London Academy For Applied Technology

LAAT Academic Integrity & Academic Misconduct Policy

Policy title: LAAT Academic Integrity & Misconduct Policy
Document reference: LAAT-ACA-POL-AI01
Department / Function: Academic / Quality & Standards
Owner: Academic Dean, Dr Manoj Ponugubati
Oversight committee: Academic Board / Academic Quality & Progress Panel
Approving body: Academic Board (recommendation) / Board of Governors (final approval)
Version: v1.0
Status: Adapted
Date approved: 06/02/2026
Review date: Annually from the approval date
Supersedes: None

Regulatory Alignment with Office for Students (OfS) Conditions

The Academic Integrity and Academic Misconduct Policy form a core part of the London Academy for Applied Technology's (LAAT) academic governance and quality assurance framework. The Policy safeguards academic standards, promotes fairness and transparency in assessment practice, and ensures consistent handling of academic misconduct across all programmes, thereby maintaining confidence in the credibility and value of LAAT's higher education awards.

In accordance with ***OfS Condition B4 (Assessment and Awards***), this Policy ensures that assessment processes are fair, valid, reliable, and secure, and that academic progression and award decisions are based on authentic student achievement. The Policy establishes clear definitions of academic misconduct, structured investigation procedures, and proportionate sanctions, protecting the integrity of assessment outcomes. Alignment with OfS Condition ***B5 (Sector-Recognised Standards)*** is achieved through consistency with Plymouth Marjon University's Student Regulations Framework and external examining arrangements, ensuring that LAAT's academic awards meet recognised sector standards. The Policy further contributes to Condition ***B1 (Academic Experience)*** by fostering a learning environment grounded in honesty, academic professionalism, and student confidence in fair treatment.

The Policy supports OfS Condition ***C1 (Consumer Protection Law)*** by providing students with clear, accessible, and accurate information on academic integrity expectations, misconduct

procedures, possible outcomes, and appeal rights, ensuring transparent contractual treatment. It also aligns with Condition ***C5 (Treating Students Fairly)*** by ensuring that investigations follow consistent and unbiased procedures, allow students the opportunity to respond, and apply proportionate and documented decision-making.

In relation to governance and accountability, the Policy supports OfS Condition ***E1 (Public Interest Governance)*** by embedding responsibility for academic integrity within LAAT's academic governance structures and ensuring protection of the public value of its awards. It further supports Condition ***E2 (Management and Governance)*** through defined roles, escalation routes, committee oversight, and secure record-keeping for academic misconduct cases, ensuring effective internal control and risk management. Accountability is reinforced through ***Condition E3 (Accountability)*** by maintaining audit trails, reporting trends to governance committees, and enabling institutional assurance of compliance.

This Policy is informed by the ***UK Quality Code for Higher Education***, the ***OIA Good Practice*** Framework, and Plymouth Marjon University's validating partner regulations, and is implemented through LAAT's academic governance and quality assurance arrangements to ensure consistent oversight, transparency, and continuous improvement in academic integrity practice.

Terms of Reference

1. Purpose

This Policy defines academic integrity expectations for students at the London Academy for Applied Technology (LAAT) and sets out how suspected academic misconduct will be managed. Its purpose is to promote a culture of honesty, responsibility, and fairness in all academic work; to provide clear definitions and examples of academic misconduct (including misuse of Artificial Intelligence tools); to explain the stages of investigation, decision-making, and appeals; and to ensure that sanctions are proportionate and applied consistently, thereby protecting the academic standards and value of LAAT's awards.

Purpose Statement:

LAAT is committed to upholding academic integrity as a fundamental condition of scholarly activity and assessment practice. This Policy ensures that all students are assessed fairly based on authentic achievement, that academic misconduct is addressed through transparent and consistent procedures, and that confidence in LAAT's academic standards and awards is maintained.

2. Scope

This Policy applies to all students enrolled on franchised higher education programmes delivered by LAAT, to all forms of assessed work (including examinations, coursework, projects, presentations, practical assessments, group work, and digital submissions), and to all locations and modes of delivery. Academic misconduct occurring on programmes where Plymouth Marjon University is the awarding body will be handled in accordance with this Policy and the partner university's academic regulations. Where any conflict arises, the validating partner's regulations take precedence.

3. Definitions

Academic integrity refers to acting honestly and responsibly in study and assessment; producing work that reflects one's own learning; and acknowledging the work of others through appropriate referencing and scholarly practice.

Academic misconduct refers to any act, whether intentional or reckless, that gives or attempts to give an unfair academic advantage or misrepresents a student's work as their own. This includes, but is not limited to plagiarism, collusion, contract cheating, fabrication of data or evidence, impersonation, use of unauthorised materials in examinations, and misuse of Artificial Intelligence tools.

Poor academic practice refers to minor or unintentional breaches of academic conventions (such as incomplete referencing) that may be addressed through guidance, learning support, or resubmission rather than formal misconduct procedures.

Statement of Student Responsibility:

All LAAT students are expected to meet the standards of behaviour required of them as members of the LAAT and Plymouth Marjon University academic community. LAAT operates a range of policies and procedures to manage breaches of student codes of conduct, student contracts, and academic regulations with fairness and consideration of individual circumstances.

4. Principles

LAAT's academic integrity framework is founded on the values of honesty, integrity, responsibility, trust, respect, and fairness, and is guided by the following principles:

An educational and developmental focus, supporting students to understand and adopt good academic practice.

- Fairness and proportionality in the investigation of allegations and application of outcomes.
- Evidence-based decision-making, relying on clear academic evidence and professional judgement, not solely on automated detection tools.
- Consistency and transparency in procedures, communication, and outcomes.

- Confidential handling of information shared only where necessary for legitimate process purposes.
- Alignment with validating partner regulations and Office for Students expectations for quality, standards, and student fairness.

Academic Integrity Principles at LAAT:

LAAT's approach to academic integrity is based upon the values of honesty, integrity, responsibility, trust, respect, and fairness. Each student takes responsibility for their own work and treats the work of others with respect and in accordance with good academic practice. LAAT recognises that some students may require guidance and compassionate support in developing academic skills and is committed to providing appropriate learning support and educational interventions. Assessment briefs are designed to minimise opportunities for academic misconduct. No academic credit will be awarded for work that breaches regulations, and all proven instances of academic misconduct will be subject to appropriate penalty.

5. Governance and Oversight

The Academic Board holds overall responsibility for oversight of academic integrity and academic misconduct arrangements and receives annual reporting on case volumes, categories, outcomes, and emerging themes. An Academic Misconduct Panel operates under delegated authority to investigate and determine serious or complex cases in accordance with approved procedures. The Board of Governors receives high-level assurance that academic standards, assessment integrity, and institutional reputation are being protected through effective academic governance and quality assurance arrangements.

6. Policy Statement

6.1 Promoting Academic Integrity

LAAT will provide guidance on referencing, plagiarism and academic integrity through handbooks, workshops and the VLE; clearly state expectations and consequences of misconduct in assessment briefs and during induction; and offer development-focused responses for first-time, low-level issues where appropriate, particularly at lower levels.

6.2 Stages of the Academic Misconduct Process

The operational stages are:

Stage 1 – Allegation raised by marker, module tutor or invigilator and initial evidence gathered.

Stage 2 – Initial review by Programme Leader, who may treat cases as poor academic practice or escalate as suspected misconduct.

Stage 3 – Formal investigation for moderate or repeated concerns, normally by a senior academic; student is invited to a meeting and a decision made on penalty.

Stage 4 – Academic Misconduct Panel hearing for serious cases (e.g. impersonation, contract cheating, extensive fabrication, large-scale AI misuse).
Stage 5 – Appeal, where a student may challenge outcomes on limited grounds.
Stage 6 – External review by the OIA where applicable.

6.3 Penalties

Penalties are normally applied in line with validating university tariff guidance and may include: a formal warning; resubmission of the assessment with or without a cap; zero mark for the assessment or module; requirement to repeat the module or stage; or, for serious or repeated misconduct, suspension or termination of studies. Penalties must be proportionate and consider level of study, prior history, intent and impact on academic standards.

6.4 AI Misuse

AI misuse is treated as a form of academic misconduct. The LAAT Assessment Practices Policy sets out expectations for when AI may or may not be used in assessments and requires students to include an AI Use Statement where allowed. Students are advised to keep a version trail of their work (before and after using AI tools) in case external scrutiny is required.

7. Standard Operating Procedure (SOP)

A detailed Academic Misconduct SOP is maintained as a controlled institutional document and sets out step-by-step procedures for handling allegations, conducting investigations and panel hearings, recording decisions, and managing appeals. It includes guidance on evidencing suspected AI misuse, the use of viva assessments where appropriate, and requirements for clear and auditable documentation of decisions. This SOP provides operational guidance for detecting, investigating, deciding, recording, and reporting academic misconduct at LAAT. It ensures consistency, proportionality, fairness, confidentiality, and alignment with:

- Plymouth Marjon University validating partner regulation
- OfS Conditions B1–B5 (Quality and Standards) and E2 (Management and Governance)
- OIA Good Practice Framework
- QAA sector guidance on assessment integrity

Where allegations indicate safeguarding concerns or potential criminal behaviour, cases will also be referred immediately to the Designated Safeguarding Lead in accordance with LAAT's Safeguarding Policy. All procedures are conducted in accordance with the Equality, Diversity and Inclusion Policy, with reasonable adjustments provided where required.

Overview of Process Stages

1. Stage 1 – Allegation Raised and Initial Evidence Collection
2. Stage 2 – Initial Review by Programme Leader

3. Stage 3 – Formal Academic Misconduct Investigation
4. Stage 4 – Academic Misconduct Panel (Serious or Complex Cases)
5. Stage 5 – Appeal Stage
6. Stage 6 – External Review (Office of the Independent Adjudicator)

SOP – Detailed Process

Stage 1 – Identification of Suspected Misconduct

How allegations arise

- Allegations may be identified through:
  Markers or Module Tutors during assessment marking
- Invigilators during in-person examinations
- Automated similarity or AI-detection tools, which inform academic judgement but do not solely determine decisions
- Irregularities in viva, oral, or practical assessments
- Confidential reports from students or staff

Evidence gathering

The staff member identifying the concern must compile:

- Similarity or Turnitin reports
- Annotated scripts highlighting areas of concern
- Relevant assessment briefs and submission rules
- AI-use expectations for the module (from the Assessment Practices Policy)
- Invigilator notes (for examinations)
- Version history where available (particularly in AI-misuse cases)

This evidence must be submitted to the Programme Leader within three working days.

Stage 2 – Initial Review (Programme Leader)

Purpose of review

The Programme Leader categorises the case as either:

- Poor Academic Practice (e.g., minor referencing errors or first-time misunderstanding),
- Suspected Academic Misconduct requiring formal investigation.

Outcomes at this stage

- Poor Academic Practice → Recorded locally; student receives guidance, feedback, and signposting to academic support.
- Suspected Misconduct → Escalated to Stage 3 and student formally notified.

A written explanation of the decision must be issued to the student within five working days.

Notification to student

The notification must include:

- The nature of the allegation
- The evidence available
- Next steps and expected timescales
- Student rights to representation and reasonable adjustments
- Information on any forthcoming meeting

Stage 3 – Formal Academic Misconduct Investigation

Appointment of Investigating Officer

The Academic Dean (or nominee) appoints a senior academic who has not previously been involved in the case.

Investigation actions

The Investigating Officer must:

1. Review all evidence submitted at Stage 1
2. Request additional information where necessary
3. Invite the student to a formal meeting (online or in person)
4. Provide all evidence to the student at least five working days before the meeting
5. Offer the student the opportunity to submit a written statement
6. Consider whether a viva voce assessment is required to confirm authorship (particularly in AI misuse, contract cheating, or ghost-writing concerns)
7. Apply validating-partner tariff guidance when recommending outcomes or penalties

Conducting the student meeting

The student may:

- Be accompanied by a friend or representative (not acting in a legal capacity)
- Access reasonable adjustments
- Provide explanations and supporting evidence

Investigation outcome

The Investigating Officer must produce a written report summarising:

- Allegations
- Evidence reviewed
- Student explanation
- Findings
- Recommended outcome and penalty

Timescale

Normally, an outcome is issued within twenty working days of escalation to Stage 3.

Stage 4 – Academic Misconduct Panel

When a Panel is required

A Panel is convened where:

- Misconduct is serious (e.g., impersonation, contract cheating, extensive plagiarism, or large-scale AI misuse)
- Misconduct is repeated
- Potential penalties include module failure, suspension, or termination

Panel composition

- Chair – Academic Dean or senior nominee
- Academic representative
- Professional Services representative
- Secretary (non-voting)

Panel duties

1. Review the Stage 3 investigation report
2. Meet with the student (normally required for serious cases)
3. Consider validating-university tariff guidance
4. Decide findings and penalties
5. Ensure proportionality considering intent, history, level of study, and impact on standards

Penalty examples

- Formal warning
- Mark of zero (with or without resubmission rights)
- Capped resubmission
- Module failure
- Requirement to repeat the stage or year
- Suspension or termination (in the most serious cases)

Outcome letter

The outcome letter must be issued within five working days and include:

- Decision reached
- Reasons for the decision
- Penalty applied
- Appeal rights and timescales

Stage 5 – Appeal Process

Students may appeal on defined grounds, including procedural irregularity, new evidence, or disproportionality of outcome. Appeals are considered by an independent senior academic not previously involved in the case.

Appeals are accepted only on:

- Procedural error
- Unreasonable decision

- New evidence not previously available
- Evidence of bias or conflict of interest

Submission

Student submits an Appeal Form within ten working days of the outcome letter.

Appeal decision-making

Handled by an Independent Senior Academic not previously involved.

Possible outcomes

- Uphold original decision
- Reduce the penalty to a lesser sanction
- Refer case back for reconsideration

Completion of Procedures Letter

Issued after final internal decision.

Stage 6 – External Review

Following completion of internal procedures, students may escalate complaints to the Office of the Independent Adjudicator (OIA), where applicable.

Students may apply to the OIA within 12 months of the date of the Completion of Procedures letter.

LAAT will:

- Cooperate fully with OIA requests
- Supply documentation promptly
- Implement recommendations where required

Record-Keeping and Reporting

Logs maintained by the Academic Quality Lead:

- Misconduct Case Register
- Poor Academic Practice Register
- Annual Academic Integrity Report to Academic Board

Reporting

- Quarterly reporting to Academic Board and Academic Quality & Progress Panel
- Annual assurance report to Board of Governors
- Themes used for staff development, curriculum improvement, and risk management

Records will be retained in line with LAAT's Data Retention Schedule and UK GDPR requirements.

Training and Educational Support

LAAT provides:

- Academic integrity workshops
- Referencing training
- AI literacy and responsible-use sessions
- Guidance through handbooks and the VLE
- Staff training on detection, investigation, and fair handling

Regulatory Assurance Statement

This SOP ensures that LAAT's academic misconduct processes:

- Protect academic standards and award credibility (OfS Conditions B4 and B5)
- Treat students fairly and transparently (OfS Condition C1)
- Operate robust governance, accountability, and record-keeping (OfS Condition E2)
- Align with validating-partner regulations and sector good practice

8. Penalties for Academic Misconduct – Criteria for Determining the Penalty

When determining the appropriate penalty for academic misconduct, LAAT will apply a rising tariff and indicative penalty framework to ensure consistency of sanctions while taking individual circumstances into account. Where an allegation is referred to an Academic Misconduct Panel Hearing, the Panel will consider the nature and seriousness of the misconduct using the criteria outlined below, alongside the student's prior academic conduct and the specific context of the case.

Criteria considered when determining penalties:

- **Pre-meditated dishonesty** – Deliberate and intentional academic misconduct that is planned, rather than arising from misunderstanding or carelessness, will normally be considered more serious than inadvertent breaches of academic integrity.
- **Previous history** – A prior record of academic misconduct will normally be considered an aggravating factor and treated more seriously than a first offence.
- **Theft, falsification, or work obtained from third parties** – Misconduct involving theft of another student's work, falsification of data or sources, purchase of assignments from third parties, use of contract-cheating services, or use of "cheat sites" — whether involving human providers or AI-generated content — will normally be regarded as more serious than unattributed but otherwise authorised use of another person's work.
- **Other relevant factors** – Any additional factors relevant to the individual case, including intent, impact on academic standards, level of study, or mitigating circumstances, may also be considered when determining the appropriate sanction.

9. Tariff of penalties for academic misconduct

Academic Misconduct Penalties

Level A1 Plagiarism allegations only: first instance of minor offence

A student who plagiarises for the first time will be issued a Level A1 Penalty, providing that there is no evidence of pre- meditated dishonesty.

Penalty Outcome:

- **Level A1 pass**

The student will be issued with a capped mark against the relevant assessment component. **Or**

- **Level A1 fail**

If the extent of the academic misconduct means that the work is a fail.

  - the student will be issued with a mark of 0 against the relevant assessment component.
  - The student will be permitted to retake this component at the next assessment point.
  - The relevant module will be capped against the relevant pass mark.

If a mark of zero is issued during a reassessment opportunity, the Exams/Progression Board will determine the appropriate consequence.

Level A2 Collusion or Self-Plagiarism allegation only: first instance of minor offence

A student who colludes or self-plagiarises for the first time will be issued with a Level A2 Penalty, providing that there is no evidence of pre-meditated dishonesty.

Penalty Outcome:

Level A2

- The student will be issued with a mark of 0 against the relevant assessment component.
- The student will be permitted to retake this component at the next assessment point.
- The relevant module will be capped at the relevant pass mark.

If a mark of zero is issued during a reassessment opportunity, the Progression Board will determine the appropriate consequence.

Level B: First instance of serious academic misconduct and/or any academic misconduct following a Level A1 pass or fail or A2 Penalty

Penalty Outcome:

The student will be issued with a mark of 0 against the relevant assessment component.

- The student will be permitted to retake this component at the next assessment point.
- The relevant module will be capped at the relevant pass mark.

Where a level B penalty is issued at the reassessment point, the Assessment Board will determine the appropriate consequence.

Indicative Misconduct:

- Attempting to copy from another student in an examination.
- Importing prohibited materials of any type into an examination room

- Any instance of academic misconduct that has been preceded by a Level A1 pass or fail or A2 penalty.

Level C: First instance of serious academic misconduct involving pre-meditated dishonesty and/or any academic misconduct following a Level B Penalty)

Penalty Outcome:

- The student will be issued with a mark of 0 against the relevant assessment component.
- The student will be permitted to retake the component at the next assessment point.
- The overall module mark will be capped.
- The student will be suspended from their studies for the next academic year.

Where a level C penalty is issued at the reassessment point, the Assessment Board will determine the appropriate consequence.

Indicative Misconduct:

- Any instance of academic misconduct that has been preceded by a Level B penalty.
- A serious first instance where the student has acted in a grossly dishonest way (this could pertain to academic misconduct such as theft, forgery, or contract cheating involving work produced by external parties like essay mills or other sources). Irrespective of whether this involves human agency or generated by Artificial Intelligence.
- Any other types of misconduct involving impersonation, bribery, reference to prohibited materials in an examination and/or the attempted intimidation of an invigilator.

Level D: Any academic misconduct following a Level C Penalty

Penalty Outcome:

- The student will be issued with a mark of 0 against the relevant assessment component.
- Expulsion with immediate effect.

Indicative Misconduct:

- Any instance of academic misconduct that has been preceded by a Level C penalty, or any instance of academic misconduct deemed to merit this penalty.

10. Monitoring, Compliance and Review

Monitoring

The Academic Quality Lead maintains a secure register of academic misconduct cases, outcomes, and emerging trends, and produces an annual Academic Integrity Report for

submission to the Academic Board. The report highlights key patterns, risks, and recommended actions to support continuous improvement in academic integrity practice.

Compliance

Compliance with this Policy is mandatory for all staff and students involved in teaching, learning, assessment, and academic governance. All academic misconduct cases must be managed in accordance with the approved SOP and validating-partner regulations. Failure by staff to follow this Policy may constitute a breach of institutional governance and staff conduct requirements. All procedures are conducted in line with UK GDPR, Equality, Diversity and Inclusion, and Safeguarding policies.

Review

This Policy will be reviewed annually to ensure continued alignment with Office for Students regulatory expectations, sector best practice, developments in Artificial Intelligence use in assessment, and validating-partner regulations. Revisions will be undertaken in consultation with Plymouth Marjon University and approved through LAAT's academic governance processes.

11. Responsible People and Role Include

Dean (Policy Owner): Dr Manoj Ponugubati

Oversees implementation of the Academic Integrity and Academic Misconduct Policy, appoints Investigating Officers and Academic Misconduct Panels, and ensures alignment with validating-partner regulations and OfS requirements.

Programme Leader: Mr Amarjeet Singh

Conducts initial reviews of suspected academic misconduct, determines whether cases constitute poor academic practice or require formal investigation, and communicates decisions to students.

Head of Academic Quality: Dr Vishwanath Kokkonda

Maintains misconduct records and registers, ensures secure documentation, and produces institutional reports on academic integrity.

Safeguarding Lead: Mr Jay Sharda

Receives referrals where cases involve safeguarding or potential criminal concerns.

Data Protection Officer/Lead: Miss Nadia Asim

Ensures GDPR-compliant handling, storage, and retention of misconduct case records.

List of People and Contacts

Role	Name	Contact Email
Dean (Policy Owner)	Dr Manoj Ponugubati	manoj@laat.ac.uk
Programme Leader	Mr Amarjeet Singh	Amarjet.singh@laat.ac.uk

Head of Academic Quality	Dr Vishwanath Kokkonda	vishwanath.kokkonda@laat.ac.uk
Assessment Officer	Ms Moluk All Nakash	moluk@laat.ac.uk
Safeguarding Lead	Mr Jai Sharda	safeguarding@laat.ac.uk
Data Protection Officer	Miss Nadia Asim	dpo@laat.ac.uk

12. List of Documents

Below is the recommended full set of appendices and supporting documents required for policy compliance.

- Academic Misconduct Allegation Referral Form
- Student Response / Statement Form
- Academic Misconduct Investigation Report Template
- Academic Misconduct Panel Outcome Template
- Appeal Submission Form
- Completion of Procedures (CoP) Letter Template

This policy should be read in conjunction with

- Assessment and feedback practice policy
- AI in use assessment policy
- Academic progression and award policy
- PMU regulation framework

13. Evidence

The following evidence demonstrate implementation, oversight, and effectiveness of the Academic Integrity & Academic Misconduct Policy and provide assurance of compliance with Office for Students (OfS) Conditions of Registration and Plymouth Marjon University validating-partner expectations.

- Academic Misconduct Allegation Referral Form
- Student Response / Statement Form
- Academic Misconduct Investigation Report Template
- Academic Misconduct Panel Outcome Template
- Appeal Submission Form
- Completion of Procedures (CoP) Letter Template
- Assessment and feedback practice policy
- AI in use assessment policy
- Academic progression and award policy

- PMU student regulation framework

Evidence Item	Purpose / What it Demonstrates	Relevant OfS Condition(s)
Academic Misconduct Allegation Referral Form	Provides a clear and standardised mechanism for staff to report suspected academic misconduct, ensuring consistent initiation of investigations. Demonstrates fair and transparent procedural handling.	B4 (Fairness and Transparency in Assessment), C1 (Consumer Protection)
Academic Misconduct Investigation Report Template	Ensures structured, evidence-based investigation of misconduct cases with documented findings and recommendations. Demonstrates reliability and integrity of assessment decision-making.	B4 (Assessment and Awards), E2 (Management and Governance)
Academic Misconduct Panel Outcome Letter Template	Provides consistent communication of decisions, reasons, penalties, and appeal rights to students. Demonstrates transparency and fairness of outcomes.	C1 (Consumer Protection), C5 (Treating Students Fairly)
Appeal Submission Form	Provides students with a clear route to challenge misconduct decisions on defined grounds. Demonstrates procedural fairness and access to redress.	C1 (Consumer Protection), C2 (Student Complaints and Appeals)
Completion of Procedures (CoP) Letter Template	Confirms completion of internal processes and provides correct escalation routes to the OIA. Demonstrates compliance with external review requirements.	C2 (Student Complaints Scheme), C1 (Transparency)
Academic Misconduct Case Register	Maintains institutional records of misconduct cases, outcomes, and trends. Demonstrates monitoring, accountability, and governance oversight.	E2 (Management and Governance), E3 (Accountability)

Assessment and feedback Practices Policy	Defines assessment design, security, and integrity arrangements. Demonstrates that assessments are fair, valid, reliable, and secure.	B4 (Assessment and Awards)
AI Use in Assessment Policy	Defines permitted and prohibited use of AI in assessments and evidencing requirements. Demonstrates proactive management of emerging academic integrity risks.	B4 (Assessment Integrity), C1 (Transparent Information)
Academic Progression and award policy	Sets out academic rules, progression requirements, and student responsibilities. Demonstrates clarity of academic contract and student expectations.	C1 (Consumer Protection), B1 (Academic Experience)
Plymouth Marjon University Student Regulations Framework	Confirms alignment with validating-partner academic regulations, sector-recognised standards, and external oversight of academic integrity processes.	B5 (Sector-Recognised Standards), E1 (Public Interest Governance)

1. Academic Misconduct Allegation Referral Form

Document Ref: LAAT-ACA-FRM-AI01

Purpose: To report suspected academic misconduct

A. Student Details

- Student Name:
- Student ID:
- Programme:
- Module Code & Title:
- Level of Study:

B. Assessment Details

- Assessment Type:
- Submission Date:
- Assessment Weighting:

C. Nature of Allegation

☐ Plagiarism

☐ Collusion

☐ Contract Cheating

☐ AI Misuse

☐ Examination Misconduct

☐ Other (specify):

D. Summary of Concern

(Brief description of suspected misconduct)

E. Evidence Attached

☐ Similarity Report

☐ Annotated Script

☐ Invigilator Report

☐ Version History

☐ Other:

F. Reported by

- Staff Name:
- Role:
- Date:
- Signature:

2. Academic Misconduct Investigation Report

Document Ref: LAAT-ACA-TMP-AI02

Case Reference Number:

Student Name / ID:

Programme / Module:

Investigating Officer:

1. Allegation Summary
2. Evidence Reviewed
3. Student Response Summary
4. Findings
5. Determination (Misconduct / No Misconduct)
6. Recommended Penalty
7. Rationale for Decision

Investigating Officer Signature:

Date:

3. Academic Misconduct Panel Outcome Letter

Document Ref: LAAT-ACA-TMP-AI03

To: Student Name / ID

Case Reference:

Decision Summary:

Findings:

Penalty Applied:

Reason for Decision:

Appeal Rights:

(Explain grounds and deadline)

Signed:

Chair, Academic Misconduct Panel

Date:

4. Appeal Submission Form

Document Ref: LAAT-ACA-FRM-AI04

Student Name / ID:

Case Reference:

Grounds for Appeal:

☐ Procedural Error

☐ New Evidence

☐ Disproportionate Penalty

☐ Bias / Conflict of Interest

Appeal Statement:

(Text box)

Supporting Evidence Attached:

☐ Yes ☐ No

Student Signature:

Date:

5. Completion of Procedures (CoP) Letter

Document Ref: LAAT-ACA-TMP-AI05

To: Student Name / ID

Case Reference:

This letter confirms that LAAT's internal academic misconduct procedures have been completed.

Final Decision:

Penalty Applied:

You may refer your case to the Office of the Independent Adjudicator (OIA) within 12 months from the date of this letter.

Signed:

Academic Dean

Date:

6. Academic Misconduct Case Register

Document Ref: LAAT-ACA-REG-AI06

Fields:

- Case Reference
- Student ID
- Programme
- Module
- Allegation Type
- Outcome
- Penalty
- Appeal (Yes/No)
- Final Status
- Date Closed