Academic Misconduct Policy

Policy Category:	Academic - Student
Subject:	Academic Misconduct
Approving Authority:	Academic Board
Responsible Officer:	Executive Director, Education and Students
Responsible Office:	Student Conduct & Appeals (Student and Education Directorate)
Related Procedures:	Academic Misconduct Procedure
Related College Policies:	Fitness to Practise Policy Support for Study Policy Non-Academic Misconduct Policy
Effective Date:	1 September 2023
Supersedes:	Misconduct Policy & Procedure, Academic Honesty and Integrity Policy, Proof Reading Policy
Next Review:	September 2026

I. PURPOSE AND SCOPE

King's College London is committed to developing and encouraging high standards of academic practice amongst its staff and students. This involves safeguarding the integrity of its assessment and academic awards, and ensuring any actions that interfere with this are dealt with appropriately. This policy and associate procedure outline how the College will act upon concern related to academic misconduct, including the possible outcomes.

This policy applies to all current and former students of King's College London, including pre-undergraduate, undergraduate, postgraduate taught and postgraduate research students, and students enrolled on free standing credit bearing modules and credit bearing short courses. Instances of Research Misconduct by research students will be considered in accordance with the Research Misconduct Procedure.

This policy applies to students registered on a module at King's College London offered under a collaborative partnership agreement. Students of King's College London studying modules at other institutions are subject to the host institution's procedures.

This policy may be applied retrospectively if a graduate is believed to have committed academic misconduct whilst enrolled at King's College London. In such cases this policy will normally apply for one year following the date of a student's award, but consideration will be given to the circumstances of the case and the severity of the concern.

Concerns arising in formative assessment should be dealt with locally by the Faculty/Department and focused on educative outcomes.

This policy should be read alongside the accompanying Academic Misconduct Procedure document, which outlines the processes involved in the implementation of this policy.

II. POLICY

1. Introduction

1.1 Students at King's College London are part of an academic community that values trust, fairness and respect and actively encourages students to act with honesty and integrity. The King's Community Charter sets out that each member of our community is responsible for ensuring academic integrity is upheld. Members of the King's community take responsibility for fostering a culture of openness, transparency, trust, and recognition of the contributions of others in the conduct of teaching and assessment. Academic honesty also involves a duty of candour when someone is aware of issues that impact the integrity of teaching and assessment.

1.2 Academic Misconduct is the adoption of working methods that are outside the spirit of the College regulations and the values of academic integrity. Any actions which interfere with the integrity and rigour of assessment undermine the College's reputation and educational standards.

1.3 The College has a responsibility to investigate all instances of potential academic misconduct. All cases will be considered with consistency and fairness, and will be investigated in line with this policy and associated procedure. All cases will be considered on the balance of probabilities.

2. Responsibilities

Responsibilities of students

2.1 Students should:

- take responsibility for their own learning, including familiarising themselves with the academic conventions and requirements of their Faculty/Department;
- take responsibility for their own academic work and ensure that they comply with assessment requirements and this policy;
- ensure that their academic work is expressed in their own words and incorporates their own ideas and judgements;
- comply with the requirements of their professional body (if applicable);
- proactively make use of the resources and support provided by the College, before submission of any summative assignment (Appendix 1);
- make a declaration with each assessment to confirm that the assignment submitted is their own work.

2.2 Support is available for students who find themselves facing hardship or challenging circumstances which impact their studies, and the College has a Mitigating Circumstances process available to students where such circumstances impact their ability to complete an assessment. Students are encouraged to use the variety of resources and services available to them (Appendix 1). Students are expected to engage with this support to ensure that any assessment they submit adheres to the values of academic honesty and integrity.

Responsibilities of faculties/departments

2.3 Staff should:

- ensure that students have appropriate guidance and opportunities to familiarise themselves with this policy and procedure, and associated guidance on Student Services Online;
- familarise students with the academic conventions required for their programme and the expectations of the academic community;
- provide students with access to help on plagiarism and academic integrity, such as the relevant KEATs modules via King's Academic Skills for Learning (Appendix 1);
- ensure that students are aware of professional requirements (if applicable);
- ensure that any concerns regarding academic integrity are considered in line with this policy and procedure.

3. Academic Misconduct

3.1 The following is a non-exhaustive list of types of academic misconduct which will be considered under this policy and associated procedure:

- Plagiarism
- Contract Cheating
- Third party involvement
- Collusion
- Examination Misconduct
- Fabrication
- Self-plagiarism
- Text Manipulation

3.2 Definitions of different types of academic misconduct and related terminology can be found in the Academic Glossary.

3.3. Under Contract Cheating, the following will also be considered under this policy as types of academic misconduct, even where the individual's own assessments are not impacted:

- Provision of contract cheating services: providing, or arranging for another person to provide, contract cheating services for financial gain to students.
- Promotion of contract cheating services: arranging an advertisement that offers to provide a cheating service. This includes an advertisement that describes a person/service as being available or competent to provide a cheating service, or to arrange for another person to provide a cheating service.

3.4 Examples of different types of academic misconduct can be found in the associated staff guidance document.

3.5 The College understands that sometimes students make mistakes, and is committed to supporting all students, even where academic misconduct may have occurred. The College takes honesty and contrition into account when considering any action

under this policy.

3.6 If a student is subject to coercive behaviour or threats to make malicious academic integrity reports by a third-party, they are encouraged to speak to staff and seek support.

4. Proof Reading, Writing Services, Software and Technology

4.1 The College does not offer a proof reading service to students nor does it recommend the use of any proof reading services. Proof reading is the final stage of producing a piece of written work and therefore students should carry out their own proof reading. The work submitted by a student must be their own work and any use of a third-party proof reading or editing service must not compromise the authorship of the work submitted.

4.2 The College accepts that there is an increasing integration of artificial intelligence into everyday word processing software and a range of tools are externally available. However, the use of generative AI tools to produce output which is then copied as part of a submission is not appropriate. Prudent, ethical and constructive use of tools is increasingly likely to form part of the production of assessed work. Students should see university guidance on how to do this here. Any use of writing technologies must adhere to the same principles as third-party services. This means that any work submitted must represent a genuine demonstration of the student's own work, skills and subject knowledge, adheres to the guidelines of the assessment task, and respects the College's value of academic integrity and honesty.

4.3 Where a student chooses to ask another individual to proof read their work, engages a private tutor to assist with assessments, or uses writing technologies, this should be limited to learning activities which do not form part of the final stages of assessments submitted for credit, or highlighting errors in spelling, punctuation or grammar. The service should not assist with substantive content creation or structuring of the assessment. Above all, third parties cannot make substantive changes which compromise the authorship of the text (for example, translating whole sections of text, rather than individual phrases), revise calculations, formulae, equations, or code, alter charts, figures or diagrams, correct information or references, or involve any tutoring.

4.4 Students should consult their Faculty/Department on any local advice with respect to the use of proof readers on their programmes and modules.

4.5 Additional assistance provided by a third party may be considered under this policy as a form of academic misconduct if it provides an unfair advantage or casts doubt on the intellectual ownership of the content from the submitting student. For the avoidance of doubt, generative Artificial Intelligence writing programmes are third party technologies and must only be used in accordance with College guidance. The following definitions should be adhered to:

Third party involvement: when a student receives unauthorized assistance from a third party which results in the submission of an individual assessment which the

College cannot be satisfied wholly represents the student's own work or understanding. As opposed to assistance for learning which has been explicitly authorised by the College (e.g. through a Personalised Assessment Arrangement), third party involvement is considered misconduct when it involves presenting someone else's ideas as your own, or calls into question the integrity of the assessment.

Third party production: when work submitted is substantively the product of a third party. Examples include, but are not limited to, when a substantial part/all of an assessment is produced or translated by another person, or extensive changes to the content of an assessment are made by another individual. It does not necessarily involve payment for the services of the third party, but this may be considered an aggravating factor.

4.6 Failure to adhere to these principles will result in an investigation and appropriate penalties may be applied.

File Sharing and Social Media Etiquette

4.7 The College provides resources and materials to students for the purposes of their own learning and assessment. Course and module materials, such as lecture notes and reading lists, often contain copyright material. The unauthorized distribution of these materials, such as uploading to file sharing sites or sending to external tutors, is not permitted and may be considered Non-Academic Misconduct. Students should comply with all of the College's policies, including those related to IT Acceptable Use, Data Governance, Copyright and Library Use

4.8 Sharing assessment and examination materials outside of the assessment task is also against examination rules and therefore may be considered academic misconduct. Students should carefully consider any distribution, publication or communication related to assessment tasks or materials, including but not limited to social media, file sharing platforms, and communications both with other students or external parties.

5. Academic Misconduct which is also a criminal offence

5.1 The Skills and Post-16 Education Bill sets out that it is a criminal offence to provide or arrange cheating services for financial gain to students enrolled at a higher education provider in England. It is also an offence to participate in advertising these services. When conducted by a King's student, these activities are also forms of academic misconduct as they do not align with our values of academic integrity.

5.2 Staff and students should report any activity related to the provision or advertisement of contract cheating services which occurs within the King's community to Student Conduct & Appeals (SCA). Where the activity may constitute a criminal offence, action may be taken to report the concerns to police, and/or for the matter to considered in line with this policy.

5.3 Where the alleged misconduct could also constitute an offence under the criminal law special provisions will apply and the College's own misconduct investigations or proceedings may be delayed until such time as the police and/or courts have completed their investigations and proceedings.

6. Identifying Academic Integrity Concerns

6.1 Concerns around academic integrity can arise in a variety of ways. All concerns will be investigated in accordance with this policy and using the associated procedure.

6.2 Faculties/Departments have the discretion to appoint an Academic Integrity Lead, who should have sufficient expertise and experience in this area. The Academic Integrity Lead should be a point of contact for Assessment Sub-Board (ASB) Chairs to discuss matters relating to academic misconduct and should have oversight of practice within their Faculty/Department. The Academic Integrity Lead may or may not also act as an ASB Chair or Assessment Board (AB) Chair.

6.3 Decisions about whether misconduct has occurred, the consideration of evidence and facts, and procedural matters do not normally require academic judgement. A judgement about marks awarded, the significance of certain contributions to an overall piece of work, degree classification, research methodology, whether feedback is correct or adequate, and the content or outcomes of a course will normally involve academic judgment.

6.4 Staff may use the electronic software "TurnitinUK" or other means to assist them in the process of detecting academic misconduct. Any material presented for assessment may be submitted to an academic misconduct detection service for text analysis and the findings considered as part of an investigation under this policy and procedure. Submitted work will be stored in a database (along with the student's name, email address, programme/module details and institution) and will form part of the body of student work against which future submissions from this and other institutions will be compared.

6.5 All first instances of academic misconduct may be investigated in accordance with Stage One: Academic Integrity Meeting (below). All second instances where academic misconduct was upheld in the first instance, should be referred to Stage Two: Misconduct Committee (below). Prior to the referral for second instances, an investigation should be carried out locally, which may include an Academic Integrity Meeting if deemed appropriate. A second instance does not need to be the same type of academic misconduct as a first instance in order to be considered as such. For example, if a student has had a first case of plagiarism and the second case is collusion, the collusion counts as a second case and vice versa.

6.6 Where a third party or member of the King's community has concerns about the academic integrity of a student, they may report this to the ASB Chair for their programme. The ASB Chair will then make a decision as to whether the case should be referred to Student Conduct & Appeals. In line with the Student Complaint Policy, action is not normally taken on anonymous complaints, and to ensure procedural fairness, students will have a right to know evidence on which their case is based.

However, where an ASB Chair considers there is suitable reason to do so, a student may be invited to attend an Academic Integrity Meeting as outlined in Stage One of this meeting to discuss the concerns. Where there is compelling evidence available from reliable sources, they may consider appropriate action.

Exam Misconduct

6.7 Where an examination invigilator becomes aware of any concern related to academic integrity or compliance with examination instructions, a report will be submitted to the Head of Student Conduct & Appeals (HoSCA). SCA will review all invigilator reports, and where appropriate seek information from the relevant Department/Faculty in determining the appropriate course of action.

HoSCA may issue a written warning for academic misconduct during examinations where the integrity of an assessment has not been impacted. The student can contest the allegations and any penalty within 5 working days, in which case the HoSCA will refer the matter to a Misconduct Committee.

Any other academic integrity concerns occurring during examinations will be referred to Stage Two of this policy and procedure.

7. Investigating Academic Integrity Concerns

7.1 It is not necessary to prove intention to commit academic misconduct and all cases will be considered in line with this policy, regardless of whether the misconduct was intentional. However, proven intent to commit academic misconduct is likely to be considered an aggravating factor when considering potential outcomes.

7.2 The ASB Chair, or their nominee, should be notified of any academic integrity concern identified. In cases where the ASB Chair is the student's personal tutor or module lead, then the ASB Chair role should be delegated to an appropriate nominee (for example, the deputy ASB Chair or AB Chair).

7.3 In consultation with module and/or programme leads, the ASB Chair (or their nominee) will consider the information available about the concern, such as:

- the student's submission
- instruction, guidance or requirements for the assessment task
- a similarity or authorship report produced by TurnitinUK or other relevant software
- search engine results linked to the submission content
- original source material identified
- academic judgement of relevant markers/module leads
- Examination Invigilator's Reports
- Any statement or evidence provided by the student
- Notes of any relevant meeting or discussion, and/or any relevant email correspondence
- Evidence from any other relevant parties where relevant
- Any history of academic misconduct by the student

The ASB Chair may also request access to assignments that have been submitted by the student within the same academic year.

7.4 Once the ASB Chair (or their nominee) has reviewed the information available, they may decide that the concern relates to poor academic practice and that no academic misconduct has occurred. Poor academic practice involves an unintentional misunderstanding of scholarly practice. Examples include when sources are acknowledged to some extent, but citation is inadequate or incomplete. It does not include when the failure to adhere to scholarly practice is blatant, extensive or results from a lack of effort. Poor academic practice is not a form of academic misconduct. The student will be provided with feedback, and the work will be marked in line with the assessment criteria. The student should be signposted to academic support resources (see Appendix 1).

7.5 Where the ASB Chair (or their nominee) is satisfied that there is sufficient reason to believe that the concern may involve academic misconduct, the student will normally be invited to a Stage One Academic Integrity Meeting (AIM). The ASB Chair may escalate any case directly to Stage Two: Misconduct Committee (see 7.20) but second cases should always be referred to Stage Two following a local investigation (see 6.5 above).

7.6 Proceedings under Stages 1-3 (below) are not invalidated or postponed due to the absence of the student, provided that the student has been given timely written notice of the AIM/Committee and provided that those conducting the AIM/Committee believe that all the evidence and representations are before it. In the event that a student has indicated that they will attend but then cannot do so for good reason an adjournment may be considered.

Stage One: Academic Integrity Meeting

7.7 The student will be invited to attend the Academic Integrity Meeting (AIM), which will normally be with any two of the following staff members: module leader, programme leader (or deputy), ASB Chair (or nominee), Programme Manager or personal tutor.

7.8 The meeting is not a hearing, and the meeting should be informal, supportive and exploratory.

7.9 Where the academic integrity concerns involve concerns of third-party involvement or doubts about the authorship of the submission, it is appropriate to ask the student to explain their answers, ideas, concepts or references. This may inform an academic judgement about whether the submission represents a genuine reflection of the student's own understanding and abilities.

7.10 The student should not be under any pressure, or obliged to provide specific responses. If a student declines to engage with the AIM, they will have the opportunity to provide a written response. The ASB Chair will reach an outcome on the basis of the information available, even if the student declines to provide any

further response.

7.11 Staff should keep notes of the discussion and share these with the student, along with any other relevant materials discussed (e.g. items listed in 7.3). The student may provide any other relevant information after the meeting, and should normally do this within 5 working days.

7.12 Following the AIM, staff should reflect on all of the information available and make a recommendation to, or consult with, the ASB Chair (or their nominee). If there are concerns of a serious nature, the ASB Chair (or their nominee) may also consult SCA for advice.

7.13 Following the receipt of any further relevant information from the student (see 7.11), the ASB Chair (or their nominee) will determine the outcome of the Stage One AIM within five working days, and will reach one of the following decisions:

1. There is no cause for concern regarding the student's submission. No further action will be taken, and the work will be marked as usual. The Department will keep a record of the AIM occurring, noting that no misconduct was found. **(Outcome 1)**

2. That no academic misconduct has occurred, and the concerns relate to poor academic practice (see 7.4). The student will be provided with feedback, and the work will be marked in line with the assessment criteria. The Department will keep a record of the AIM occurring, noting that no misconduct was found. **(Outcome 2)**

3. Academic misconduct has occurred and an outcome should be applied locally. The list of available penalties can be found in 7.26. Under a Stage One AIM, Educative Outcomes or Restorative Outcomes (a)-(d) may be applied. The outcome will be sent to the student in writing, giving reasons for the decision. A copy of the outcome will also be sent to SCA. **(Outcome 3)**

4. That the matter should be referred to Stage Two. Cases which warrant referral to Stage Two include:

- All second instances of academic misconduct (see 6.5);
- Any case where the Guidance on Penalties does not include Educative Outcomes or Restorative Outcomes (a) - (d). (that is, the guidance penalty is either Restorative Outcomes (e)-(h) or Punitive Outcomes);
- Any case where the ASB Chair considers there are aggravating factors which warrant consideration of either Restorative Outcomes (e)-(h) or Punitive Outcomes
- Any other case where the ASB Chair considers it necessary or appropriate for the case to be considered under Stage Two.
  (Outcome 4)

7.14 The outcome should be recorded by the Faculty/Department, including a summary of what was discussed in the AIM, all relevant evidence considered, and reasons for the outcome determined.

7.15 If a student does not attend the initial meeting, they should be offered one further opportunity to attend. Should the student not attend either meeting, the ASB Chair can decide whether academic misconduct has taken place and issue an Educative Outcome or Restorative Outcomes (a) - (d).

Contestation

7.16 A student cannot contest Outcomes 1 or 2 (see 7.13), as no academic misconduct has been found and no penalty applied. A student cannot contest Outcome 4 (see 7.13), as this does not constitute the final outcome with regards to whether any misconduct has occurred.

7.17 In the case of Outcome 3 (see 7.13), where academic misconduct has been found and a penalty applied by the ASB Chair, the student may contest this outcome.

7.18 The contestation should be sent to Student Conduct & Appeals in writing within 10 working days from the date of written notification of the Stage One outcome. The contestation should outline the reasons that the case warrants further review. Suitable reasons for further review include, but are not limited to:

- that there is new evidence or information of sufficient significance that the case warrants further review;
- that a significant procedural or administrative error occurred during the Stage One consideration and the case warrants further review;
- the Stage One outcome cannot reasonably be sustained by relevant guidance on assessment, academic integrity or penalties.

7.19 Student Conduct & Appeals will consider the contestation and the outcome will normally be communicated to the student in writing within 15 working days. Where SCA is satisfied that the case warrants further review, the matter will be referred to Stage Two. Where SCA is not satisfied that the case warrants further review, the student will be provided with a Completion of Procedures letter.

Stage Two: Misconduct Committee

7.20 A suspected case of academic misconduct may be referred to a Misconduct Committee for the following reasons:

1. It is the recommendation of the ASB Chair following Stage One (for example, if an outcome could not be determined locally, if the case is deemed serious or complex enough to be referred, or if the guidance penalty is either Restorative Outcomes (e)-(h) or Punitive Outcomes)
2. If the student contest the decision
3. If it is a second case of misconduct (see 6.5)

7.21 The ASB Chair, or their nominee, will provide SCA with all documentation considered at Stage One, including the notes from the AIM and any other representations or information presented by the student.

7.22 Student Conduct & Appeals will review the information provided and determine whether the case requires a full hearing by a Misconduct Committee. A full hearing may not be required where the facts are not contested by the student and they acknowledge the mistake.

7.23 If SCA considers that a full hearing may not be required, they will write to the student to inform them about the procedure and provide them with the opportunity to request a full hearing if they prefer. The student will also be provided with a copy of all of the documentation to be considered in their case. They will have 5 working days to provide any further evidence or information. The case will then be considered in writing by the Misconduct Committee Chair only, with procedural advice from SCA. The Chair may issue an outcome and actions within 10 working days. In any case where the Chair considers that the appropriate outcome calls into question the student's registration (that is, the outcome should include suspension or expulsion) they should refer the case to a full hearing.

7.24 Once a case has been referred to SCA, they will contact the student regarding any Stage Two actions. However, the Chair, or other appropriate member of the Assessment Board will be invited to present the case against the student at any subsequent Misconduct Hearing and provide programme information and representations on behalf of the Faculty/Department.

7.25 Should a Misconduct Committee decide that the charge was not established, that decision will be communicated to all persons involved in the case, normally within five working days of the date of the Committee.

7.26 Where a Misconduct Committee determines that a charge of academic misconduct has been substantiated on the balance of probabilities, the Committee may decide one or more of the following outcomes:

	Restorative Outcomes
a.	referral to support services or activities (see Appendix 1), which may include referral to the Support for Study policy and procedure;
b.	a formal warning, with those parts of the student's work that are unaffected by the concern to be marked, and the assessment result capped at the pass mark. For Level 3 students, the assessment result may be capped at the minimum progression mark;
c.	the assignment of the minimum pass mark to the assessment/s. For Level 3 students, this may be the minimum progression mark;
d.	the cancellation of the results in an assessment/s and a mark of zero returned;
e.	conditions for the continuation of student status;
f.	a non-contact order regarding one or more members of the King's community;
g.	payment of compensation for damages;
h.	exclusion for a stated period from specified activities or specified parts of the College, including King's Residence, conditions for re-admittance may be specified.
	Educative Outcomes
i.	a formal warning, with those parts of the student's work that unaffected by the concern to be marked;

j.	the requirement that the student resubmit an amended version of the assessment. This will not count as an additional attempt, but the mark for the resubmission will be capped at the minimum pass mark. For Level 3 students, the resubmission may be capped at the minimum progression mark;
k.	the requirement that the student undertake a specified formative task or training.
	Punitive Outcomes
l.	the cancellation of the results in an assessment/s and a mark of zero returned and any mark resulting from a resit capped at the highest applicable compensated/condoned fail level. For Level 3 students, any mark resulting from a resit may be capped at the lowest applicable progression mark;
m.	the cancellation of the results in an assessment/s and a mark of zero returned. The final module mark following reassessment is capped at the highest applicable compensated/condoned fail level. For Level 3 students, the final module mark following reassessment may be capped at the lowest applicable progression mark;
n.	the cancellation of the results in an assessment/s and a mark of zero returned and the student not permitted to resit but permitted to take an alternative module (but with only one attempt at the assessment permitted, which will be capped at the highest applicable compensated/condoned fail level. This may be the lowest applicable progression mark for Level 3 students);
o.	the student is not permitted to resubmit the assessment;
p.	cancellation of all assessments undertaken within a specified period of time, to be no greater than one year. The student will be permitted to reattempt the modules (with or without teaching). The final module mark following reassessment is capped at the pass mark. For Level 3 students, this may be the lowest applicable progression mark ;
q.	community service;
r.	a fine, up to £1,000 payable to a charity (not being King's College London);
s.	the student's right to be considered for an exit award withdrawn;
t.	suspension for an indefinite period, with an agreed review date;
u.	a recommendation to the Academic Board that the student's award be revoked;
v.	expulsion (with or without credit retained).

7.27 The Misconduct Committee may decide that the outcome be imposed immediately or be deferred (in exceptional circumstances). The conditions of any such deferment will be clearly stated as part of the decision of the Committee.

7.28 The Misconduct Committee will have the discretion to indicate a point in the future, and the conditions under which a substantiated case of misconduct may be considered spent.

7.29 The decision and outcome of the Committee will normally be sent to the student within five working days of the date of the decision of the Committee. These will be communicated to the student, Assessment Board and Assessment Sub-Board Chairs, and where appropriate, to the relevant Executive Dean of Faculty. Where appropriate, other relevant programme team members may also be informed. A copy of the decision and outcome will be placed on the student's file. A student will also be advised that the case may be taken into consideration in the event of a future substantiated case.

7.30 Where a student is following a programme of study leading to a professional qualification which is registrable with a statutory regulatory body the decision of the Committee will also be sent to the Executive Dean of Faculty for consideration in accordance with Academic Regulation 8.27.

7.31 Where a student who has been found guilty of misconduct holds a professional qualification which is registerable with a professional, statutory or regulatory body, the College may report the student to that body under Academic Regulation 8.27.

Stage Three: Misconduct Appeal

7.32 Students may appeal the decision of a Misconduct Committee on either of both of the following grounds:
1. There is new evidence that could not have been, or for good reason was not, made available at the time of the Committee, and the case warrants further consideration;
2. Evidence can be produced of significant procedural error on the part of the College before or during the Committee, and the case warrants further consideration.

7.33 The Principal will have the discretion to take into account grounds (including grounds of compassion) other than those stated above in deciding whether to allow an appeal to be heard.

7.34 Students should submit a Misconduct Appeal Form to the HoSCA, on behalf of the Principal, within 10 working days of the date of the Misconduct Committee outcome. Misconduct Appeal Forms received after this deadline will only be accepted at the discretion of the Principal.

7.35 The Principal will normally advise the student of their decision on the appeal within 30 working days of receipt. If the appeal is to be heard, an Appeal Committee will be appointed. If the appeal is rejected, reasons will be given.

Appeal Outcomes

7.36 The decision and outcome of an Appeal Committee will normally be sent to the student within five working days of the date of the decision of the Appeal Committee. These will also be communicated to AB and ASB Chairs, and where appropriate, to the relevant Executive Dean of Faculty. A copy of the decision and outcome will be placed on the student's file.

7.37 The Appeal Committee may reject or uphold the appeal. Where the Appeal Committee upholds the appeal, the Committee may order one or more of the following measures:
a. modify or reverse the findings of a Misconduct Committee;
b. modify or reverse the order of a Misconduct Committee.

7.38 Where an Appeal Committee rejects the appeal, the findings and decision of the Misconduct Committee stands.

7.39 A decision of an Appeal Committee will be final.

8. Academic Misconduct and Progression

8.1 No mark should be assigned to an assessment that is being considered under this policy until the matter has been resolved and proceedings have concluded.

8.2 Marks withheld will not contribute to credit obtained for the purposes of progression. Any decision regarding a student's progression to the next stage of their studies will be based on whether they have obtained sufficient credit in modules unaffected by the academic integrity concerns to meet the relevant programme specifications.

8.3 A student's final award will be withheld whilst any action is being taken under this policy. This restriction will be lifted upon completion of the action.

9. Relationship to Support for Study Policy

9.1 There may be instances where a student states that the behaviour giving rise to a misconduct concern is related to their long-term medical/mental health condition or disability. The College may consider whether to proceed with misconduct proceedings and/or refer the student to the Support for Study Policy and Procedure.

9.2 To ensure the Support for Study Policy and Procedure are used appropriately and where there are justifiable concerns about misconduct, these concerns should be raised with the Head of Student Conduct & Appeals or their nominee, who will ask the Student of Concern Management Group to review the case and decide whether to invoke this Policy and Procedure and/or continue with misconduct proceedings. This may include consultation with members of staff from the student's faculty or other relevant members of the university community, collaborative partners or external professionals.

10. Relationship to Fitness to Practise Policy

10.1 Accusations of academic misconduct can impact on a student's fitness to practise in a professional capacity. Where a Fitness to Practise issue is present within a misconduct case, the HoSCA will notify the student's Faculty as soon as possible in order to allow the Faculty to determine whether any precautionary action should be taken in line with the College's Fitness to Practise Policy and Procedure, or if the student should be removed from placement under Chapter 8.21 of the academic regulations.

11. Disclosure of Information

11.1 All university staff members are governed by the requirements of GDPR. All data relating to an individual's physical or mental health is regarded as sensitive personal data. The KCL Data Protection Policy contains guidance on the use of sensitive personal data and should be followed in any academic misconduct procedures.

12. Office of the Independent Adjudicator – Information for Students

12.1 A student will normally need to have completed the Stage Three: Misconduct Appeal process and have received a Completion of Procedures Letter before a complaint can be made to the OIA. The complaint needs to be submitted to the OIA within 12 months of

the date of the Completion of Procedures Letter.

12.2 Provided the complaint is eligible under the rules of the OIA's complaints scheme, the OIA will look at whether the university has applied its regulations and policies properly and followed its procedures correctly. It also considers whether any decision made by the university was fair and reasonable in all the circumstances.

Appendix One: Links and Resources

Links
Academic Regulations
Academic Glossary
Student Conduct and Appeals
King's Community Charter
Office for the Independent Adjudicator's Good Practice Framework
King's Guidance on Generative AI for teaching, assessment and feedback

Associated Policies and Procedures
Academic Misconduct Procedure
Fitness to Practise Policy
Support for Study Policy
Mitigating Circumstances Policy
General Dental Council Fitness to Practise Guidance
General Medical Council Fitness to Practise Guidance
Nursing and Midwifery Council Code
Removal from placement regulation (8.21-8.25)

Academic Integrity: Information and Resources
King's Academic Skills for Learning
King's Academic Skills for Learning: Using Turnitin
Academic Skills Tutors
King's Academy
Libraries & Collections: Getting Started with Referencing
KEATs Assessment Tools: Using the Turnitin Tool

Student Support: Information and Resources
KCLSU Advice
Student Services Online
Assessment – Mitigating Circumstances
Disability Support
Fees, funding and money advice
Visa and International Student Advice
Money and Housing Advice