

**Kingston
University**
London

Academic Regulations 6:

Academic Integrity Taught Courses

2026-2027

This document is available in hard copy and on the University intranet and internet sites. Please contact the Information Centres (in each campus library) or the Kingston Students' Union Advice Centre if you have any difficulty in obtaining a copy that you can read, or find any aspect of these regulations difficult to understand.

Contents

Section	Title	paragraph numbers
	Introduction	1 - 8
Section 1	What is Academic Integrity?	9
	What is Poor Academic Practice?	10
	What is Academic Misconduct (Breaches of Academic Integrity)?	11
Section 2	What are the different types of Academic Misconduct	12
	Plagiarism (including copying)	13
	Self-plagiarism	14
	Collusion	15
	Unacceptable use of Generative Artificial Intelligence	16
	Academic misconduct in time constrained assessments	17
	Cheating in an examination venue	18
	Fabricating or falsifying data or using without permission another person's work	19
	Purchasing or commissioning	20
Section 3	What is the Academic Induction Period?	21 - 24
	What happens if there is a suspected breach of academic integrity in the Academic Induction Period	25 - 26
Section 4	What happens if there is a suspected breach of academic integrity outside of the Academic Induction Period	
	Step 1: Consideration by the Module Leader/Academic Integrity Officer	27-37
	Informal meetings	32-34
	Step 2: Consideration by the Course Leader/Academic Registry	35-28
	Step 3: Actions by the Student	39-42
	Step 4: Formal Hearing – Actions of the Hearing Panel	43 - 53
	Step 5: Actions by the Programme Assessment Board	54
	Consistency of Treatment	55
	Accompaniment and Representation	56-58
	Allegations raised by a third party	59-63
	Anonymity	64-65
Section 5	Penalties	66-72
	Concurrent Offences	73-76
	Compensation Regulations	77
	Student Conduct and Behaviour Procedure	79
	Academic Appeals	79-80
Annex A	Penalties for Academic Misconduct	Page 17
Annex B	See Academic Guidance 2: Statement on editorial help for students' work: guidance for students, supervisors and examiners published from: Policies and regulations Kingston University London	

Introduction

1. The University is a community bound by, among other things, a culture of academic integrity. Students are continually supported and guided in what constitutes academic integrity and why this enriches their experience and bestows benefits intrinsically linked to knowledge acquisition, skills development and qualification. Academic misconduct is, in essence, a breach of this norm, and the application of the academic misconduct procedure set out in Academic Regulations 6 primarily protects this culture.
2. The academic misconduct procedure is an internal procedure designed to examine why a piece of assessment has been judged by the Module Leader (or tutor) to be the result of academic misconduct, and why the student believes that this is incorrect. It is not a legal process. Should a student wish to pursue a complaint through legal channels the matter will be treated separately from the Academic Misconduct Procedures. Letters received from solicitors shall be treated as legal matters. In such cases, the matter will be referred to the University's Governance, Legal and Compliance Office.
3. The procedures allow both parties to present their viewpoints. Further information relating to accompaniment and representation can be found in the sections below.
4. A finding that academic misconduct has occurred is a judgement based on available evidence, the standard of proof being the balance of probability. What this means is that, on the basis of the evidence, it is more likely than not that academic misconduct has occurred. Course teams are therefore required to provide evidence that academic misconduct against the definitions provided in this procedure has taken place. The student is not required to prove that it has not.
5. The University views academic misconduct very seriously. Any form of cheating poses a threat to the academic standards of a provider's qualifications, and to the integrity of qualifications awarded to the vast majority of students who achieve their qualification entirely by legitimate means Academic Council has delegated to its Programme Assessment Boards the authority to impose penalties for academic misconduct that may include the termination of students' registration and expulsion from the University. The possible penalties are outlined in Annex A.
6. Where a graduate of the University is found to have achieved credit for their award through academic misconduct, the Vice-Chancellor acting on the recommendation of Academic Council may rescind the award.
7. These Regulations do not cover matters which have already or are currently being considered by the Office of the Independent Adjudicator for Higher Education (OIA), a court, or a tribunal.
8. Student expenses for attending an Academic Misconduct Hearing will not be reimbursed by the University regardless of the subsequent outcome.

Section 1

What is Academic Integrity?

9. Academic integrity means demonstrating honest, moral behaviours when producing academic work. This involves acknowledging the work of others, giving appropriate credit to others where their ideas are presented as part of a students' work and the importance of producing work in the student's own voice. Contributions by artificial intelligence (AI) tools must also be properly acknowledged. As part of a learning community students share ideas and develop new ones- they need to be able to interpret and present other people's ideas and combine these with their own when producing their work. To achieve this, students need to develop skills of reflection and self-awareness about topics such as fairness, responsibility and respect in academic practice.

What is Poor Academic Practice?

10. The University recognises that there is a difference between academic misconduct and poor academic practice. Poor academic practice involves minor breaches of discipline-specific citation and/or referencing conventions that give no discernible advantage. In cases of poor academic practice, the work will be marked according to the relevant grade criteria, and students will be directed to the resources available to help them improve their working methods and academic writing to avoid potential academic misconduct.

What is Academic Misconduct (Breaches of Academic Integrity)?

11. The University defines academic misconduct (breaches of academic integrity) in assessment as any action by a student that has the potential to give them an unfair advantage, or to aid another to gain such an advantage.

A student's intentions are not relevant to whether or not they have committed misconduct. Examples of the types of academic misconduct covered by these procedures are provided below, but this should not be regarded as a definitive list. The University reserves the right to include other types of academic misconduct under this procedure.

Section 2

What are the different types of Academic Misconduct?

12. The University typically recognises the following types of academic misconduct:

The following are usually considered as 'Type 1' Academic Misconduct offences

Plagiarism

13. The University defines plagiarism as the act of presenting the work of another person (or people) and/or content generated by artificial intelligence (AI) tools, as one's own without proper acknowledgement. This also includes copying the work of another student or other students.

The University expects students to take responsibility for the security of their work (i.e. with written work, to ensure that other students do not get access to electronic or hard copy of the work). Failure to keep work secure may allow others to cheat, and could result in an allegation of academic misconduct for students whose work have been copied, particularly if the origin of the work is in doubt.

The University will not accept a lack of understanding of the requirements for acknowledging the work of others and/or content generated by artificial intelligence tools as a legitimate defence for academic misconduct.

In cases where a student resubmits the same plagiarised work for reassessment this is considered a new offence and the procedure as outlined in these regulations must be followed.

Self-plagiarism

14. The University defines self-plagiarism as the act of presenting part or all of a student's work that has been previously submitted to meet the requirements of a different assessment which they have gained academic credit for, except where the nature of the assessment makes this permissible and this is explicitly stated in the assessment brief

Collusion

15. The University defines collusion as the act, by two or more students, of presenting a piece of work jointly without acknowledging the collaboration.

This could include a student who permits or assists another to present work that has been copied or paraphrased from the student's own work.

The University also defines collusion as the act of one student presenting a piece of work as their own independent work when the work was undertaken by a group. With group work, where individual members submit parts of the total assignment, each member of a group must take

responsibility for checking the legitimacy of the work submitted in their name. If even part of the work is found to contain academic misconduct, penalties will normally be imposed on all group members equally.

Unacceptable use of Generative Artificial Intelligence

16. The University defines the unacceptable use of Generative Artificial Intelligence as the act of presenting content generated by artificial intelligence tools (such as text, media, tables etc – list not exhaustive), as one's own without proper acknowledgement, except where the nature of the assessment makes this permissible and is explicitly stated in the assessment brief.

Academic Misconduct in Time Constrained Assessments

17. The University defines academic misconduct in time constrained assessments as any action by a student that has the potential to give them an unfair advantage, or to aid another to gain such an advantage, where this occurs in assessments such as in-class tests, presentations, vivas and performances (this list is not exhaustive).

The following are usually considered as 'Type 2' Academic Misconduct Offences

Academic Misconduct in an Examination Venue

17. The University defines academic misconduct in an examination venue as including:
 - taking notes or any unauthorised materials into an examination venue. This includes having notes available in toilets or other areas that may be visited during the examination. If students refuse to comply with instructions if they request to leave the examination venue during the examination (e.g. a toilet visit), this may be considered evidence of attempted academic misconduct.
 - obtaining an advanced copy of a question paper
 - unauthorised communication during an examination (including via telephone or other electronic media)
 - removing an examination answer book from the examination venue
 - copying from another candidate
 - allowing oneself to be impersonated
 - impersonating another candidate.

Fabricating or falsifying data or using without permission another person's work

18. The University defines the act of fabricating or falsifying data to include presenting work that has not taken place. This includes laboratory reports or projects based on experimental or field work. It may also include falsifying attendance sheets for placements where this is part of the assessment requirements.

Purchasing or Commissioning

19. The University defines the act of purchasing or commissioning as either attempting to purchase or purchasing work for an assessment including, for example from the internet, or attempting to commission, or commissioning someone else to complete an assessment.

Where students are judged to be aiding others outside the jurisdiction of the University or are acting as an agent for a third party, they will be dealt with under the general disciplinary processes, [General Regulations 3: Student Conduct and Behaviour Procedure](#) which is available on the [University's website](#).

Commissioning of proof reading is discouraged. Students should be directed to University support services in relation to writing, spelling, punctuation and grammar, including help from their relevant tutors. However, commissioning proof-reading is not considered a form of academic misconduct. There are strict rules around what is permitted, which are provided in Annex B.

20. These examples of academic misconduct are not exhaustive and the University reserves the right to include other types of cheating under the terms of this procedure and determine which type of academic misconduct this falls under.

Section 3

What is the Academic Induction Period (AIP)?

21. The University recognises that students who are new to UK Higher Education may need some time to learn how to acknowledge sources properly. Therefore, it operates an 'Academic Induction Period (AIP)' during which the focus of the University's response to signs of plagiarism and/or collusion is to educate students in regard to appropriate academic practice and academic integrity rather than to penalise unacceptable academic practice.
22. The Academic Induction Period (AIP) applies to all full-time and part-time students and is defined as:
 - the first academic year of a student's registration with the University on an undergraduate course at Level 3 or 4 only
 - the first teaching block on a short course for academic credit at Undergraduate or Postgraduate Level
 - the first teaching block on a postgraduate course

The Academic Induction Period (AIP) does not apply to:

- direct entrants at Levels 5 and 6
 - any form of reassessment
23. The Academic Induction Period (AIP) covers first and concurrent occurrences of plagiarism, copying, self-plagiarism, collusion and unacceptable use of generative artificial intelligence. It does not apply to other forms of academic misconduct.
 24. All second and subsequent occurrences of plagiarism, copying, self-plagiarism, collusion and unacceptable use of generative artificial intelligence during the Academic Induction Period (AIP) should be considered under the Formal Procedures for Dealing with Academic Misconduct outlined in paragraphs 27 onwards.

What happens if there is a breach of Academic Integrity within the Academic Induction Period

25. If a Module Leader determines that a summative assessment completed within the Academic Induction Period (AIP) evidences possible plagiarism, copying, self-plagiarism, collusion and/or unacceptable use of generative artificial intelligence, the Module Leader should contact the Student Casework Team to confirm it is the first occurrence that can be considered under the academic induction period.
26. If the occurrence is determined eligible to be considered under the AIP, an academic will appropriately mark the work taking into account what work is deemed original and attributable to the student, and the relevant grade criteria. The Module Leader will invite the student to a meeting to provide feedback and direct the student to appropriate support in relation to the academic integrity concerns raised within their work.

Section 4

What happens if there is a suspected breach of Academic Integrity outside of the Academic Induction Period?

Step 1: Consideration by the Module Leader/Academic integrity Officer

27. In cases of plagiarism, copying, self-plagiarism, collusion and/or unacceptable use of generative artificial intelligence, that are suspected outside of the Academic Induction Period, the Module Leader (or other appropriate authority) will hold an informal meeting with the student(s), except in a retake period when they may proceed directly to submitting a written report and relevant evidence to the Course Leader. The objective of the informal meeting is to discuss the assessment and the student's approach to determine whether the next stage of the Academic Misconduct Procedures should be invoked.
28. When the suspected misconduct does not involve plagiarism copying, self-plagiarism, collusion and/or unacceptable use of generative artificial intelligence, the Module Leader (or other appropriate authority) can make a written report and submit the relevant evidence to the Course Leader. When the Module Leader is the Course Leader the relevant evidence will be submitted to a more senior member of academic staff.
29. If there is evidence that a student has purchased or commissioned work prior to submission, this will be referred to an Academic Integrity Officer within the Academic Registry. If the Academic Integrity Officer does consider that academic misconduct may have occurred, they will make a written report and submit the relevant evidence to the Academic Registrar Regulations, Assessment and Student Casework (RASC) or their nominee.
30. Where the suspicion of purchasing or commissioning arises during or after marking, the Module Leader (or other appropriate authority) should make a written report and submit the relevant evidence to the Course Leader. When the Module Leader is the Course Leader the relevant evidence will be submitted to a more senior member of academic staff.
31. If the suspected misconduct has taken place in an examination venue this will be referred to an Academic Integrity Officer within the Academic Registry. If the Academic Integrity Officer does consider that academic misconduct may have occurred, they will make a written report and submit the relevant evidence to the Academic Registrar Regulations, Assessment and Student Casework (RASC) or their nominee. The evidence will include the student's script, if relevant, any materials collected in the room and the (suitably redacted) Chief Invigilator's report.

Informal meeting

32. The aim of an informal meeting is to allow the Module Leader (or other appropriate authority) to fully understand how the student has approached the assessment and to allow the student to reflect on their practices. This

meeting should not include note-taking other than to record one of three possible outcomes:

- i) there is no evidence of academic misconduct, or
 - ii) the process moves onto the formal steps of the academic misconduct procedure, or
 - iii) the student admits the presence of academic misconduct in the work.
33. The informal meeting should not be used to discuss regulatory issues, such as potential penalties. However, a copy of these procedures should be available to advise students should the meeting lead to the second of these three outcomes.
34. Following the informal meeting, if the Module Leader (or other appropriate authority) does consider that academic misconduct may have occurred they will make a written report and submit the relevant evidence to the Course Leader. When the Module Leader is the Course Leader the relevant evidence will be submitted to a more senior member of academic staff.

Step 2: Consideration by the Course Leader or Academic Registrar - Regulations, Assessment and Student Casework (RASC)

35. Following receipt of the written report the individual considering the case will determine whether:
- (a) there is insufficient evidence to proceed. They will then notify the person making the allegation of the reasons for not holding a hearing.
 - (b) there is sufficient evidence to proceed to a formal hearing.
36. If the individual considering the case judges that a formal hearing is justified, the student will be provided with:
- (a) a copy of these procedures;
 - (b) written details of the allegation and a copy of all evidence provided for the hearing by the academic who had made the allegation. This will include specific reference to the assessment in question and the nature of the suspected misconduct. For example:
 - (i) in a case of suspected plagiarism, the student should be provided with a copy of their work with the sections where plagiarism is suspected indicated which may include a copy of the Turnitin report detailing the identified sources;
 - (ii) in a case of suspected cheating in an examination venue the student should be provided with a copy of the (suitably redacted) Chief Invigilators' report and copies of any materials removed from the student in the exam venue (if applicable);
 - (c) advice to contact the Kingston Students' Union Advice Centre (see <http://www.kingstonstudents.net/advice> or email support@kingston.ac.uk). Although the Kingston Students' Union officers cannot act as advocates, they may be able to advise on the case and may agree to act as an observer at the hearing;

- (d) the date, time and place of the hearing. The University will try to arrange the hearing at a time that is suitable for the student. Normally the hearing will take place within six weeks of the date that the student is formally notified in writing that an allegation has been made.
- 37. Where the evidence of misconduct relates to a group of students, the Course Leader will judge from the nature of the offence and the numbers involved, whether to hold individual hearings or to call the group together in a single hearing.
- 38. Where a student has been permitted a reassessment attempt after academic misconduct has been found and it is suspected that he or she has committed academic misconduct on the reassessment, this must be treated as a new offence and all relevant stages of this procedure must be followed.

Step 3: Actions by the Student

- 39. A student may decide to admit that the allegation of academic misconduct is justified by providing a written statement. In this case no formal hearing will take place. An appropriate member of the Regulations, Assessment and Student Casework team will be informed of the academic misconduct and the student's admission and will determine the relevant penalty in line with this procedure. It is the programme assessment board which ultimately ratifies the final penalty which will be applied on consideration of the student's complete profile. Once a student admits that they committed academic misconduct formally they cannot retract this, except in the case of paragraph 40 below.
- 40. If the student admits that the allegation of academic misconduct is justified at an informal meeting, they will have 5 university working days from the date of the informal meeting to reflect on the decision and retract their admission if they change their mind.
- 41. If the student does not admit that the allegation is justified, they will proceed to a formal hearing. They will be asked to confirm attendance to either the Course Leader or the relevant administrator and to provide the name of any person chosen to accompany the student (see paragraphs below for further information on accompaniment and representation).
- 42. If the student fails to attend the hearing within 15 minutes of the scheduled start time without a reason that is deemed acceptable by the University, the hearing will proceed on the basis of the evidence available to the panel. This will include any written submission that the student may have made.

Step 4: Formal Hearing – Actions of the Hearing Panel

- 43. The panel established to consider the evidence will comprise a minimum of two members of academic staff. One of these will be designated as Chair of the panel. The Chair of the panel will be chosen from a group of staff designated for this purpose by the Faculty and will be independent, i.e. will not be directly associated with the student's learning and teaching.

44. In normal circumstances the Academic Misconduct Hearing must not be digitally recorded by the student. While the University allows audio recordings of lectures for study purposes, hearings may not be digitally recorded by students, and the notes taken by the University will constitute the official record of the hearing. The Chair of the panel will make this clear to the student at the beginning of the meeting. If the student records the hearing notwithstanding this advice, they may be subject to action under the Student Conduct and Behaviour Procedure. This rule may be waived in cases where reasonable adjustments are required.
45. The panel will normally interview:
 - the student, who may present documentation and/or supporting evidence
 - any relevant members of staff (e.g. module leader, or Field Leader, Course Leader or Academic Integrity Officer who will present the evidence).
46. The student, their representative (where present) and the staff member(s) presenting the evidence will then be asked to leave the hearing whilst the panel considers its decision.
47. The panel will decide if on balance of probability i.e. that it is more likely than not:
 - a) there is insufficient evidence of academic misconduct, or
 - b) there is evidence of academic misconduct.
48. Where it is found that there is insufficient evidence of academic misconduct, the process will be terminated and no report will be kept on the student's file.
49. Where it is found that there is evidence of academic misconduct, the panel shall then be advised of any prior instances of academic misconduct committed by the student in order to be able to determine a recommendation for the level of penalty to be imposed (see Annex A: Penalties for Academic Misconduct). In the interests of natural justice this information should not be made available to the panel prior to this point.
50. It is recognised that there are instances where further information may need to be sought prior to the panel making a final decision, for example advice on detailed PSRB regulations. In these instances, the student should be advised of the need for further information to be sought and provided with a date by which the final decision will be advised.
51. Following the conclusion of the hearing, a summary report will be produced which sets out the nature of the allegations, the key discussions held, the basis for the decision which has been made and the recommendation of the panel concerning the level of penalty to be imposed. The student will be provided with a copy of this report and a copy will be placed on the student's file.
52. If the panel is unable to reach a consensus view, it shall find in the student's favour and will give the student a statement to this effect.

53. If the outcome of the academic misconduct procedures indicates that a fitness to practise issue additionally arises, the separate Fitness to Practise procedures will be invoked. However, in these instances, it may not be necessary to carry out the initial investigation stage of the Fitness to Practise procedures. For further information see [General Regulations 4: Fitness to Practise](#).

Step 5: Actions by the Programme Assessment Board

54. The student's results together with any penalty recommended by the formal hearing will be considered by the Programme Assessment Board. It is the programme assessment board which ultimately ratifies the final overall penalty which will be applied on consideration of the student's complete profile.

Consistency of Treatment

55. The University aims to treat its students consistently across all programmes, but it recognises that some courses lead to both a University qualification and a licence to practise e.g. nursing and teaching. These courses may have specific codes of conduct of professional behaviour which will be clearly communicated to students. Any record of academic misconduct may result in the termination of a student's registration on one of these courses as the University will be unable to confirm students' suitability to practise.

Accompaniment and Representation

56. A student may wish to seek advice from the Kingston Students' Union. However, this is an internal procedure and it is appropriate for students to represent themselves with any necessary support which is permitted as follows:

Accompaniment

57. Students invited to attend a hearing may be accompanied by one friend, family member, officer or staff member from the Kingston Students' Union Advice Centre, or a Trade Union or professional association staff member, if applicable. The individual accompanying is not permitted to make representations, or ask or answer questions on behalf of the student.

Representation

58. Representation by any third party will only be permitted where there is a compelling reason, for example, ill health and/or disability and if considered necessary by the Academic Registrar (whose decision is final). In such circumstances, the student must provide signed written consent for the representation.

Allegations raised by a Third Party

59. The University encourages anyone to come forward and provide information related to any incidents where Academic Integrity is believed to have been breached.
60. Any allegations of academic misconduct raised to the University are taken seriously and will be investigated in accordance with the University's academic misconduct procedures. To ensure a thorough investigation, the University will request any evidence and information that can be provided in relation to the alleged misconduct. All information will be confidential and used solely for the purpose of investigating the matter raised. In accordance with the principles of natural justice, the student will be provided with access to any information and evidence provided should the case be brought before an Academic Misconduct Panel. If no information or evidence is provided the matter will not be investigated and will be considered closed.
61. Details of the status or outcome of a case will not be shared with the third party due to data protection.
62. Where a third party has concerns pertaining to the work of a student they should contact Academic Registry in the first instance academicregistry@kingston.ac.uk
63. Reports which are felt to be frivolous or vexatious may not be considered and may be addressed under the University's Student Behaviour and Conduct Procedure if raised by a student.

Anonymity

64. The University wishes to support anyone in raising concerns where Academic Integrity is believed to have been breached. However, it may not be possible or conducive to an investigation for allegations or matters raised to be considered anonymously. In the principle of natural justice, information or evidence will be provided to a student for any case brought to a panel under our procedures. All matters will be treated sensitively and the University will endeavour to suitably redact information provided where appropriate.
65. The Academic Registrar may, in exceptional cases, allow for evidence to be redacted or withheld from the accused student where there are compelling reasons. These justifications must be carefully considered in light of the principle of natural justice. Compelling grounds for redaction or withholding of evidence include but are not limited to, ensuring the personal safety of individuals involved, safeguarding the privacy of sensitive personal information, and preventing any potential harm to the well-being of the third party, the accused student, or other relevant parties. The Academic Registrar's decision in this respect is final.

Section 5

Penalties

66. The penalties in Annex A have been determined on the basis of the following principles:
 - no student should gain any advantage over another as a result of academic misconduct
 - where there is evidence of collusion, all students implicated in the case should normally receive the same penalty
 - where there is evidence of plagiarism or copying group work, all those involved will normally receive the same penalty
67. While students may face challenging circumstances that may affect their academic performance, it is important to note that mitigating circumstances cannot excuse academic misconduct. However, there may be exceptional cases where mitigating circumstances may be taken into account when considering academic misconduct penalties. For instance, if a student was suffering from a severe medical condition that significantly impacted their mental or physical health, and that condition directly led to the academic misconduct.
68. The Programme Assessment Board has authority delegated from the Academic Council to make a judgement on the penalty to be imposed and this judgement is final and not subject to appeal.
69. Where the regulations of accrediting Professional, Statutory and Regulatory Bodies (PSRB) require, the Programme Assessment Board will terminate a student's registration for any occurrence of academic misconduct.
70. Students will not be permitted further reassessment where an offence of academic misconduct is committed at the final assessment opportunity allowed under the Undergraduate Regulations, Degree Apprenticeship Regulations or Postgraduate Regulations.
71. Registration may be terminated where other penalties in Annex A are not possible (e.g. where modules cannot be repeated).
72. The academic misconduct penalties apply to a student for the duration of their registration for the qualification aim upon which they were registered at the time of the offence. For example: if a student transfers from one programme title to another, e.g. BA (Hons) Business to BA (Hons) Business and Management Studies, they would retain their academic misconduct record. Whereas, a student transferring between qualification aims e.g. Foundation Degree to a BA (Hons) top-up would not.

Concurrent offences

73. Concurrent offences relate to instances of plagiarism, copying, self-plagiarism, collusion, unacceptable use of Generative Artificial Intelligence. Instances of other types of academic misconduct, such as cheating in time-constrained assessments, cheating in an examination or other forms of misconduct, normally cannot be classified as concurrent offences.
74. Concurrent offences of academic misconduct will not be considered repeat offences.
75. Concurrent offences occur when a student has two or more instances of the same form of academic misconduct (either plagiarism, or copying, or self-plagiarism, or collusion or unacceptable use of Generative Artificial Intelligence) within the same assessment period, provided that it is the student's first instance of that specific type of academic misconduct. For example, if a student submits two assignments within a three-week period, both found to have instances of plagiarism, these plagiarism offences would be considered concurrent.
76. Further instances of the same form of academic misconduct by the same student in subsequent assessment periods will not be regarded as concurrent offences. For instance, if the same student were to commit plagiarism again in two further assessments in a subsequent assessment period, these subsequent plagiarism offences would be treated as separate repeat offences, and not concurrent.

Compensation Regulations

77. Failure due to academic misconduct cannot be compensated.

Student Conduct and Behaviour Procedure

78. In exceptional circumstances [General Regulations 3: Student Conduct and Behaviour Procedure](#) will apply where academic misconduct has brought the good name of the University into disrepute or criminal proceedings are involved or where that misconduct constitutes any other breach of the University's Regulations.

Academic Appeals

79. A student can use the procedures set out in Academic Regulations 8: [Academic Appeals \(Taught Courses\)](#) to request a review of an outcome in relation to Academic Misconduct either following the Academic Misconduct Panel or following the final decision of the Programme Assessment Board if there is evidence that the procedure was not followed.
80. A student cannot otherwise appeal against the penalty imposed by the Programme Assessment Board.

ANNEX A

Penalties for Academic Misconduct

Note:

- The University reserves the right to terminate the registration of any student for academic misconduct.
- The academic misconduct penalties apply to a student for the duration of their registration for the qualification aim upon which they were registered at the time of the offence (see paragraph 72 for further explanation).
- Where the regulations of accrediting Professional, Statutory and Regulatory Bodies (PSRB) require it, the Programme Assessment Board will terminate a student's registration for any occurrence of academic misconduct.
- Students should be aware that, following the application of a penalty relating to academic misconduct, no further reassessment will be available if this was their last attempt at a module, or where the University's maximum module or programme registration periods may be exceeded.
- If a student admits to academic misconduct prior to a formal hearing, they will receive a penalty one level lower than that which would normally be applied for the type of misconduct identified as a first or repeat offence (see penalty table below).
- Where Academic Misconduct is confirmed as a fourth formal offence, the penalty applied will always be Penalty D.

Penalties by Offence and Repeat Offence

Please note that the consideration of breaches of academic integrity in the Academic Induction Period are not reflected in the Penalty tables below. Please see Section 3 of these regulations for further information.

Offence	Type 1 – academic misconduct	Type 2 – academic misconduct	Mixed offences*
**	A	N/A	N/A
First offence	B	C	N/A
Second Offence	C	D	D
Third offence	D	N/A	D

*Mixed offences are when a repeat offence is made in a different category to the first offence

**Penalty A is only applied where a penalty B offence is admitted to prior to a formal hearing.

Summary of penalties applicable for Academic Misconduct

Penalty	Summary
Penalty A	Element of assessment awarded a mark of zero (Z). reassessment by retake is permitted if required.
Penalty B	Module and element of assessment awarded a mark of zero (Z). Reassessment by retake is permitted, if this is allowed by the standard assessment regulations. If the reassessment is being undertaken in retake mode, the penalty only requires reassessment in the piece of work in which the academic misconduct took place. However, where other elements are failed, these too should be set as retake as per assessment regulations. Where any subsequent reassessment is judged to be of the required pass standard, the overall module result will be capped at the minimum pass mark. Additional learning support to be provided.
Penalty C	Module and element of assessment awarded a mark of zero (Z). Reassessment by retake will not be permitted. An opportunity to repeat/replace the module is permitted, if this is allowed by the standard assessment regulations. Where any subsequent reassessment is judged to be of the required pass standard, the overall module result will be capped at the minimum pass mark.
Penalty D	Module and element of assessment awarded a mark of zero (Z). A PAB will terminate the registration and award based on credit achieved at that point.

Annex B - Statement on editorial help for students' work: guidance for students, supervisors and examiners

This guidance is now published as a standalone Academic Guidance document (see Academic Guidance 2) from [Policies and regulations | Kingston University London](#)