.
- The effect of the penalty – are the practical implications of a penalty on progression or awards proportionate and appropriate?
- No advantage – all decisions will consider whether or not a student who committed academic misconduct will be advantaged over a student who failed an assessment or module honestly, and attempt to ensure this is not the case.

To support the successful implementation of amendments to the Academic Misconduct Policy 2023/24 at Senate in July 2023, the Appeals, Complaints & Conduct Office are working towards the following actions:

1. Delivery of training for all staff members involved in handling academic misconduct cases, to cover best practice guidance, regulations, and technical aspects (using the MySIS Misconduct Dashboard). Faculty and School leadership are asked to encourage all relevant members of their teams to attend one of these training sessions, which will be delivered on a range of dates from November-April.
2. Bi-weekly drop-in sessions with Appeals, Complaints & Conduct Office staff members, open to all staff members who would like guidance or support with academic misconduct cases.
3. A Misconduct Chair’s Forum to be held each semester, for all Senate appointed Academic Misconduct Chairs to share experiences and raise issues identified in the course of their role.
4. Establishment of a Task & Finish Group to complete a more detailed review of the Academic Misconduct Policy for 2024/25.
5. The appended Principles for Responding to Academic Misconduct at Queen Mary and updated Penalty Guidance draw on relevant regulatory points and existing guidance documents. Senate is asked to consider the Principles, which will form the basis of guidance to support Actions 1, 3 & 4.
6. Collaboration with IT Services and Planning Department to create a PowerBi dashboard based on data from the MySIS Academic Misconduct Workflow, to support educational and operational activities related to academic integrity.
7. Academic Integrity & Misconduct Workstream of the EQSB Assessment sub-Board considering completion rates of the Academic Integrity at Queen Mary QM+ Module and misconduct data, with view to better promote and integrate positive behaviours and good academic integrity in responses to concerns with student work.

## Outcome Guidance

Type of misconduct	Example misconduct	Commonly applied penalty
Plagiarism/collusion	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Small amount of plagiarism</li> <li>• First finding of misconduct by a first-year UG student</li> </ul>	Central Penalty iv / School penalty iii.
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• First finding of misconduct by a second or third-year UG student</li> <li>• First finding of misconduct by a PG student</li> </ul>	Central Penalty iv or vi / School penalty iii.
Misconduct in invigilated examinations	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Mobile phone or unauthorised electronic device on person</li> <li>• Unauthorised material on person</li> <li>• Having writing on body</li> <li>• Communicating with another student</li> <li>• Failing to follow the instructions of an invigilator</li> <li>• Copying the work of another student</li> </ul>	Central Penalty vi.
Ghost-writing	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Contract cheating</li> <li>• The use of websites like Chegg, Bartleby, Course Hero where students actively request their work is completed by a third-party</li> </ul>	Generally misconduct of this kind will incur severe penalties that reflect the nature of the case. Students should expect central penalty vii as a minimum.
Other types of misconduct	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Fraudulent reporting of source material</li> <li>• Falsification of data</li> <li>• Impersonation of another student</li> </ul>	Generally misconduct of this kind will incur severe penalties that reflect the nature of the case. Students should expect central penalty vii as a minimum.
Unauthorised or unacknowledged text manipulation which undermines the integrity of an assessment	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Using Generative AI to produce work which is presented as the student's own</li> </ul>	For further discussion
A second or subsequent offence of any kind	See above examples	Escalating outcomes, relative to previous penalty. This means usually central penalty vi or above.